

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, July 29, 1964.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The Highways Department proposes erecting certain signs on the Blanchetown bridge indicating the cross currents of wind. The work that has been carried out on the bridge is of an excellent character. In a letter which appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday it was suggested that it would be better for a wind sock to be erected at each end of the bridge showing the direction of the wind. This sign would be similar to those in operation at airports. Will the Minister take this into consideration when considering the establishment of suitable signs?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I think the executive officer of the Road Traffic Board has already considered the matter. Undoubtedly, dangerous situations could arise from time to time, but whether we should go in for signs and signals associated with aviation is a very doubtful matter.

DRILLING MUD.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My question concerns drilling mud. I understand that at the present time this article, which is essential in the oil drilling industry, is being imported from the United States of America, particularly from Texas, at approximately £60 a ton. Drilling mud consists of bentonite, and a weighting agent, such as barytes and various electrolytes mixed with water. In view of the high cost of the imported article, and as it appears that large quantities will be used in the future in the search for oil, will the Minister of Mines obtain a report from his department setting out, first, the availability of these minerals in South Australia and, secondly, whether in the opinion of the department a commercial venture could be set up to manufacture drilling mud, and whether such a venture could succeed?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Action has already been taken to set up an industry

to provide the materials for drilling mud, and that industry is situated at Quorn. The barytes are brought down from the north and are treated at Quorn. This article is quite satisfactory for drilling mud under certain conditions, but there are varieties of mud which are used in oil drilling that are of different density and for different purposes, because sometimes the ordinary varieties may not be suitable. The ordinary barytes produced here is not necessarily of a high grade, but it is a variety which we are capable of supplying, and the question gets down to a matter of price. The article does not have to be imported from far away. I think there is some competition from Victoria, but there is an industry here that has been assisted in its establishment by the Government. It produces normal barytes for the production of drilling mud. This has been used extensively in the north; I have seen it. I know that other types are also used. I do not know anything beyond that. That is the information on the present position. The substance is available here and it is only the matter of a competitive price that has to be considered as regards consumption. If the honourable member wants anything more than that, I shall be pleased to see if I can obtain further statistics.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask the Minister whether the department has investigated the other main ingredient in the mud, bentonite, to see whether we have large deposits of that material and whether it can be exploited here.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I shall be happy to get that information for the honourable member. It is not a term that is familiar to me but I think an important point to be considered is tonnage requirements. Barytes used to be commonly used in the production of paint, but it is not used to the same extent now for that purpose. I will see whether I can get some information about the production of bentonite.

LAND VALUATION.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister representing the Treasurer say whether a report has been received from the Land Valuation Committee set up some time ago by the Government to investigate the methods of land valuation for the purposes of land tax, council rates, water rates, succession and probate duty, and estate duty?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Personally, I cannot report on the matter, but I will get the information for the honourable member.

SALINE EFFLUENTS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Several months ago I furnished a report to the Minister of Lands (Mr. Quirke) on the grave problem of the disposal of saline effluents into the River Murray in South Australia. I had a letter from the Minister of Lands telling me that a survey of the whole problem was to be carried out: that survey was actually to be undertaken. I now ask the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Lands in another place, (1) which departments are undertaking the survey; (2) whether any firm conclusion has been reached; and (3) whether the Minister will make a statement on the progress up to the present time?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not know the answer to the questions but shall be pleased to get the information required by the honourable member.

MILLICENT PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I refer to a report in the *South-East Times* of Tuesday, July 28, in which the President of the Millicent Primary School Welfare Committee stated that a new primary school for Millicent North was not a foregone conclusion. As the new Millicent North school may take 10 years to eventuate, she feels that an adequate toilet block should be built at the present primary school. At present there are approximately 750 pupils at the school. It is hoped that the new Millicent South school will be ready for occupation in 1966. I believe it is now before the Public Works Committee. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Education say whether the delay in the erection of the Millicent North primary school will be in the order of 10 years and, if so, will steps be taken to erect adequate toilet blocks at the present Millicent primary school?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

SUPREME COURT JUDGES.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: As the Attorney-General is fully aware of the large quantity of work that is cluttering up the Supreme Court, and of the consequent burden on the existing judges, is it the Government's intention to appoint an acting judge or further judges to the bench?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I was not aware that there was a large quantity of work cluttering up the Supreme Court. My impression is that the court has kept reasonably up to date with its work. It is certainly more up to date than any similar court in Australia. Therefore, I cannot agree with the honourable member's statement and from the information I have obtained I understand that the existing bench of six judges is able to handle the work and I do not think that the time has yet arrived when the Government would be justified in making further appointments to the bench.

STURT HIGHWAY.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe it is the correct thing to do if one gets over into the backyard of another honourable member to apologize to him for encroaching on his province. Therefore, I must apologize to Mr. Story. I was interested yesterday in the reply of the Minister of Roads regarding the Sturt Highway. I am interested in the work that is to be done between Waikerie and Blanchetown and also the work envisaged between Truro and Blanchetown. I have travelled over that road several times lately and the portion which gives me considerable concern is that between Waikerie and Kingston. Quite a section of the road seems to me to be overdue for reconstruction, as the surface is very close to being worn through. I am quite aware that the Highways Department cannot do the impossible and that we cannot expect all these jobs to be done in any one year, but I would ask the Minister of Roads if it is possible to reconstruct that section of the road between Waikerie and Kingston and to give it as high a priority as possible in the meantime so that the maintenance is kept at a high level.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: If I accept the honourable member's suggestion that the department has failed in that particular area, it is perfectly obvious that the roadway cannot be allowed to get into a very bad state of repair, because of the large loss involved. I can assure him that the department regards it as an important matter of maintenance, and it will be attended to. As I have indicated, certain surveys are going on, and I do not like to spend much money on a road which has to be altered, but I can assure the honourable member that the paving will be reasonably maintained. I will not say that with this year's limited programme the road will be entirely resealed. I remind the honourable

member that a certain new Act has been proclaimed for the purpose of getting money especially for the maintenance of main roads, and no doubt it will be used where the greatest benefit will accrue.

