

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Thursday, August 16, 1951.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY.**

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive honourable members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.5 p.m. I now propose, accompanied by the mover and other honourable members who may find it convenient, to proceed to Government House.

At 2.2 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. On returning at 2.18 p.m.:

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Governor the Address adopted by the House on August 15, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:—

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament on June 27. I join with you in expressing profound gratification at the continued progress in the health of His Majesty the King. I am certain that there is no State in the British Empire which will welcome Their Majesties and Her Royal Highness Princess Margaret more loyally or more enthusiastically than the people of South Australia. It will be my honour and privilege to transmit the sentiments of loyal allegiance to Their Majesties which you have just expressed. I am confident that you will give full and most careful attention to all matters placed before you, and I pray that God's blessing may crown your labours.

**POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

His Excellency the Governor by message recommended the House of Assembly to appropriate such amounts of the general revenue as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Police Act Amendment Bill, 1951.

**SETTLEMENT OF EX-SERVICEMEN.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have been handed a communication by a Commonwealth Member of Parliament which he had received from a Commonwealth Minister indicating that the War Service Land Settlement Agreement for the settlement of soldiers on the land which was negotiated by this Government and the Commonwealth Government and ratified by this Parliament in 1945 had recently been

invalidated. Can the Minister of Lands say whether this is so, and, if it is so, in what respect it has been invalidated and what steps are being undertaken to overcome the difficulty which will naturally arise if the statement is correct?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have not had any information that the Act has been invalidated, but have had word that the Commonwealth Government has considered and will still further consider increasing the amount which was originally agreed upon in 1942 for the purchase of land. I will have inquiries made and let the honourable member have the particulars.

**SUPERPHOSPHATE SUPPLIES.**

Mr. McLACHLAN—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the questions asked by the member for Mount Gambier and me about increased prices on undelivered superphosphate from June 30?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I have received the following report from the Prices Commissioner:—

Investigations by the Prices Department have disclosed that every effort was made by the superphosphate manufacturers to effect all deliveries of superphosphate to the South-East before June 30. Over 14,000 tons of superphosphate were delivered to the South-East during May and June, 1951, and this tonnage would have been increased had transport difficulties not arisen during the first three weeks in June. The transport position improved during the last week in June enabling 2,400 tons to be delivered for that week. The substantial increases which occurred in prices of phosphate rock and brimstone on July 1, 1951, applied to all stocks of raw materials and manufactured superphosphate held by the manufacturers on that date. The manufacturers, therefore, did not obtain any additional monetary benefit from the price increase granted by the Prices Department on account of the increased cost of those materials. Although strong endeavours were made to increase the price of cornsacks from May 1, this increase did not take place until July 1; otherwise new prices would have been announced two months earlier. The new maximum prices for superphosphate, effective as from July 1, 1951, are:—

	Per Ton.		
	£	s.	d.
Supplied in new cornsacks . . .	14	6	3
Supplied in once used cornsacks	13	19	3
Supplied in farmers' own cornsacks . . . . .	11	5	6

The above prices are subject to a reduction of 5s. per ton when payment is made within 30 days of date of delivery.

## DAVENPORT NORTH SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Education anything further to report about the closing of the Davenport North School and the request for transport for children who were attending that school to enable them to attend another school?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have taken up this matter with my colleague. Very often there is a satisfactory answer to statements which, on the face of them, appear to be conflicting. I have received this report:—

Two tenders were received for transport from hundred of Davenport to the Stirling North school and each was for £3 a day. As there were only six children to be conveyed these tenders represented a cost per child of 10s. a day. Another offer for transport from Nectar Brook, where there are three children, to the Stirling North school was received. This was for £3 12s. per day and would have included the hundred of Davenport children, but the distance involved would be 52 miles a day, half of which would be empty running, and the cost would be 8s. per day per child. This, probably, is the tender which Mr. Riches handed in, but it was not considered in the previous reply. The transport officer discussed the question of transport from hundred of Davenport with Mr. Inspector Mugford prior to his taking up duty at Port Augusta, and asked him to submit a report when he was sufficiently familiar with all the circumstances. It is conceivable that Mr. Mugford, when answering questions from Mr. Riches, was thinking in terms of a formal written request.

I have received another explanation of the position which states:—

It is on the other hand equally possible that in the midst of all the changes associated with removal and the undertaking of entirely new duties the verbal comment of the Transport Officer may have slipped from Mr. Mugford's memory.

There is not the slightest doubt that Mr. Mugford was requested to make a report. The report goes on, and I believe this satisfactorily answers the honourable member's question:—

Approval has been given for the appointment of a temporary teacher at the hundred of Davenport school, and it is expected that she will be able to take up duty no later than September 18.

Apparently this has come about as a result of co-operative effort, because the report also states:—

The services of this teacher are available only because her husband expects to occupy one of the railway cottages at Winninowie, adjacent to Hundred of Davenport school. There are many other schools temporarily closed for lack of teachers, and this lady is obviously available only at hundred of Davenport. Further, her husband would not have sought the appointment at Winninowie in the service

of the Commonwealth Railways if the Education Department had not been prepared to appoint his wife as teacher at that school.

Every effort has been made to meet the situation, as promised.

