

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, June 25, 1952.

The House met at 11 a.m. pursuant to Proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) presiding.

The Clerk read the proclamation by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor (Sir Mellis Napier) summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, the House, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 11.5 to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. Honourable members returned to the Assembly Chamber at 11.45 and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

NEXT DAY OF SITTING.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, July 22, at 2 p.m.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

To amend the motion by striking out "22" and inserting "1."

That would mean that the House at its rising would adjourn until Tuesday next. I think there are enough urgent and important matters to be considered by the Parliament to warrant the session continuing forthwith.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

NEW MEMBER FOR GAWLER.

Mr. John Stephen Clark, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the House as member for the district of Gawler in place of Mr. L. S. Duncan, deceased.

AMENDMENTS TO JOINT STANDING ORDERS.

The SPEAKER—I have received from His Excellency the Governor a copy of the amendments to the Joint Standing Orders adopted by the Legislative Council on November 21, 1951, and by the House of Assembly on November 29, 1951, and approved by him in Executive Council on January 17, 1952.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT ACT NO. 2.

The SPEAKER—I draw the attention of the House to a proclamation in the *Government Gazette* dated March 6, 1952, notifying His late Majesty's assent to the Constitution Act Amendment Act No. 2, 1951, which had been reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure thereon.

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

The SPEAKER—I have to report that, in compliance with summons from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament of which I have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House to make appropriation of the sums set forth in the accompanying Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government during the year ending June 30, 1952, for the purposes therein stated.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer), having obtained the suspension of Standing Orders 43 and 44, moved—

That the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider further Supply being granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—There are several matters of urgent and vital importance to the State that I desire to bring forward at this stage for the dual purpose of securing information and enabling Parliament to be better equipped to deal with them when they arise—as I confidently expect they will—at a later stage of the session. That is why I took the unusual step of moving an amendment to the motion that the House at its rising adjourn until July 22: I felt that an earlier resumption of Parliament would enable consideration to be given to those matters. The amendment was not accepted and therefore I have no alternative but to raise the matters now. One arises from today's proceedings in Parliament. An Opposition member was waiting to be sworn in and if this matter of an earlier meeting of Parliament had been pressed to a division we would have seen the new member for Gawler sitting in the Distinguished Visitors' Gallery and unable to record his vote. I suggest to those responsible that this matter be remembered when arranging procedure for future openings of Parliament. Each member should have the opportunity to be present at all times in order to effectively represent his constituents. He should be able to represent them at the earliest opportunity, and the swearing-in ceremony should precede other business.

The most vital matter concerning us at the moment, and it particularly concerns my electorate, is the development of our uranium resources. During the past few weeks there has been a spate of publicity from local and overseas sources regarding the development of Australia's uranium deposits. It seems to me that some of the publicity has gone perilously close to infringing the spirit, if not the letter, of the legislation passed by this Parliament and the Commonwealth Parliament in order to safeguard as far as possible aspects of the development that might be of some value to potential enemies of Australia. Of course, that is more a matter for consideration by the Commonwealth Parliament than this Parliament, but a great doubt has been created in my mind, and also in the minds of other people, following the spate of propaganda to which I have referred. I shall deal briefly with some of the statements that have been made. I shall not refer to all of them, because members have seen them in the press almost daily during the past few weeks. One important statement was headed, "Development Key Uranium Problem," and was published in the *Advertiser* of June 16, 1952. It came, apparently authoritatively, from the special representative accompanying Mr. Menzies on his tour abroad. It said:—

Big developmental works, foreshadowed when Mr. Menzies was in Washington recently, are likely to follow his final talks in the U.S. late this week on the exploitation of Rum Jungle uranium.

In the *Mail* of last Saturday appeared the following report from Canberra:—

The Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) is about to complete a big uranium deal with America. It will transform Australia's economy within 18 months. The deal will permit lifting of main dollar restrictions, allowing free import of American cars and other goods. It will also strengthen the defence of Australia and other British Commonwealth countries. Reports from the U.S. experts who inspected the Rum Jungle (Northern Territory) uranium deposits have greatly interested the U.S. Government. Rum Jungle is likely to prove one of the world's biggest deposits of high quality uranium, the raw material for atomic plants. Production from Rum Jungle will be the cheapest in the world. The uranium discoveries have given Australia tremendous bargaining power. In exchange for uranium Mr. Menzies will be able to get modern aircraft and arms from America for Australian defence. Selling uranium to America is Australia's only hope of earning an adequate supply of dollars. Experts say that within 18 months Australian shops will be stocked with U.S. luxury goods banned from import since 1946. All dollar restrictions should be lifted shortly afterwards.