SURVEY INDICATORS.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Mines Department is carrying out seismic surveys in certain portions of the State and has been doing so for a considerable time. Many of these operations are carried out along the roadways and for the purpose of their operations the officers place indicators approximately every chain along the roads. These indicators are secured to the roadway by a 3in. or 4in. nail and at the conclusion of their operations it would appear that the nails are still left in the ground. However, with the movement of stock along these roads, apparently these nails are brought to the surface and, further, when the local councils grade the roads a number of these nails will be graded on to the roadways; and I fear that at some stage motorists or primary producers will have trouble with the puncturing of their tyres because of these nails. I was wondering whether it would be possible at the conclusion of the Mines Department's operations along the roads which are used to any extent for these nails and indicators to be removed.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I will be obliged if the honourable member will give me details of the actual conditions and where they exist, and then I will have the question looked into.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 28. Page 73.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and on behalf of my colleagues extend a sincere welcome to the Hon. Mr. Kemp. One can welcome him with all the pleasure one feels because he comes here as a result of a by-election in place of a member who has resigned, and therefore no sadness is attached to his coming. Mr. Kemp takes the place of the Hon. Mr. Giles, who has realized an ambition to enter the Commonwealth Parliament. I congratulate Mr. Giles on his elevation. In this walk of life one is rarely permitted to do what one wants, so Mr. Kemp can be congratulated without there being any sadness about the occasion. I have for many years read his articles in the newspapers, which I have enjoyed very much. If he is as

effective in this Chamber as he is in writing those articles, he will be a worthy representative. I hope he will be happy amongst us. I do not think we shall agree with everything he says, but I assure him that any apparent ill feeling that may arise here is never taken outside. As we get to know him and friendships ripen, he will be happy in our midst.

I congratulate the mover of the motion, Sir Arthur Rymill, on the excellent speech he made from his and the Government's point of view. His speech was of the high quality to which we have become accustomed since he entered this Chamber. He gave it much thought and delivered it slowly and precisely, exhibiting that learned education which he possesses but which few of us can obtain. I listened attentively to his remarks. I can agree with many of the things he said, but not with all. Towards the end of his speech I started to feel sorry for him and this Chamber, as we have all known that at times he has criticized the Government and some of the Bills it has introduced. I was sad because it seemed from what he said that the Government had gained another convert and that henceforth he would agree with what the Government did; that is unfortunate from my point of view. I visualize that when the Prices Bill is introduced later he will have no objection to it and that we have heard the last of the Hackham crossing, as yesterday he implied that this Government could do no wrong. He did, however, criticize the roofing of the building next door, and I agree with his remarks on this matter. It appears that the Government took the cheapest way out, whereas it should have preserved something for future generations.

I admired and envied the seconder of the motion, the Hon. Mr. Robinson, for the way he delivered his speech, which will possibly be his last Address in Reply speech. I say sincerely that if that is so, and if when I am making my last Address in Reply speech I can do as well as Mr. Robinson, I shall be happy indeed. He was sincere and gave us some valuable information, which I think at times is guarded too closely by the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are treading on dangerous ground in speaking about the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I congratulate Mr. Robinson on the way he delivered his speech, and I hope he continues to enjoy the good health with which he has been blessed. I shall deal now with a topical subject that has been contentious over the years—the issuing of

licences to milk vendors by the Metropolitan Milk Board. In April milk vendors came to me with a complaint. I contacted Mr. Gale, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Milk Board, whom I have known for many years—we are personal friends—and discussed this matter with him. Before dealing further with this, I must say that I was surprised and delighted at the magnificent building occupied by the Milk Board in Hutt Street, at the standard of the laboratories and rooms there, and at the scientific approach used to test milk consumed by the public to ensure that it is of the highest possible quality. Overall, I think the Milk Board is doing a particularly good job, although there is one thing on which I think it is wrong. However, I think a solution can be found. I congratulate the board on what it is doing and on the efficient manner in which it carries out its duties. I can assure the public that the board is doing everything possible to see that the milk supply is of the best possible quality. The milk is tested daily, and the results are made known.

In speaking about the issue of licences to vendors, I wish to make it perfectly clear that the board is not doing anything contrary to the Act, although I disagree with its interpretation of one particular matter. As I believe it is our duty to bring these matters forward, I will quote from the regulations under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1956. Regulation 3 provides:

The board may from time to time define retail milk distribution areas (in these regulations called "zones") within the metropolitan area or any part thereof and may subject to these regulations allot one or more of such zones to any retail milk vendor who makes application for such allotment. The allotment of a zone or zones shall be made by a licence in the form contained in the first schedule hereto.

The board does that. Regulation 4 provides:

The board may from time to time alter any zone by changing all or any of the boundaries thereof or by dividing the same into two or more separate zones.

Regulation 22 is the cause of my complaint; it provides:

If the board at any time alters any zone or zones as provided in these regulations it may withdraw the allotment of such zone or zones as existing prior to such alteration from all or any licensees and make such new allotment of a zone or zones to such licensees as the board in the circumstances considers just.

I ask members to take particular note of those last few words, namely, "as the board in the circumstances considers just".

That is where we break down and that is my disagreement with the board. The particular query that I have is in connection with zone 32, which was allotted to five members by licence in 1960. I have no complaint about that, as it is for five members licensed to sell milk in that zone.