## HOUSING AT KIRTON POINT.

Mr. PEARSON—Has the Minister of Lands a report concerning the question I asked the Premier on August 8 with reference to the erection of prefabricated homes by the Electricity Trust at Kirton Point, Port Lincoln?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have a report from the chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust which reads as follows:—

The components of the imported houses to be erected at Port Lincoln were supplied by the South Australian Housing Trust to the Electricity Trust of South Australia and are being erected by the Electricity Trust. The Housing Trust is not taking any part in the erection of the houses and the houses are being erected on land of the Electricity Trust. However, it is known to the Housing Trust that there is a considerable demand for houses in Port Lincoln and, for reasons later stated, it has proved impossible for the Housing Trust to finish houses at a rate which would provide housing as speedily as the needs of the Electricity Trust require and also serve the needs of local people requiring housing. So far, the Housing Trust has built 124 houses at Port Lincoln whilst a further 28 are under construction or are contracted for. All these houses are of solid construction. When building started in 1947, the trust's contractor received approximately 30,000 bricks per month from Hallett's brickyard at Port Lincoln. This brick supply has gradually diminished and is now approximately 5,500 per month and, despite all efforts by the builder and the trust, it has not been possible to get an increase. The result is that cement bricks have had to be manufactured and of the last 18 houses built at Port Lincoln only four have been built of red bricks. As is well known, cement supplies, at the present time, are unsatisfactory. It would therefore appear to be an inescapable conclusion that, if a body such as the Electricity Trust finds it necessary to provide a relatively large number of houses speedily, this would be impossible to be done by means of solid construction and the only alternative is to provide housing of timber construction as is being done by the Electricity Trust.

## MARGINAL LANDS SCHEME.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Can the Minister of Lands say what funds are available for carrying out operations under the Marginal Lands Scheme?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—As the honourable member was good enough to intimate yesterday

that he proposed asking this question today, I have been able to get the following information:—

Funds originally made available by the Commonwealth Government for the administration of this scheme have been exhausted. However, revenue from rentals paid under marginal lands perpetual leases over and above that portion based on the unimproved value, is credited to a special account, and utilized for additional assistance to settlers in the area, in the way of improvements to their holdings. Up to June 30 last, the sum of £95,439 had been credited to this special fund, enabling 206 cases to be assisted to the value of £55,008, leaving a balance of £40,431, which, it is anticipated, will be sufficient only to deal with applications received for assistance for improvements from time to time. The building up of inadequate areas, reference to which has been made in the report of the Marginal Lands Committee, has, however, been effected in some cases through the provisions of section 170A of the Crown Lands Act. On April 23, 1951, application was made to the Prime Minister for a further grant of £300,000, with a first payment of £100,000, so that finance might be readily available to negotiate for and purchase properties.

#### CITRUS TREES FOR LOXTON AREA.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Repatriation say whether sufficient citrus trees will be available from the Upper Murray district for planting on the blocks in the new Loxton irrigation settlement and whether sufficient precautions have been taken to see that they are free from red scale?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Every precaution will be taken to see that the trees are free from red scale, but I cannot say whether sufficient will be available. In most cases trees of all types are in short supply, possibly through seasonal conditions. That might apply to citrus, but I will obtain a report and let the honourable member have the information.

#### COUNTRY ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Mr. TEUSNER—Section 3 of the Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act passed last year provides that the Treasurer may, from time to time, make grants to the Electricity Trust for the following purposes:—

Every such grant—

- (a) shall be made upon terms and conditions agreed upon between the Treasurer and the Electricity Trust:
- (b) shall be used by the Electricity Trust to defray expenditure incurred by the trust in generating electricity for supply to consumers in sparsely settled areas, and in transmitting and distributing electricity to such consumers.

I understand that many consumers in country areas are desirous of benefiting under the provisions of the section, but do not know what

steps to take to obtain the amenities. Can the Minister of Works say what action is necessary by intending consumers in sparsely populated areas to get the benefits and what persons would qualify?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Some applications have been brought under my notice. Although the Treasurer looks after the financial side, more or less, administration details come under my notice. Where there is a local electricity undertaking or council supply, which it is desired to extend into the more sparsely populated areas, if the council or undertaking makes representations to the trust, it examines the position and assists, by way of subsidy, towards the extension of lines beyond what is regarded as a normal payable proposition. Every application is treated on its merits.

Mr. Teusner—What is the position if there is no local supply?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The trust cannot go into hundreds of very sparsely settled areas and establish local supplies; that would be beyond its resources and would be taking things to extremes.

Mr. TEUSNER—I am concerned mainly with small groups of from six to 12 persons who live within a mile or so of the trust's mains in sparsely-populated areas and who are anxious to be served with electricity. Can the Minister say what is the policy of the trust with regard to making such connections and whether the benefits of the Act could be evoked to give such consumers the supplies they desire?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Each case must be taken on its merits, because the mains carry such a degree of power that it must be broken down by transformers before these connections can be made. It is a question of how many consumers would be required to justify a transformer. This question cannot be answered generally. I do not know whether groups of three or four consumers would be large enough to justify such connections. I know of cases where such a suggestion would have to be ruled out because of the cost involved. If the honourable member will let me know the specific localities requiring this service, I will inquire of the trust and let him have a reply.

#### FREE MILK FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Mr. DUNKS—Has the Minister of Works received a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding the supply of free milk to school children at private as well as State schools?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Applications have been received from many private schools and supplies of milk will be extended to them at the commencement of the next term as and when they become available. As the honourable member knows, there are not enough suppliers for all schools which have applied. As suppliers become available milk will be supplied to State and private schools alike.

#### WATER RATES.

Mr. MOIR—Can the Minister of Works explain the sudden increase in water rates this year? In most cases there are excess charges for 1950-51.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—If there are excess water charges it is obvious that people have used excess water. Despite restrictions more water was used last year than ever before. As announced in the press in a large advertisement, in keeping with present-day values and costs a new assessment was made. For the metropolitan area, the city of Adelaide assessment was followed *in toto*. Elsewhere our own valuers valued properties. We announced that anyone wanting to know about the new assessment could get the information and have a month in which to appeal. About 3,000 inquiries were made, but only 30 appeals were received. Apparently the others were satisfied. Costs and values have increased, but our assessment, although increased, is not 50 per cent of the actual value of properties. Some properties, such as hotels, were assessed at a rental value of from £300 to £400, whereas the licensees are paying up to £6,000 rent for the hotels. The increased assessment has not kept pace, or anything like it, with the earning power of properties.