The *Advertiser* of Monday, June 23, contained a report headed "Some Issues not Settled on Uranium," which dealt with certain negotiations in which the Prime Minister had apparently been engaged in the United States. The report reads:—

Australia is pressing for the ore to be refined locally and for the uranium to be exported in its purified form. This presents the need for further capital and plant for the erection of a refinery in Australia. It is doubtful whether this suggestion is wholly acceptable here, partly because of the amount of capital and plant needed above that required for mining operations, and partly because it may result in some delay in reaching full output. Mr. Menzies is pressing that Australia should retain a quota of all current production for stockpiling and ultimate domestic use.

This morning's *Advertiser* reports that an agreement has been made for the development of our South Australian deposits at Radium Hill. The second paragraph of that report reads:—

Speculation has now arisen as to whether the proposed Port Pirie treatment plant will serve both the Radium Hill and Rum Jungle fields.

I am concerned because apparently all the negotiations referred to relate to Rum Jungle and not to the South Australian field. Is there not a danger that Rum Jungle may be used to by-pass the development of our own field at Radium Hill? I know it has been suggested that a firm agreement has been made with the Commonwealth and U.S.A. Atomic Energy Commission with regard to the development of Radium Hill, and that may be the complete answer to my question. It may be that negotiations on Radium Hill have been satisfactorily concluded and that what is now being done in relation to Rum Jungle represents another approach to the problem. I realize that the Commonwealth has the right to do what it wishes with Rum Jungle, which is in its territory. If the Commonwealth wants to make the same mess of this project that it has made of everything else under its jurisdiction recently that is its business, but Radium Hill is in South Australian territory. The Premier, in introducing the first Uranium Mining Bill in 1949, said positively that already overtures had been made by the Commonwealth for the control of the development of this field; but, he said, he had resisted and would continue to resist those overtures, believing that these resources, after provision had been made for quantities required by the Commonwealth for defence, should be retained primarily for the development of atomic energy

in this State. Then, if there were a surplus, the Premier said, it should be made available to people in other States.

We are entitled to the assurance that nothing that has been done in recent weeks or that is being done today will impair that position. Frankly, I am worried because throughout all these discussions reported in the press no reference whatever has been made to the development of atomic energy, a matter about which every member of this Parliament is greatly concerned. It seems rather pitiful that Mr. Menzies should have to "press" for Australia's retaining a quota of this mineral for stockpiling and ultimate domestic use. Whose mineral is it? Is it not ours? If it is so valuable is there any necessity for us to go cap in hand to other people for help in the development of these resources? I realize the question of "know-how" is involved, but surely the interests of Australia in general and South Australia in particular could be adequately safeguarded so that there would not be the doubt which has been created by these statements. We have spent much money on developing our field at Radium Hill—to the end of June, 1951, about £293,000. Further substantial sums have been spent since then and further sums are to be spent. This is a matter on which we are entitled to information, which I hope the Premier will be able to give later in this debate.

Another important matter is the impact on our public works policy and on the provision of services and amenities for the people of South Australia that will result from the recent substantial cut in our loan programme following on the last meeting of the Loan Council. That programme has been cut from over £50,000,000 to about £30,000,000. We have had no authoritative statement from the Government as to which public works will be curtailed, which will be stopped, and which will not be started, as a result of this curtailment of loan expenditure. Surely we are entitled to that information, for already unemployed men are to be found both in the metropolitan and the country areas of this State, although not yet in great numbers. People are becoming worried on two aspects of this problem: firstly to what extent will the unemployment grow, and, secondly, how long will many country people have to wait for schemes such as sewerage, adequate water supplies and schools, which are to be provided from loan funds? Last Sunday evening the news service from the National Broadcasting Station contained a statement attributed to the Minister of Works

that sewerage schemes for country towns were "out" as the result of the curtailment of Loan funds. Some of these schemes have already been investigated and recommended by the Public Works Committee. The people concerned, and those in many other towns who are still awaiting the submission of plans to the committee and their investigation, are entitled to know the position. Likewise, we are entitled to know whether, as has been suggested in some quarters, the construction of the South Para Reservoir is to be discontinued. Already a substantial sum has been spent on this work. We should also be told whether the suggestion in the press is correct that expenditure on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline will have to be curtailed by 30 per cent as a result of cuts in the Loan programme. Parliament is entitled to know the true position. Amounts were voted last year and the year before and Parliament intended that they should be spent on certain public works to provide necessary services and amenities to people in all parts of the State. Members should be told firstly whether the Government, in determining which works shall proceed and which shall be curtailed, has given effect to a policy which is in the best interests of the State as a whole and, secondly, whether it has considered giving priority to works having a high labour absorption capacity in order to prevent the growth of unemployment.