In April of this year the licensees were notified that portion of that zone was deleted from where they had been licensed, and given to one of the five to serve on his own, and it was termed a caretaker zone. The story leading up to this—and I do not think it is correct—began in September of last year. The Metropolitan Milk Board asked the vendors in zones 32, 33, 34 and 35 to have a meeting with a view to trying to reach some agreement between themselves in the re-allocation of the zone. The result was that nothing was achieved. The five people in zone 32 were entitled to go to this meeting, which was held in September 1963, and in fact most of them did go. Certainly the people who came to see me attended that meeting. The Milk Board was advised of the result of that meeting. Nothing further was done, but in April of this year the members of the North Adelaide branch of the Milk Vendors' Association had a meeting of their own to which the five members who were affected in zone 32 were not invited, nor were they eligible to go. The meeting was held and on April 14 the Milk Board was notified by letter that they were prepared to agree that portion of zone 32 be taken out of that zone and be known as zone 32C, and that one of the five vendors should be given the sole right to serve that section. That is bad enough in itself from my point of view, but one of the five vendors who had at least two customers in the portion known as 32C was told to give those two customers up, or exchange them with the person allotted zone 32C, and recoup them from him in zone 32.

I can understand a zone developing to the extent where the five licensees in that zone could not manage to cope with the community, and I can understand another licence being given to someone in zone 32, but after four years, with five people being zoned in a particular area, why should the board make it smaller and give the right to a portion of it to one only? That zone became known as zone 32C and the vendor in that zone had the sole right to it. Therefore, the customers in that community had no choice as to who would serve them with milk. They must deal with the one vendor no matter how good or how bad he may be; no matter how clean or untidy the vendor. Even

in wartime the position did not arise that one particular vendor had the sole right to serve anyone.

Milk rounds today are exchanging hands at a price of approximately £68 a gallon, so I am told. It is happening all around Adelaide. The vendor given this caretaker zone is given the sole right to serve that zone, and to build up to 30 gallons within the zone without any cost. It is more or less given to him on a plate. Then, for the next 50 gallons up to 80 gallons, he has to pay at the rate of £40 a gallon. That sum is paid into the Metropolitan Milk Vendors' Association, and in this case they compensate the milk vendors in North Adelaide whose milk rounds and quantities are diminishing.

We are often accused of Socialism on our side of the Council, but I have never heard of this sort of thing before. It is astonishing to me that this is permitted to go on. I have never heard of any other business being compensated for a loss of trade. Certainly 273 or 373 small grocery businesses closed their doors during the last three years. They did not receive compensation for loss of business, yet this is going on in our community, the sole right being given to one vendor to serve a district. I do not think that that is right.

I could understand it if the board proposed giving the licensee of a dwindling zone in North Adelaide a part of another area. That licensee could continue to serve the dying area and go out and rebuild, but it is not being done that way. Vendors are being compensated in hard cash. I think that is wrong, and I have said so. What makes it worse is that there were five vendors in zone 32 who had the right to service it, and that very zone was then reduced in size and one of the five was given the sole right to serve there. I have already quoted Regulation 32, and all I have to say, as kindly as I can, is that the Metropolitan Milk Board has a different interpretation of the word "just" from mine. Another aspect that gives me concern is that there could be some ingredient in the price of the milk to permit this practice to go on.

I cannot prove this, but surely someone is not going to pay money out of his own pocket to compensate vendors whose business is taken from them. He must be getting it from somewhere. People who are purchasing homes in a new developing area, such as Tea Tree Gully or Holden Hill, should not have to pay more for their milk to compensate vendors who are losing business in North Adelaide. That is what I am told is happening.

Another point on which I join issue with the Milk Board is that the vendors in the various areas are given licences in one, two, three or more adjoining zones, and particularly in the developing areas there is not enough gallonage in one zone for everybody to get a living so they are allowed to intermingle and compete in their service to the public. Depending on the quality of their milk and their cleanliness, their business either grows or it does not. That is quite good. They are zoned for the same reason and they have to serve within close proximity of a given area. But where I disagree with the Milk Board again is that, before these vendors who are issued with a licence can lease a section of their licence to serve milk, the board lays it down that they must have 50 gallons in any one zone.

Let us assume that a person is licensed to serve in three zones (which, I am told, is usual): he could possibly have 35 to 40 gallons in each zone which, multiplied by three, would give him 115 to 120 gallons of milk to serve in all the zones. I am told (and I know this to be correct) that a reasonable round and a fair day's work for a milk vendor who is doing his job correctly and is delivering according to the distances between customers is to do from 80 to 90 gallons a day.

A man starts off on his own with three zones to serve. Let us assume he builds up to 35 gallons in each zone, giving him 115 gallons. Before he can sublease to another person a portion of that round, he has to have 50 gallons in any one given zone. I think that is wrong. I am told (and I believe this) that, if they want to keep going and build up their business, they must employ labour. We know (it is on record in *Hansard* and I know personally) that to employ labour on a milk round is not satisfactory from a vendor's point of view.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: What is the normal daily rate?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am given to understand that it is 80 to 90 gallons: 80 gallons is a very good day's work. The Metropolitan Milk Board will not let the vendors sublease a round unless they have 50 gallons in one particular zone. That is a hardship on these people. It ought to be remedied because they cannot efficiently do 35 gallons in three zones without employing labour.

I put that to the board and it thought I was wrong. I told my friend Mr. Gale that I thought he was wrong (there was no ill-feeling about it) and, after discussing this with Mr. Gale and the board and receiving complaints from the vendors, I contacted the Milk Board.