#### BUTTER PRICE.

Mr. SHANNON—In view of the obvious recalcitrance of the New South Wales Government in regard to increasing the price of butter, will the Minister of Lands, as Acting Leader of the Government, get in touch with the Premier before he leaves for overseas with a view to securing his consent to increasing the price by the proportion—the proportion being that agreed upon by Western Australia, South Australia, and Tasmania—of the increased cost of production as disclosed by the recent survey of the dairying industry, so as to afford some relief to those dairy farmers who are seriously considering going out of business?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up the honourable member's request with the Premier before his departure for America.

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—This Bill provides for an increase in Ministers' salaries. Under section 65 of the Constitution Act the maximum total amount of these salaries is at present fixed at the sum of £10,750. This amount was approved by Parliament in 1947. Mr. President Morgan in his recent report said that in this matter South Australia was seriously out of line with other States and recommended that the total should be increased to £14,250. The Bill gives effect to this recommendation. During the past 50 years it has been the practice in South Australia for Parliament to vote Ministers' salaries in a lump sum. Mr. President Morgan made some suggestion—not a recommendation—that individual amounts might now be fixed, but the Government considers it desirable and expedient to retain the old practice of fixing a single aggregate amount. The Bill provides that the new rates of salaries will be payable as from 1st July last. Mr. President Morgan's report was received before that day and, of course, fixed the rate which he considered just at the time when his report was being written. It is clear, therefore, that there is ample justification for making the new rates retrospective to the 1st of July, which is also a convenient day from the administrative point of view. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Works)—This Bill increases the salaries of Judges of the Supreme Court by £750 a year each. This amount was recommended by Mr. President Morgan. In assessing it he took into account principally the rates of judicial salaries in the other States and the fall in the value of money since 1947, when the salaries of the Supreme Court Judges were last fixed. As a result of the Bill the salary of the Chief Justice will become £3,750, and that of the other Judges £3,250. In accordance with the general policy of the Government in relation to salary increases proposed by Mr. President Morgan, the Bill provides that the new rates will operate from 1st July of this year. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Minister of Agriculture)—This Bill gives effect to the recommendation of Mr. President Morgan with respect to the salary of the Auditor-General. The recommendation was that this salary should be £2,300 a year. The present rate is £2,158, though when Mr. President Morgan's report was written it was less. Under the present law the salary of the Auditor-General must be fixed by the Governor at or before the time of his appointment and cannot afterwards be altered except to give effect to general salary increases in accordance with decisions of the Public Service Board.

Mr. President Morgan expressed the opinion that the present method of fixing the Auditor-General's salary is wrong in principle. He said that the nature of this office was such that the Auditor-General should be answerable only to Parliament—in particular his emolument should neither be raised nor lowered except by Parliament and should not be within the power of Cabinet or any official or board. He therefore recommended that Parliament should fix a rate of salary which should not be subject to alteration in any way except by another Act of Parliament. Although the present method of fixing the Auditor-General's salary has some advantages, the Government accepts Mr. President Morgan's recommendations, both as regards the method of fixing the salary and the amount thereof. The new rate will be payable as from the commencement of the current financial year. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Yorke Peninsula—Minister of Lands)—In this Bill it is the unpleasant duty of the Government to propose a reduction in the salaries of members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Land Settlement. These rates were inquired into by Mr. President Morgan and he reported that in view of the volume of work before the committee he regarded its present remuneration as too large. He recommended that the salary of the chairman should be reduced from £400 a year to £250 and that of the other members from £250 a year to £200. The Bill makes

the necessary amendments for this purpose. Mr. President Morgan also recommended that the travelling allowances payable to the committee should be increased in the same way as those of the Public Works Committee. This is a matter which, in the President's opinion, should be dealt with by regulations. The principal Act already contains sufficient power to make such regulations and there is, therefore, no mention of it in the Bill. It is not intended to make it retrospective. It is hardly necessary to say that the proposed reduction implies no reflection whatever on the way in which the committee has done its work. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Albert—Minister of Works)—Among the salaries which Mr. President Morgan was asked to report on were those of the members of the Public Works Standing Committee. After investigations His Honour found himself unable to say that the existing rates, namely, £400 for the chairman and £250 to each other member, were insufficient. He therefore recommended that they should not be altered. But he did recommend alterations in the travelling allowances of members. These are at present 10s. for a country member living more than 20 miles out of Adelaide who attends a meeting in the city; 15s. a day for journeys in the State; and £1 10s. a day for journeys elsewhere. Mr. President Morgan recommended that these amounts be raised to £1 for country members attending a meeting, £1 10s. a day for travelling in the State, and £2 2s. elsewhere. He also recommended that the rates should be fixed by regulation—no doubt in order that they should be capable of being easily varied from time to time. In this Bill therefore, it is proposed to strike out the references in the principal Act to specific amounts of allowances and to provide instead that members will receive the amounts prescribed by regulation. In order that regulations may be prepared before the old rates cease to operate, it is provided that the Bill will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Yorke Peninsula—Minister of Lands)—This Bill gives effect to Mr. President Morgan's report on the salaries of members of Parliament and the holders of certain Parliamentary offices. As members may have noticed, the increase recommended for private members, both city and country, is £250 a year. The allowances of the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly are to be increased from £400 to £600 a year, and that of the Chairman of Committees of the House of Assembly from £200 to £250. The Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly will receive an increase of £200 a year, bringing his allowance up to £500. The Bill provides for these new rates. As in the case of the other increases recommended by Mr. President Morgan, the Government considers it just that the increases should be payable as from the beginning of the present financial year and has included a clause to provide for this. In support of the Bill I desire to draw attention to the matters on which Mr. President Morgan based his report and recommendations. These matters are summed up in a general way on page 1 of the report as follows:—

In arriving at what appear to me to be the appropriate sums to be paid by way of salary by this State to the abovenamed I have relied principally upon the following matters:—(1) The change in the value of money since the salary was last fixed. (2) The salary of the individual holding a comparable office (where such exists) in each of the other five States. (3) The salaries of officers in the Public Service of this State particularly those in the higher paid positions. Generally speaking I have given these less weight than interstate comparisons or than comparisons between the salaries of those with whom I am particularly concerned. (4) The information before me as to duties and responsibilities of the office in question and as to all other matters pertaining to it which seem to me relevant to the salary attached.