I then had representations made to me from the Metropolitan Milk Vendors' Association. I told them distinctly that I thought they were wrong; that I did not think that Parliament would agree with what they were doing in giving one licence only to a given area; that I did not think the public would want it. We discussed the position. No names were mentioned and I do not want to mention any. All those people I have known, particularly in North Adelaide and in the northern areas; I have known them personally over the years. I did get a telephone call from an officer of the vendors' association on a Monday morning. He told me that they had seen the point that had been made and he said that in the particular area of which I complained they had put a second vendor in, and that would be their policy: they would get away from giving this "caretaker round" to one person and one person only.

I want to leave this thought with the Milk Vendors' Association. If they are sincere that they will put two into the section known as the "caretaker round"—and I have no reason to doubt that they are sincere—they ought to take up with the Metropolitan Milk Board the amendment of the 1946-56 regulations, clause 3, which reads:

The board may from time to time define retail milk distribution areas (in these regulations called "zones") within the metropolitan area or any part thereof and may subject to these regulations allot one or more of such zones . . . I suggest that the words "one or more" be altered to read "two or more". I think the public are entitled to a choice of the tradesmen with whom they will deal. I think that what is being done is totally wrong. Although the Chairman of the Milk Board and I could not see eye to eye on it, and I have drawn this to the attention of Parliament, it is a pity that this has come about because, apart from that, I think the Metropolitan Milk Board is doing a particularly good job in other directions.

I now come to my second point—misrepresentation by advertisement. When people advertise something, I believe that what they are referring to in the advertisement should be available when one tries to purchase it. I have mentioned this many times in this Chamber. Misrepresentation is a serious matter. It is bad enough when it is done by people handling merchandise just by advertisement. One sees an advertisement, one goes along to try to purchase something, and one cannot find it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Was not that matter dealt with by a Bill last year?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have not yet seen the result of that. I did not think it would ever come about that I would in this Chamber assert that a semi-government department would do exactly what has been done: I refer to the last Electricity Trust loan. What happened then should never have been permitted to happen; it should have been avoided. I asked a question in the Council about it but did not get a satisfactory reply, so I think the facts of what took place should be put on record. It is unfortunate that the Electricity Trust of South Australia, which does a really good job, should have permitted itself to be involved in what happened in the last loan. It broke faith with the public and with the banks of South Australia. I do not know whether or not my friends will agree with me on this. A letter dated March 25 of this year was sent out from the Electricity Trust to the debenture holders announcing that a £2,250,000 cash or conversion loan was to open on April 2. That was a Wednesday. On that particular night the Premier made his usual statement over the air.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: He is full of gimmicks!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know about that, but this one came unstuck.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: You always listen to him?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is my job to do so, and when he is wrong I point it out. If I did not listen I would not be as informed as I should be. I do not think that anyone would suggest that I should not listen to those speeches. I also listen to speeches in the Commonwealth Parliament and try to keep up with affairs there.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You have learned something from these speeches.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: From this one I have learned how the public is misled, and that is not good. The Premier on this particular night told the story about a loan being opened by the Electricity Trust and referred to it as a gilt-edged security, inviting the public to invest in the loan. That was all very well. On the Thursday a letter came out under the date of March 25 in which it was stated that the trust would open a £2,250,000 cash and conversion loan on April 2, 1964, closing not later than April 22, 1964. It was stated that cash subscriptions would be accepted from the general public, as well as from existing debenture holders. It was also stated:

Although you are not a holder in the series of maturing debentures, in appreciation of your past support, a copy of the prospectus and an application form are enclosed to give you an opportunity to apply for a cash investment.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That does not say that if one applied one automatically got it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Let the Minister wait until I finish. Although he is quite right there, the reference to the opening day is all wrong, and that is my point. There was an advertisement in the press at that time. A person that I know very well filled out an application form and on March 31 went along as advised to invest a modest sum in this loan at the trust's showroom in Pulteney Street. That was a Tuesday. He met an officer of the trust who said that they had received instructions from the head office that no application forms for the loan could be accepted, and that any prospective investor would have to bring his form back on the Thursday morning. I am informed that is what everyone who went down on that day was told—that the trust could not accept money in advance but that investors must bring their money back on the morning the loan opened. This particular person happened to know an officer there and did not want to go back on the Thursday morning and asked him to look after it and put it in early on the Thursday morning, to which the officer agreed. On April 1 there appeared in both the *Advertiser* and the *News* an advertisement headed "Electricity Trust Loan Opens Tomorrow".

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Is there any significance in the date?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I was wondering about that. A member in another place suggested that, and was not very well received by the Premier. There may have been something in it. Among other things the advertisement said:

Learn how simple it is to invest. Your cash or conversion application will be arranged in a few minutes at the Electricity Trust of South Australia, Park Terrace, Eastwood, and at the corner of Rundle and Pulteney Streets, Adelaide. All branches of the following banks: The Bank of Adelaide, the Savings Bank of South Australia, the State Bank of South Australia, the Australia and New Zealand Bank Limited, the Commonwealth Trading Bank, the English, Scottish & Australian Bank Limited, the Bank of New South Wales, the Commercial Bank of Australia Limited, and the National Bank of Australasia Limited.

And further it stated:

If you wish you can make all arrangements through members of a recognized stock exchange or officers of the underwriting broker.