When dealing specifically with the salaries of private members, Mr. President Morgan pointed out that they had been fixed in 1948 on the recommendation of a committee appointed for the purpose and the only ground for increasing them was the fall in the value of money since then. As regards the President, the Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees, His Honour mentioned that their allowances had not been altered since 1887, except for reductions during the depression.

He recommended increases based principally on the emoluments of the holders of the same offices in other State Parliaments. This last-mentioned principle also applies to the rate recommended for the Leader of the Opposition. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Albert—Minister of Works)—There is at present no provision in the Police Act or elsewhere dealing with the salary of the Commissioner of Police. In practice, the salary has been fixed by Cabinet with the help of reports and information supplied by the Public Service Commissioner, and has been adjusted from time to time in accordance with the changes in the living wage. In May, 1951, the rate was £1,771. The question of the proper rate for the Commissioner was referred to the President of the Industrial Court, along with the other salary problems. The President's decision was that £2,050 was the proper rate having regard to other salaries, and that the uniform allowance, formerly £25, should be raised to £30. The President also expressed the view that the salary of the Commissioner of Police should be fixed by Parliament and should be not varied by any other authority. The Government has accepted these recommendations and the present Bill carries them into effect. Like the other Bills increasing salaries, it will operate as from the commencement of the current financial year. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Newcastle—Minister of Agriculture)—This is purely a machinery Bill and makes amendments to the financial provisions of the Loans to Producers Act. The provisions in question were first enacted in 1917 and were included in the consolidating measure of 1927, but are out of harmony with the present practice of the Treasury and of no use. Section 4 of the Act provides for the establishment of a fund called the Loans to Producers Fund. The Treasurer is required to set apart to the credit of the fund the loan moneys voted by

Parliament for that purpose, but not more than £100,000 in any year. It will be noted that this limitation is expressed as a restriction on the power of Parliament to vote whatever sum it thinks fit, and as such is invalid. In fact, Parliament has in the past ignored it and voted more than £100,000 in a year. The Act also requires that moneys repaid on account of loans to producers and interest are to be credited to the fund and all loans under the Act are to be made out of the fund. The restriction of the maximum annual vote to £100,000 so far as it is a fetter on Parliament is invalid, and so far as it restricts the State Bank is embarrassing. For example, the bank's commitments for loans to producers last year had reached approximately £150,000 in June and more was likely to be required.

In addition, it is no longer the practice of the Treasury to earmark specific moneys for specific purposes. All loan money forms a consolidated loan fund available for any authorized loan expenditure; and the same principle applies to revenue. There is, therefore, no need to have a special fund for loans to producers. The proper practice is to make these loans out of such money as may be voted from time to time by Parliament; and if Parliament thinks fit to vote more than £100,000 in any year there is no reason or power to stop it. This year the Loan Estimates include provision for the raising and expenditure of £150,000 to be made available to the State Bank for loans to producers. For these reasons it is proposed to repeal all the provisions of the Loans to Producers Act concerning the Loans to Producers Fund and to provide instead that money required for purposes of the Act may be paid out of money provided by Parliament for those purposes. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1920-1950. Read a first time.

#### LOAN ESTIMATES.

Grand total, £41,166,000.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 15. Page 360.)

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I am pleased to see the amount of £1,200,000 provided for the State Bank for advances for homes. The State Bank should be given the opportunity

of extending its building activities. I should, therefore, like to have seen a bigger amount provided for it and perhaps a curtailment of Housing Trust activities. When one travels through the suburbs of Adelaide and through country towns where the trust is building homes it is apparent that they cannot compare with State Bank homes. The State Bank Board has done an excellent job and it is a pity that so much of its building activities have been transferred to the Housing Trust. However, one aspect of the State Bank Board's activities is working drastically against some people who purchase homes. One section of the Act states that a person, notwithstanding that he may be in a position to repay the whole of an advance to the bank, cannot obtain a title to the land or the house until 10 years have expired. I brought a case under the notice of the State Bank Board of a man who, on account of his wife's illness and the extension of his business, is unable to carry on. He negotiated to purchase a business in another town and could have repaid the loan in full, but the State Bank was not prepared to transfer the title to the new purchaser because of that provision. There is a section in the Act stating that in cases of hardship the board has discretion to waive this provision, but it was not prepared to do so in this case.

Mr. Quirke—The board does not allow any trading in houses.

Mr. STOTT—That is so, because the terrific rise in the price of houses may lead to exploitation by some people in order to make big profits. That was not the position in this case because the man would have used the money from the sale of his property to purchase another house and business. Further, he had a doctor's certificate that his wife needed a change of atmosphere. The policy of the State Bank Board should be more elastic. I agree that Parliament should not pass Acts allowing people to exploit a situation and make big profits. There is provision for further advances to the Highways and Local Government Department for roads and bridges. I should like to have seen an allocation for bridges across the River Murray. The Government has referred this matter to the Public Works Committee for report, but is obvious that people in the upper Murray districts are not enthusiastic about the proposed railway from Morgan to Barmera. Under present-day conditions, and indeed for future needs, especially because of the extension of the Loxton irrigation scheme and other areas, road bridges are required. Production will increase tremendously in those areas and

the railways cannot hope to cope with developments taking place. Products such as peas and other vegetables must be transported quickly to market. The Government should push on with building bridges over the river at Kingston and Blanchetown. Very recently a big semi-trailer broke a back axle going down the incline at Blanchetown and the punt was held up for 24 hours. The present is not a busy time, but that accident created a queue of motor cars and smaller trucks back nearly to the restaurant, and that is a considerable distance from the punt. I was forced to travel down to Swan Reach in order to get back to Adelaide. Had this incident occurred in the grape-picking season there would have been a queue probably a milé or a mile and a half long.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Others could have done as you did, or if going up river could have gone the other way.