This person went down some time on the morning of Thursday, April 2, and was politely handed back the application form and the money involved and was told that the loan was closed before it opened. That is a bit Irish, I admit. Then I started to make inquiries and went down myself to ascertain what had happened. I was told at the trust's showroom in Rundle Street, which I believe opens at 9 a.m., that the officers were directed not to take any money at all for the loan, because it was over-subscribed. I inquired what the response had been and the officer told me that there were from 30 to 40 people outside wanting to come in to invest. That is what I take exception to. Just before 9 a.m. a notice was exhibited advising people that the loan was closed. It is only my guess that the powers that be in that organization knew that the loan was over-subscribed on April 1 when by advertisement the public were invited to go to the trust to invest. If that is so, it is wrong, and I think that the action ill becomes the trust. Many people were critical of the treatment they received. Quite a few came to me about it and I also read several letters in the press on the subject. For the benefit of my banking friends in this Chamber, I will quote a letter from a person that I do not even know. I think it is a very good one, and it appeared in the *Advertiser* of Monday, April 6:

E.T.S.A. Loan Applications.

To the Editor.

Sir—No doubt others as well as myself were disappointed on Thursday morning when making application to invest money in the new Electricity Trust Loan which was advertised to be opened that day.

In the *Advertiser* on Wednesday there appeared a glowing statement from the Electricity Trust inviting the public to invest in this loan which was available to holders of maturing A debentures and new cash subscribers, and accordingly I presented myself at my bank at the opening time prepared to invest some money.

To my dismay I was informed by the bank manager that he had been informed previously by the trust that the loan had already been filled and consequently I would not be able to invest.

I expect the reason for this state of affairs was due to the maturing A debentures being converted, and if this is so I would like to know why this was not anticipated and, further, why were the maturing A debentures not made to wait until the opening date, as new cash subscribers have to do?

Furthermore, why were not some debentures reserved for new cash subscribers, and so honor the advertisement, which reads, "Gilt-edged opportunity for new cash subscribers"?

"Mis-Led Investor," Underdale.

I asked a question about this matter, but I did not get on very well. A question was asked in another place, and the *Advertiser* of June 11 contained the following report about the Premier's reply:

The Electricity Trust, which could not take more for its annual programme than was approved by the Loan Council, had found its recent loan heavily oversubscribed immediately it opened, the Premier said in the Assembly yesterday. The trust had then immediately closed the loan and refused further contributions. He was replying to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hutchens). The Premier said that he had heard, by hearsay, that the trust chairman had arranged that one or two larger subscribers should withdraw their applications so that the loan could be spread to smaller subscribers as much as possible. The trust regretted that it could not take all the money offered immediately the loan opened.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Were they conversions?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know. Let us analyse that statement paragraph by paragraph. The first paragraph indicates that the Premier said that the trust had found its loan heavily over-subscribed immediately it opened; I say that it was never opened at the trust's office in Rundle Street or at any of the banks. The Premier then said that the trust had immediately closed the loan and had refused further contributions. For new cash contributors, the loan was never open, and no cash contributions were ever accepted.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That shows a wonderful confidence in the trust, doesn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Everything in the garden is lovely! However, let us see how far the public was misled.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It has offered avenues for investment. This is not the end of the world for investors; they have other things into which to put their money.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is not the point I am making. I am saying that it ill becomes any organization to advertise unless it has the things it advertises.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Misrepresentation!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Misrepresentation by advertisement.

The Hon. C. R. Story: How did the trust know when it advertised that the loan would be over-subscribed?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the powers that be in the trust knew on the Wednesday that it was over-subscribed.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is only your opinion, isn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but I think it is right. The Premier then said that the trust regretted that it could not take all the money offered immediately the loan opened. I say that the trust did not take any money through the banks or at its office in Foy's Building. If I am wrong, I would appreciate it if someone would tell me. A government or semi-government department should be honest and truthful, and should not mislead the public.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Will you explain how the loan was filled if it was never opened?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have been told that debentures worth £2,500,000 matured, that the new loan was for only £2,250,000, and that there was a flood of applications from previous debenture holders. If an advertisement stating that the loan was over-subscribed had been inserted, there would have been no criticism. That would have been the straight-forward way, to go about it. I have been told that people from the country and hills area went to the Rundle Street office of the trust.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Do you agree that existing holders should have been given preference?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not quarrelling about that; I am criticizing the advertisement, which has misled the public. I now turn to traffic problems. I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill that we are all apt to think we are experts on road traffic matters. I do not think I am an expert, but I want to mention one or two traffic matters, one of which I mentioned about six years ago but about which nothing has been done, except in a half-hearted manner. I entirely agree with Sir Arthur Rymill about the treatment by the police of people who commit minor offences. I agree that asking them to attend lectures brings about better results than harshness does. He told us about a couple who went to a lecture and about the husband who got up to move a vote of thanks to the police. I know a true story about a woman who told her husband that the next week she would be going to a meeting that started at 7.30, and that she would be away only a couple of hours. The husband said that he had to attend a meeting on the same night and that he would also be away for a couple of hours. They both went their various ways, and both finished at the police lecture room as a result of having committed some minor traffic offence. I think this bears out what Sir Arthur Rymill said about this system being good for all.

I agree with the comments made by Sir Arthur about school traffic lights. Yesterday