Mr. STOTT—That is beside the point. A bridge was warranted years ago and I criticized the Government severely on its lack of foresight. It is not fair to the Upper Murray district, which is becoming one of the most important parts of South Australia, quite apart from the interstate tourist traffic which travels through this district. I am voicing the sentiments echoed by over 90 per cent of the people in the district, who want bridges at both Blanchetown and Kingston. Members must know that every council, without exception, desires these bridges, and I ask the Government to expedite the matter as far as possible.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Do I understand that the people do not want the railway?

Mr. STOTT—They are not enthusiastic about the proposed line from Morgan to Barmera. It would cross the river at Kingston, and Loxton, which is a further 25 miles up river, would be out on a limb without any provision.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—It would have the provision it has today.

Mr. STOTT—There are a number of bridges crossing the river in Victoria, and South Australia is lagging badly. On our visit to Islington workshops yesterday I was pleased to see evidence of the Government's initiative in modernizing railway transport. I advocated the introduction of diesel-electric locomotives a considerable time ago and it is very pleasing to me to know that the Government has adopted the English type. I do not pose as an expert, but whilst I was abroad I saw some of the diesel-electric locomotives in

service in the United States of America and other countries, and I shall watch with great interest the progress of this innovation, particularly in its relation to fast passenger traffic on interstate lines. The acquisition of these locomotives will enable the department to transfer some of its better locomotives and rollingstock to country services, particularly to the Murray mallee area which is not very happy with the existing service. The Royal Commission on Transport advocated that some of the stopping places on the Murray mallee lines be abolished, but that would be very difficult because the people in those areas are entirely dependent upon the railway service for their bread and other essential commodities, and most of the traffic derives from the small pick-up sidings; there is no great volume of through traffic to Paringa or Loxton, for most of the people near the terminals use the buses to and from Adelaide.

Mr. Quirke—You are not suggesting that those lines would take express trains?

Mr. STOTT—No, but we would like to see the services speeded up, and with the diesel-electric locomotives in service on the main lines we may be able to get speedier engines in these districts. I will refer once more to the Morphett Street bridge. Although the Royal Commission has not said much about it I still insist that the Government should examine the question of extending the bridge right across the River Torrens, and making it wide enough to take a trolley bus service. This would accomplish two things: first, it would widen the Adelaide Station yard and thus offer better facilities for handling the proposed suburban electric services, and, secondly, it would enable a trolley bus service to be run via Montefiore Hill through Jeffcott Street, North Adelaide, which is a nice wide thoroughfare, and thereby provide an outlet to the northern suburbs, Enfield Heights, Prospect, and so forth.

Mr. Whittle—You would not get to Enfield Heights that way.

Mr. STOTT—I think it would be possible to make a diversion, or to bring a service down over the bridge, through Morphett and Brown Streets, to link up with the southern or even the Glenelg service, thus relieving the congestion in King William Street, at present carrying the bulk of the north-south traffic. It is unfortunate that the city has been virtually turned around from what was obviously intended by Light. His idea was that the railway station should be on West Terrace, and he planned several broad streets running east

and west to carry the traffic. Instead of that, vested interests in Rundle Street succeeded in having the station placed on North Terrace, and consequently we now have only one broad north-south thoroughfare, which is the cause of the present-day congestion. Because of the congestion in King William Street the Government will have to urgently consider removing the trams. Modern trolley buses similar to those operating in other parts of the world, where passengers are picked up at the kerb, could be used. The centre tram standards could be removed and King William Street modernized to cope with the rapidly increasing traffic.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Do you prefer diesel buses to trolley buses?

Mr. STOTT—Either type would do. I understand that trolley buses have been discarded in New York in favour of diesel buses. The sooner the Government institutes inquiries into the question of removal of the trams the sooner will our traffic problem be overcome. The situation with regard to inflation has considerably altered since the recent Sydney conference. Some members have advocated an adjustment or appreciation of the interest rate to halt inflation, but I am afraid that many do not understand matters affecting the interest rate. In today's press a correspondent states that if the exchange rate is appreciated more value will be put into the Australian pound, implying that if it is appreciated to parity with sterling we would have more purchasing power and people in Britain would be able to buy more foodstuffs in Australia, but that is wrong. If the exchange rate were appreciated it would have no effect on the prices of foodstuffs, such as bread, butter, dried fruits or sugar. Perhaps the only alteration as regards clothing would be on imported textiles.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—There would be less money to spend in Australia.

Mr. STOTT—Yes, we would receive 20 per cent less for our exports such as wool, wheat, dried fruits, butter and sugar. It would also affect our sterling balance in London and considerably increase Australia's national debt. The first question people often ask is, "What would be the effect if we appreciated the exchange rate?" According to a pamphlet entitled *Australia's Exchange Rate*, prepared by H. K. Nock for the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation, the concise answer is:—