I said that I thought they were the result of school committee policy rather than Government policy, but I have made some inquiries that have shown me that I was only half right. School committees ask for lights and this request is referred to the local government body, which then applies to the Government, and, if the light is erected, the council pays 50 per cent of the cost. The initial move comes from the school committee.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: We need many more, don't we?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I agree entirely. Irrespective of the cost, every school should have lights. If only one child's life is saved, the whole of the expenditure will have been warranted. I want to touch on another aspect of it. I do not like to see these various school signs in different forms. I believe that there should be a set of lights which the public the world over would know; green to go, red to stop. I think that for the ideal lights at schools we need go no further than North Terrace at the railway station. I think they are an admirable set of lights, and perfectly safe if everybody does the reasonable thing. I agree that the average motorist wants to do the right thing, particularly near schools, but with those whirling wig-wags there is a tendency for people to become confused. There is a set of school lights on the road on which I travel every morning. They also use "safety calls" there in addition to the lights. This is confusing. Sometimes the "safety calls" are still there at a quarter to ten when I pass by. That may sound a bit late, but there are reasons for that. The sooner we have complete uniformity on school lights the happier we shall be.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: You were talking of the metropolitan area, were you not?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. I would have them in the country, too, as I think they need them more there. Wherever there is electricity and wherever there is a school on the main road those warnings should be provided. The upkeep would not be heavy once the lights were installed. I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill that the traffic section of the Police Force is doing a difficult job really well. I have not been caught myself yet, but the police are to be commended on the manner in which they speak to people who commit a breach of the Act. Many people have approached me on this, and they are full of praise for our Police Force.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: When you are caught you can send them an extract from *Hansard*.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I have had occasion to approach the chief of the traffic section. People should know that we appreciate the politeness of the Police Force and the manner in which we are treated. Inspector Wilson, who is the officer in charge of the traffic section, is a most courteous officer, and I understand that when he is asked a question or when a case is taken further he is most polite and understanding. I want to say that it is a pleasure to have such men in the force. When Inspector, now Superintendent, Vogel-sang was in charge he was just as cordial in his approach, and just as good, and I think people should know this. If I have a grouch—and it is only a small one—against them it is about the manner in which motorists are permitted to turn at intersections to the inconvenience and danger of pedestrians. In 1958, after a tour overseas, when dealing with the problems of road traffic, I had this to say:

A worsening problem in Adelaide is the turning to the left of motor cars at corners. Before going abroad I watched the position in Adelaide in an attempt to solve the problem. In a speech last year I said that one could walk from Parliament House to Grote Street on practically any day and witness either near-accidents or a motorist colliding with another car. I spent a month at Geneva, visited the busiest street in that city and often watched the traffic at intersections. Underneath the traffic lights they have a blinking light outlining the words "Don't Walk". While the vehicular traffic is proceeding these lights appear at the four corners of an intersection. When the north-south traffic has passed through and the red light goes against the other oncoming vehicular traffic, the east-west traffic proceeds and when their time is completed a red light appears and the pedestrians can then cross the four roadways. When they are doing this, no vehicular traffic is in motion.

That is the complete answer to the problems associated with vehicles turning left, and it could be adopted without any trouble in Adelaide. It might be said that this would slow up traffic, but does it matter if traffic is slowed a little at busy intersections if it is safer for the pedestrians and prevents accidents, such as the one that happened last week in Adelaide when three people were knocked down by a motor car? I do not say the lights caused the trouble on that occasion; indeed, doubt was expressed about the brakes of the motor vehicle. If the Geneva system were in operation that accident would never have happened. In certain overseas cities, particularly in Switzerland, pedestrians are in the wrong if they use the roads. The footpaths are to walk on and if they do not use them, no excuse is accepted.

By education, motorists could be taught to do the reasonable thing and pedestrians to use the footpaths, and after a short time our traffic problems, particularly in the city, would be diminished considerably. I put those points forward because they may be of advantage to

someone, and if they were accepted, I would think I had done something worthwhile in the interests of the community.

I want to say that that speech could still stand today; in fact, there is more justification for it. When the Barnes Dance was being tested at the intersection of Gawler Place and Rundle Street, I took the opportunity of observing it. I do not like that system, but, if the City Council wanted to kill the Barnes Dance, it was certainly tried at the right corner to do so, as it was completely impracticable there.

I do hope that the City Council will soon come to a decision and do something about beautifying our city with a fountain, or with several fountains, and also continue with the job of improving the park lands.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Where shall we get the water?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is plenty of water. The park lands are a credit to the council. Should the name of any particular person have been perpetuated, it was that of the Town Clerk, Mr. Veale, for his wonderful work in beautifying the park lands. In conclusion I should like to mention one or two items in the Governor's Speech that interested me. Paragraph 25 states:

It is the intention of my Government to lay before you a Bill to provide for the service of women on juries.

I await the introduction of the Bill with interest. Secondly, paragraph 31 reads:

My Ministers are also considering representations from various quarters along with the report of the Betting Control Board following its investigations into the operation and effect in Victoria and Queensland of the system of off-course betting commonly known as T.A.B. Among other problems is that of the winning bets tax which does not exist in other States. I shall be interested to see what that Bill contains if and when it comes to this place.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Have you any views on it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. My views are quite clear and I will express them briefly. They are my personal views, not those of my Party. It is well known that we speak as we wish on these questions. I say that, if we are to have off-course betting of any nature, T.A.B. should be on the lines of the system adopted in Melbourne. I would not support T.A.B. on the lines operating in Western Australia. I would not have a bar of registered bookmakers and betting shops in the country for the benefit of country people to the detriment of the metropolitan area. If a Bill came down dealing with T.A.B. on the lines of the system conducted in Melbourne, I would support it; otherwise, I would not.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is a private opinion?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. This is one time when nobody can crack the whips on us. I do not know whether it is my Party's policy. It is my policy, and mine alone.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Has your Party a policy on it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, not on that. It is generally taken for granted that my Party's policy is that social questions will be referred to the people by means of a referendum. If Parliament decided by resolution that we wanted so-and-so and so-and-so and it was a social question in connection, say, with early closing or T.A.B., the Party would say, "If you want to do that, you must have a referendum and let the people decide." Our policy will not and cannot tie any member of the Party to vote against his conscience on social questions.