That it would appreciate all Australian pounds and put them on a parity with ster-

ling. Whether it be the national debt, bonds, bank deposits and advances, superannuation, life insurance, mortgages or wages, and even most free prices, they would be up, not in numbers of pounds, but in value by 25 per cent. The Government must have regard to this. They have history to guide them. In 1931-32 Australia had an economic crisis, the wool price average was 8d. per lb., and wheat was 1s. 9d. per bushel at sidings; the exports for the preceding 10 years were £235,000,000 short of what was required to pay overseas interest and for imports; the only way to get it was to "bid up" for credits, viz., to raise "exchange," as an incentive to increase exports. After a short term at 31½ per cent in open market, it was stabilized at 25 per cent. How close the figure was to correct is shown by the fact that for 1943, 12 years after fixation, the monthly average of London funds was 86 million pounds. Since then the value of Australia's primary production has jumped from 292 million pounds in 1944-45 to 720 million pounds last year, and as a result of four phenomenal seasons and high prices, overseas credits now stand at 451 million pounds Australian currency. Price prospects are still good, but on the law of averages seasonal changes could quite easily reduce returns from clip and crop by 33 per cent; and recognized financiers, taking a "long term" view, commend this amount, 360 million pounds in sterling, as a wise and reasonable reserve. Advocates of "parity with sterling" claim that it is excessive. To judge, it is worth noting that last year imports and our overseas interest bill took 431 million pounds, or within 5 per cent of present overseas funds. It is true that exports will continue, but imports are increasing. New plant, pre-fabs, coal, and steel are absorbing many extra millions and for the first six months of 1949-50 the trade balance was £48,000,000 less favourable than for the June-December period of 1948. A drift this way might easily alter the position and unpredictable risks justify caution. But this is not the only issue; there is the staggering effect of the "appreciation on all money." First, Australia has an internal national debt of £2,400,000,000, repayable from time to time as bonds become due in Australian pounds. By wiping out the 25 per cent exchange lenders will be entitled to £100 sterling instead of £80 for each £100 Australian bond. The added liability on the nation to the bond holders would equal £480,000,000. Next, the £360,000,000 sterling overseas funds held by the Commonwealth Bank (the property of the people) are today convertible to £450,000,000 Australian pounds by revaluation to parity with sterling. There would be on these two items a loss or added liability by the Australian Government—which is the people—of £570,000,000. Then there are the deposits in the banks. There are in the Commonwealth Bank £97,000,000, Savings Banks £732,000,000, trading banks, £916,000,000—a total of £1,745,000,000 now in Australian which could then be reclaimed in sterling. Life insurance policies exceed £1,000,000,000; their present funds are £360,000,000. By

removal of the exchange these, too, would be payable in the appreciated money. One-fifth increment, increased liability on bank deposits and insurance funds would cost a further £421,000,000, while all debentures, mortgages, overdrafts, and private loans in an enhanced currency would mean just that much extra liability to the borrowers. Such colossal increments in the liabilities cannot be disregarded. It is true and admitted that the reverse happened by the rise to 25 per cent in exchange in 1932 when mortgages, bonds, and debts were automatically debased; but "desperate diseases require desperate remedies." There was an economic crisis; nationally and individually Australia was threatened with bankruptcy and writing down of debts was common; but even so the amount of money then involved was but 25 per cent of that affected today; viz., trading banks' deposits £282,000,000, Commonwealth Bank deposits, £58,000,000, Savings Banks £193,000,000, total £1,089,000,000, compared with £4,145,000,000 now. The main claim in support of revaluation is that it would reduce living costs or "put more value into the pound." But would it? It is true that buyers would save one-fifth of the cost of their credits for the purchase of imports. It is true that exporters would get only four-fifths of their present returns for export; but that does not mean that citizens would pay but 16s. for what now costs them £1, for in Australia, as far as living necessities are concerned, we are living in a "pegged" economy.

Australia's main exports are wool, wheat, flour, barley, sugar, meat, dairy produce, and metals, and wool is practically the only item in which the "parity with sterling" proposal would give local users a little advantage. Wheat to millers and stock feeders, barley to the brewers, sugar, jam, and butter to the community, hides to the tanners, are all sold at prices far below their export values; bran and pollard are sold at pounds per ton less than chaff and about half the price ruling in the United States of America, while meat fluctuates in price as supplies exceed or fall short of the local demand. Wool is the one exception. Because the wool content of a suit represents about 13 per cent of the cost, appreciation of the exchange would save 2½ per cent each time a suit was bought, say 10s. in two years. Metals are our only other major exports but looking at recent Australian prices of £35, £418, £170, and £40 per ton respectively for lead, tin, copper, and zinc, compared with £152 10s., £546 5s., £175, and £109 7s. 6d., the values for export, the futility of expecting a local metal price benefit from an exchange adjustment should be obvious. The effect on gold would certainly be to prejudice the recovery of our marginal mines. Summarizing the position, we find that as far as exports are concerned although producers would lose 25 per cent the advantage from exports in living costs as far as the community is concerned would be the isolated saving of about 2½ per cent in the purchase of a suit of clothes. In regard to imports, the direct production in costs would of course be the 25 per cent, plus such *ad valorem* duty as applies to the exchange addition. Among

the major imports is tea, £8,000,000, but the Government is already subsidizing this. Next comes cornsacks and jute, £12,000,000; through superphosphate and through their direct purchases farmers would receive about £2,000,000 of this back to set off the £25,000,000 they would lose on their exports of grain; but bags don't come into the "cost of living." The yearly importations of paper cost £16,000,000 and on this importers would save about £3,000,000, but paper hardly affects the basic wage; for petrol, oils, motor vehicles, electrical and other machinery £138,000,000 was spent, and from the one-fifth saving to importers a small portion would revert to producers of exports, with possibly a minor indirect reduction on living costs. The one section from which some material advantage might be received is yarns, piece goods, apparel, carpets, rubber, and tobacco leaf, viz., one-fifth on the total outlay of £87,000,000.

Take the butter position, which is very difficult today. The Premier of New South Wales will not agree to increase the butter price to the local consumer and the Commonwealth Government will not increase its subsidy. If we appreciate the exchange rate our income from exports will be cut by 20 per cent, and Australian consumers will have to make up that loss. The local prices of butter, dried fruits, sugar and some other goods rise, and there would be a consequent wage increase, thus accentuating the inflationary spiral. Recently South Australian newspapers have agitated for the appreciation of the Australian pound as a means of halting inflation. I remind members that, because of the enormous amount of imported materials required for the production of newspapers in this country, these firms would save 20 per cent if such a step were taken; but I doubt whether the prices of our newspapers would be reduced. Rather, I suggest, the shareholders of those companies would get better dividends. The appreciation of the Australian pound would not help solve inflation.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—What has been the effect in New Zealand of the appreciation of its currency?

Mr. STOTT—A leading banker, whose view has been endorsed by the late Sir Oscar Isaachsen, said that New Zealand, Sweden, and Canada appreciated their currencies prematurely, and, instead of 20 per cent, their overall saving amounted to only 5 per cent. New Zealand's total exports of such primary produce as wool, wheat, meat, dried fruits, sugar and butter would fall far short of the Australian total.

Mr. Whittle—Its population is far less.

Mr. STOTT—Then appreciation of the currency would have a more disastrous effect in Australia than in New Zealand. Any appreciation of the Australian currency would decrease sterling credits in London, increase our national debt, and affect these Loan Estimates and our revenue expenditure. I believe that at one time the present Prime Minister of Australia was rather keen on appreciating the Australian pound; but at the recent Sydney conference he said that unbiased experts had analysed the position and in every instance had recommended leaving the exchange rate alone. Those opinions are conclusive proof that no action should be taken in this direction.

I am pleased that provision has been made for an electric motor to be installed in the Woolpunda tower for watering the Loxton district. I would like to see its installation speeded up. Last year during the dry summer a number of people were unable to get water from this tower. Some of the pipes were found to be blocked up and corroded. Provision has been made for their cleaning, and with a new motor operated by an improved electricity supply the position should be relieved. I commend the Government for its enterprise with regard to its railway programme. I hope the Government will see the wisdom of a long-term policy with regard to country railways, especially having regard to Loxton and other Upper Murray areas.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—When previous speakers suggested that the total of these Loan Estimates was a tremendous sum for one year's programme, I could not help thinking that those who follow us in this House may reflect on how little we got for our money when they see the assets which it has bought. In these days of soaring prices it might not be a bad idea to let private enterprise undertake some of the developmental work which they are capable of doing and permit Government projects to be proceeded with in the future when lower prices may be paid for our produce.

Mr. Riches—What about when private enterprise approaches the Government?

Mr. SHANNON—If it has a good case this Government will assist it. I am not certain that that is not as good a way as any of handling Government funds, because, if private enterprise directs the expenditure of that money it will see it gets a better return for it than the Government would. I favour private enterprise directing the expenditure of money, because nine times out of 10 the

money will be expended as wisely as possible, whereas that cannot be said of some Government undertakings. This afternoon's *News* reports that the Commonwealth Government has virtually told the States that their Loan programmes must be cut by about 40 per cent. I do not know what effect that cut will have on essential public works, but I am certain that the Commonwealth's attitude is correct. We have neither the labour nor the materials available to carry out the Australian programme of almost £400,000,000 proposed earlier.

Mr. Riches—Which South Australian works would you cut out of these Estimates?

Mr. SHANNON—I do not suggest cutting any out.

Mr. Riches—How could it be cut by 40 per cent?

Mr. SHANNON—This total might be cut by 50 per cent, because the passing of these Loan Estimates does not mean the completion of the works mentioned. This may be proved by seeing which of the works contained in last year's programme have been completed.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Last year's total was almost spent.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—The money was spent, but did we get the works which were planned?

Mr. SHANNON—Probably no greater amount of public works will be constructed this year for this sum than was constructed last year for the £21,000,000 approved. Towards the end of last year the Public Works Committee was told that the estimated cost of the new Mount Gambier hospital of 210 beds was £330,000. A few days ago the Architect-in-Chief gave evidence that if the work were proceeded with immediately the cost would be up 20 per cent on that estimate. That would mean over £5,000 a bed. The new Royal Melbourne Hospital built by the Victorian Government was completed early in World War II. That hospital of 400 beds cost the Victorian Government £2,500 a bed. Of approximately £800,000,000 which was available in Australia last financial year private industry absorbed about £700,000,000. From the Governments' point of view it was a good thing that private industry was prepared to take the risk of that enormous expansion. It would be wise if once more Governments allowed private industry to take the risk. Much of the new money employed in the expansion of industry, which is complained about by certain people, was used by very well-established undertakings such as the Broken Hill Proprietary Company,

which called up about £13,000,000 or £14,000,000 new share capital. I am not worried about that undertaking failing, nor do I think that that money will be spent unwisely. The Government made a wise decision in connection with the development of the Nairne pyrites deposit when it placed the mining operations under the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. The Leader of the Opposition expressed pleasure that the Government was branching out into one more socialistic venture. He said it was providing £800,000 of the £1,000,000 capital required. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company, Wallaroo-Mount Lyell Fertilizers Ltd., the Adelaide Chemical Company and the Cresco Fertilizer Company are each to provide £50,000.

Mr. RICHES—Mr. O'Halloran said that the Government was co-operating with the others.

Mr. SHANNON—He more than suggested that this project was evidence that the Government was following the Labor policy of the socialization of industry. Actually the money which the Government is supplying is by way of guarantee. Whatever portion of that guarantee is used for the development of the pyrites deposits, £30,000 a year will be repaid to the Government by the four shareholders in the undertaking.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—To the people from whom it was borrowed.

Mr. SHANNON—That is so. As the years go by the whole loan will be wiped out. I understand that the Treasurer desires to retain an interest in the show so that the Government may have a watch-dog on it to be assured that a fair deal will be given to the people who depend on sulphur for the manufacture of superphosphates. I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree that the Government could not have chosen a better bastion of private enterprise than the Broken Hill Proprietary Company to protect the interests of the public.