Paragraph 35 mentions many Bills that Ministers are considering. One deals with early closing. I do not know whether that relates to hotels or shops. Another Bill that concerns me considerably deals with police pensions. I hope that the Government will consider police pensions in the light of what has happened since they were last adjusted. May I urge the Government that also it look at the Superannuation Act for retired public servants, many of whom have approached me on this matter. Another measure nearer home I mentioned last year when dealing with Parliamentary salaries. I hope the Government will look at superannuation for ex-members of Parliament and the widows of ex-members of Parliament. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with previous speakers in congratulating Her Majesty the Queen and other members of the Royal Family on the recent birth of children to them. I wish also to refer with the deepest respect to the departure of previous members of this Legislature: in particular, Sir Shirley Jeffries, in respect of whom I had personal experience of the leadership he gave the people for whom he was responsible, and also of the deep regard he engendered in them.

In marking the 25th anniversary of the completion of this building, I felt I should take the liberty of pointing out that I am the first Assembly District elector from Gumeracha to have the opportunity and privilege of sitting in this Chamber since our present Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) took office. This building was actually the first major public work

completed after he began his term as Premier. He disclaims responsibility for it, for it was conceived of course during the premiership of Mr. Butler (as he then was) in the preceding Government. Nevertheless, it is the first of an enormous array of important works that followed in regular succession. When we look at the works that have followed since then, we perceive that this House is one of the smallest of the tremendous undertakings that have come to fruition under the long period of stable Government that the Premier has given us. I feel, therefore, that as a member elected from his electorate I can take the liberty of passing the comment that this is one of the least of his achievements, there being many greater works on the list to come before us shortly.

I wish to touch on paragraphs 6 and 9 of His Excellency's Speech, which deal with the work of the Agriculture Department and the water supply authorities. We are told that, if we are to sustain the rate of growth at present obtaining in our population, on which our prosperity and even our security depend, we must double the population of Australia within the next 20 years. If we do this, profound changes will have to take place in the agricultural industry, changes that are not often appreciated because almost invariably when agriculture is looked at most attention is directed to the glamorous lines—export-earning items such as wool, meat and grain crops. But a large portion of our agriculture is concerned with the items that we ourselves consume. Not very much importance is attached to them by the Government because a comparatively small exportable surplus arises from them.

If we are to double our population, those crops must be doubled, and the fact that they must be doubled leads me to quote some figures to indicate just what must happen. According to the *Statesman's Pocket Year Book*, of the agricultural crops of South Australia, which total £65,000,000 worth, approximately £19,000,000 is concerned with these horticultural crops, which make up about one-third of our crop in agriculture. When we bring wool, meat and the pastoral industry into it, we find that the proportion is less: only about one-sixth of our total agricultural income comes from these horticultural crops. But they are not easy ones, in the sense that in practically every case they depend for their success on an abundant supply of cheap and good quality water. This is a difficulty that is likely to arise because we

are the driest State of the driest continent. If we are to double this production and double it with the water supply that will be called for and with the specialized soil requirements and climatic requirements that these crops inevitably need we shall have to plan carefully. We have recently seen a major move in the shifting of some of these industries from the suburban area, where they depended on the water beds attached to the Torrens and Sturt river systems, to the system of the Para rivers in the Virginia and Salisbury areas. Obviously, we have made a mistake here and the supplies are being dangerously over-drawn from these beds. We certainly cannot expect to see any more production from these new areas north of Adelaide in the present circumstances. Where then must we look for an area to supply a hugely increased horticultural production? The obvious answer seems to be the Murray. The fact is that we are running into very serious trouble already in the Murray areas. Just what this trouble is and how great it will be, I think there is no-one at present competent to assess.

Undoubtedly, there is the increasing problem of salinity in the Murray areas that we are beginning to feel quite badly, a problem which must worsen, I think, and until it can be solved there is doubt whether we shall be able to put more crops on the market. To assess these problems I think that the easiest way is to ask honourable members to forget about this very common term which is used in conjunction with the Murray. The Murray River system is not a basin but a simple drainage system, consisting of drainage channels. There is only one destination for any soluble salt in the soil of the whole of the Murray drainage area: eventually it will find its way along the bed of the river to the sea at its mouth at Goolwa. There is no salt problem in the high rainfall areas from which the River Murray derives most of its flow. Many ages ago the surplus salts were washed out of these soils and were washed down along the river. The water in the river when we first opened it was remarkably pure. I have little idea of its salt content in comparison with that of other river systems of the world, except that it is one of the lowest. Ten grains of dangerous salts to the gallon was the normal figure in the early days of the river, and that can be taken as being extremely good water. Our supplies of water around Adelaide have contained salt three or four times as much as that.

The problem arises in the area of the Murray valley basin that has a rainfall only sufficient

to support the vegetation that grows on it. In these soils there has been insufficient rainfall to dispose of the salt; in fact there are huge quantities of salts stored in these desert soils that have been there from the beginning of time. They have been stored quite safely and nearly all these soils grow a very luxuriant vegetative cover which makes use of practically all the rainfall, and thus there is no runoff and no water to percolate through the soil to wash the salts out. I think I can bring the position to members' imaginations by quoting that at the Cadell settlement a drainage system was installed in the 1920's when seepage troubles occurred and the flow of salt was recorded up to the late 1930's, when the records were discontinued. I happen to have a record of this. In that decade and a half between 47,000 and 48,000 tons of salt came out of that drain, which was only a couple of miles long, and the salts found their way into the river. At the end of that decade and a half the soil was still saline, and today, nearly 25 years later, it is still very highly saline. Therefore, there is a great deal more salt there in addition to the 48,000 tons removed.

The difficulty arises when we take the good water which has come from the high rainfall districts in the Murray river watershed, and place it on the soils in these desert areas, as we do under irrigation. As soon as we do this, the salt starts moving, and its movement into the river is now giving us concern. We thought a few years ago that we had the solution to this problem. This question of seepage is a very old story along the river and the solution to it has been the installation of very costly drainage systems in every irrigation settlement. I believe that all these irrigation settlements must be served with drains after they have been established for some time and the salt from these drains is run into evaporation basins. The idea was that the evaporation basins would be allowed to collect salt in the low river periods which could then be washed out safely to sea when a high river flow came along.

Not long ago we experienced the highest river flow ever recorded, and this is one of the things that just does not seem to have worked out. The position is that after that record flood we did not return to the pure water expected as the floodwaters receded. The salinity of the river water has increased and this points to a very serious state of affairs, a state of affairs that must increase from the very nature of things with every acre of land that is brought under irrigation in the whole of the Murray-Darling river system. I do not think there

is any doubt that once a problem of this nature is thoroughly assessed and appreciated we are a fair way towards its solution, but there are, of course, technical difficulties to be overcome.

It has been said that the Chowilla dam is to be established not so much to assure us of a greatly increased quantity of water but to safeguard the supplies we are drawing on at present. The Chowilla dam can very easily increase this salt problem if we do not learn how to use it. It will be appreciated that a vast area of highly saline land will be covered with water by the very construction of the dam, and we do not positively know what will happen to the salt content of these very saline soils, many of which have a salt content as high as two per cent. Obviously there is a tremendous task ahead to find how the salt is appearing and we must store the salt again in the areas where it has arisen or channel it safely down the river past the intakes of our irrigation settlements and the Adelaide water supply. I know the authorities appreciate the problem, but there is a big task here that both the departments concerned must be urged to tackle if we are to sustain horticultural production by irrigation and the reticulated water system from the Murray on which we already depend.

I return now to the increase needed in horticultural production. It seems from what I have said that we cannot look to the Murray for any great increase. Rather, we must strictly restrain our increasing demands on the Murray and look elsewhere for the water to grow the crops we shall need for our increased population. I do not think there is any doubt that in the South-Eastern water beds there are more than sufficient resources to cater for all the increased production we require. A greatly increased production can come from the Adelaide Hills areas, but it must be appreciated that there are climatic as well as soil and water requirements, and that the Adelaide Hills crops are essentially summer crops. Crops that come in winter months must come from areas which have a comparatively low rainfall and which are well drained. In the South-East we have in the water beds a huge asset, as they extend over a very large area. It is pleasing that this asset has been appreciated and that in a Mines Department bulletin this area has been excellently surveyed. I do not think anyone who goes through that bulletin—I think it is No. 35—can be other than astonished at the amount of detail it has been possible for Mr. O'Driscoll to collect in surveys of the water supply as a whole. The soils

have been roughly looked at; they have been covered by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization soil survey division in a reconnaissance survey. We are now able to pick out where there is a combination of suitable soil and an apparently good water supply. The surveys, however, are essentially rough reconnaissance surveys. There is still much that we do not know about the water beds and the soils of that area.

There is a further need here for the two departments chiefly responsible to get together and try to co-ordinate their knowledge of this area. If it is at all possible, before we get down into that area on any great scale we should have the detailed knowledge that will enable us to avoid the mistakes made in the Para River districts.

I turn now to paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech, which deals with the preservation of our natural resources and heritage. In pursuing agriculture in this State, we have had of necessity to devastate large areas of our natural vegetation. I know steps are being taken to preserve substantial areas in their original state, but there is another side to this problem. Over a large part of the State, right from the beginning farmers have appreciated the value of our original trees and, as far as it has been practicable, particularly in the red gum districts, they have preserved some of the most beautiful trees in South Australia. In the red gum districts we have some of the most beautiful farmlands of Australia. The trees are truly relics. It is not, and cannot be, known exactly how old a red gum is, but we have records of trees known to have grown from saplings over the 100 or 120 years of the State's existence. It is certain that many of the trees that we regard just as large gum trees must be at least five or six times as old as the 100-year-old saplings, and some of the huge old shells that remain—in many cases only as vestiges—could well be 10 times as old, or even older. Nobody can argue about this because there are no growth rings in our native vegetation such as those which are present in *pinus radiata*, which mark the calendar years very clearly. These relic trees are highly valued by most people who possess them and are being carefully preserved as far as it is possible to preserve them, but every

year sees wastage. Only three weeks ago we lost heavily indeed in a tornadic storm in the Woodside district that stripped hundreds of these trees, and chance, accident and necessity each year lead to their going one by one. There is materially no replacement by natural regeneration.

If one goes through these districts one finds a few sapling seedlings on the roadside and in odd corners where chance has preserved them from stock. I think the time is coming when we shall have to protect some of these native tree species by a system that will ensure that when one is lost there will be a replacement with the same kind of tree. The river red gum is closely approaching the stage of vitally needing this protection, and other species will pass through the same stage in succession. There is precedent for protective legislation of this kind. There are two or three countries where it is the privilege of any landholder to fell a tree, but as soon as he accepts that privilege he automatically has laid upon him the obligation to replace that tree with two or three seedlings, and not only to replace them but to safeguard them. The multiple replacement is necessary because the chance that one of those seedlings will survive to maturity is fairly good, whereas if there were only one replacement the chance of survival would be remote. I think that the majority of landholders would welcome legislation that would preserve our countryside as we know it today. If we do not have such legislation in the not very distant future we shall have completely treeless belts instead of our red gum lands.

In conclusion, I sincerely thank preceding speakers who have had some nice things to say about me. I refer particularly to Sir Arthur Rymill, but the Hon. Mr. Robinson and the Hon. Mr. Shard also congratulated me. I thank them very humbly, and if I can discharge my duties in the way they expect of me I shall be very grateful.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, at 2.15 p.m.