The South Australian Electricity Trust is growing into one of the biggest State departments from the point of view of the expenditure of funds, rivalling even the railways. By Act of Parliament it has been agreed that the trust shall function without any supervision in the form of inquiries by committees. This Parliament has appointed a watch-dog, namely the Public Works Standing Committee, to inquire into paltry things such as school buildings and police stations costing more than £30,000, and incidentally has also had referred to it the project for improvements at Port Adelaide estimated to cost £50,000,000. Parliament has also accepted the amount of

£11,500,000 set down on the Loan Estimates this year for expenditure by the Electricity Trust, but there has been no inquiry by any official committee.

I agree with Mr. O'Halloran in his comments regarding the Aroona water supply. There is no doubt in my mind as to the holding capacity of this country. The Leader of the Opposition was slightly at fault in giving full marks to the Public Works Standing Committee for originally raising doubt on the old site for a reservoir at Leigh Creek. The man who gave the committee the tip and was ultimately responsible for the Mines Department making a thorough survey of the area was Mr. Victor Hirsch, the proprietor of the Leigh Creek sheep station.

Mr. Christian—The committee elicited that information from him and sought his advice.

Mr. SHANNON—I agree that the committee realized the importance of Mr. Hirsch's evidence, as he had lived there all his lifetime, and when he said that about half a mile away from the site of the proposed reservoir there were limestone caves and that was reported by the committee to the Mines Department, the officials were immediately alive to the possible danger of erecting a reservoir on that site as water would possibly run out almost as quickly as it ran in. A limestone formation is well known to geologists as being one of the things to be avoided when building a reservoir. I do not know whether similar conditions prevail in the Aroona country. I hope that the knowledge of old-timers in the district is taken into account, as they may know of factors not easily discovered by investigation. What might have proved a total failure at Leigh Creek was avoided by the inquiry of the Public Works Standing Committee. It is proposed that the Electricity Trust should spend £11,500,000 without any inquiry whatsoever. That procedure is unwise. Such departments as the Railways Department, the Harbors Board and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, all of great importance to the economy of the State, have many of their projects inquired into by the Public Works Standing Committee and it seems to me that the time must come when Parliament must take unto itself the right to direct the activities of big Government operations such as those undertaken by the Electricity Trust.

Mr. RICHES—Did you vote that way when the Electricity Trust issue was before the House?

Mr. SHANNON—If the honourable member was in his place he would not have asked me how I voted or spoke. If he does not remember

it would be valueless for me to remind him. In speaking of our railways the member for Ridley had 2s. each way. He condemned the proposal to extend the railways in the upper Murray, but commended the department for the purchase of diesel-electric motors and hoped we would have a modern railway system. How he can reconcile those statements is beyond me. I realize the big investment this State has in its railways, which are of vital importance to every part of South Australia. It was suggested that the Willunga, Mount Pleasant, and Sedan spur lines were a waste of money, but I am not so sure. It is difficult to assess the value of developmental work undertaken by the State. Our railways must keep up with the times and we are fortunate in having officers who are well versed in their own spheres and have the right outlook. The member for Eyre and the Leader of the Opposition have a just cause for dissatisfaction with existing rollingstock on our narrow gauge systems. However, the Railways Department has to solve a most difficult riddle. It cannot satisfy the demands of both broad and narrow gauge systems forthwith. Some of our narrow gauge systems are being converted to broad gauge and the rollingstock on those divisions will then be reconditioned for use on the remaining narrow gauge systems.

Mr. Christian—It will be worn out.

Mr. SHANNON—The reconditioning being carried out by the railways amazes me. Passenger coaches commonly referred to as "dog boxes" have been made most comfortable and up to date.

Mr. Christian—There is a difference between passenger coaches and trucks.

Mr. SHANNON—I admit that my illustration is not a good analogy, but it indicates what can be done in the reconstruction of vehicles. Narrow gauge rolling stock will be thoroughly overhauled before being transferred to other divisions. We cannot afford to discard any equipment with steel in its construction that can be used again. Even if it cannot be made to look like new it will be serviceable and must be kept in use. I believe that the Commissioner's policy in this respect is in the best interests of the State generally. The member for Eyre is unhappy about the difficulty of the railways in shifting wheat, oats, and barley from centres on Eyre Peninsula to Port Lincoln. It seems that there will be a big carry-over when grain from the new harvest is brought in to sidings, but shipping is in some measure to blame for this. The inability

of road transport and the railways to meet the demands of ships coming to Port Lincoln for loading is creating difficulties for the Australian Wheat Board. I think the season will be one of the best for many years and the farmers on Eyre Peninsula deserve it. Two of the main factors responsible for spiraling costs are the 40-hour week and the limited output per man. The 40-hour week was forced upon the people of Australia largely as a result of action by the New South Wales Government in arbitrarily fixing a 40-hour week in that State while the matter was before the Arbitration Court. Not even a 40-hour week is worked on the coalfields. The hours of work are decided by the darg, which stipulates a certain number of skips of coal per shift. When the coalminer has completed his quota of skips he goes home, often in time for his midday meal. Many more schools and hospitals are required in South Australia, but the bricklayer only lays 300 bricks a day. If he lays more he is called a scab and a pacemaker. Years ago the average tradesman could lay 1,000 or 1,200 a day and not turn a hair. Those suffering most by this limited output are the workers themselves. Can the average worker afford £2,500 for a cottage? The high cost of houses is a result of the lowered output of building tradesmen. Low coal production affects many industries, such as cement and steel. The Communist influence in unions is largely responsible for undermining the very fabric of our social structure by lowering output. I do not blame the average working man entirely for this position. He does not worry much about the policy of his union and does not even attend union meetings to elect officers, but his apathy has led us into this morass and it is a pity he does not take a more active interest in union affairs. As long as this state of affairs continues all State Governments would be wise to curtail public works in every possible direction. I know it cannot be done *in toto* because there are essential works that must be carried out. For instance, the Minister of Works must provide sewer and water extensions for new housing districts, but many undertakings could be postponed. Future generations would thank us if we delayed spending much public money in these days of soaring costs.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 21, at 2 p.m.