The third point to which I shall refer is the air of mystery surrounding the future of our metropolitan tramway system. This matter has been a live topic for two years or more; indeed, ever since the first substantial increase in fares was made by the trust in order, as the trust chairman then stated, to balance its budget. It is interesting to see what the impact of that increase was on the trust's finances. The losses in recent years have been—1947-48, £94,000; 1948-49, £138,000; 1949-50, £236,000; 1950-51, £313,000. In 1949-50, when the first steep increase in fares was recommended and accepted by the trust in an effort to balance its budget, further losses were incurred. For the year 1951-52, despite another increase in fares in the meantime, the loss was £529,000.

Mr. Stephens—And the losses are still growing.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, enormously. The losses for the last five years amount to £1,310,000. In recent years the passengers carried decreased from 90,000,000 to 75,000,000, so the only result of increasing fares has been to drive patronage away from the public system

of transport. Bicycle manufacturers have reaped a harvest, and it has become economical for owners of motor cars to use them instead of the trams. The Opposition saw this situation developing two years ago and suggested that the only solution of the problem was that the Tramways Trust should be taken over by the Government and administered by a body on which the workers employed in the organization would have representation. The Opposition has reiterated its ideas on several occasions but up to the present, apart from appointing a committee of inquiry, nothing positive has been done by the Government. Tramway losses have been written off practically since the trust was established in 1907. The accumulated deficiency of the organization amounts to £1,332,000. Since 1907, £615,000 has been written off by the adoption of various expedients, some of which were of very doubtful financial practice. The total deficiency since the inception of the trust, up to the last figures available, amounts to £1,947,000.

The unsatisfactory financial position of the trust has not developed recently, but has been developing for years. I am pleased that the committee of inquiry has made recommendations substantially along the lines that we advocated two years ago. If the Government had taken our advice then considerable losses could have been avoided, but even now we have no certainty what the future will hold. I understand a conference is to be held by local government bodies, but something positive will have to be done soon. According to today's press the trust, to avoid a forced sale of Commonwealth inscribed stock in which it has invested some of its reserves, will have to negotiate an overdraft with its bankers. I am very concerned about a paragraph in a press report that Alderman F. R. Marshall of the Glenelg Council, who is a representative of councils on the Municipal Tramways Trust, said that unless all councils supported the proposals the trust would have to put on the market some of its stock at a loss of from £6 to £8 in every £100. The report further states—and I presume Mr. Marshall said this—that by borrowing from the State Bank the trust could get along until the State Government made its grant. Parliament is entitled to know what is to be inferred by the reference to the State Government making a grant. Is it that the Government will ignore the sweeping recommendations of its own committee of inquiry, particularly the one that the tramways system should be taken over, put under an efficient management, and run as a Government

instrumentality, or are we to simply help the trust out of its financial difficulty by making a grant? The Opposition would vigorously oppose the latter policy. It has been suggested that the power in the Act to compel councils to contribute towards the interest on trust debentures should be invoked, but I think there would be difficulty in invoking it. Firstly, how is the interest to be separated from working expenses? It would be a fine legal point which might take the court a long time to determine. There may have been some merit in the proposal at the time it was incorporated in the Act and when tram operations began in 1907, because at that time it was visualized that as a result of the tramway system suburban areas would be developed and industries assisted to establish themselves because employees would have transport available to and from their place of employment. Those who are past middle age remember the tremendous development in the areas contiguous to what was then the outer part of the metropolitan area, and recall how paddocks were subdivided and sold. Generally speaking, the price of the land was such that when it was bought the tramway system was bought with it. That land was purchased by persons who desired to become home owners and is still held by that type of person, and it would be wrong at this stage to allow the speculators of that period to benefit from that expansion and expect the people who bought the land in good faith years afterwards—in some cases 30 years after—to meet the cost of the tramway system, portion of which, in my opinion, they had already paid for in buying the land. These are matters of such great importance that Parliament is entitled to have some information about them, and I hope we shall receive that information before the House adjourns today. There are many other things which can properly wait for discussion in the Address in Reply debate.

The SPEAKER—Before the debate proceeds further, I will refer to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition as to the procedure on the first day of sitting. Standing Order 39 provides that the House shall transact some formal business before the Speaker lays on the table a copy of His Excellency the Governor's speech. That was done today and then, before any other business was transacted, I mentioned the return of the writ for the district of Gawler. I saw Mr. Clark, the elected member, in the gallery and he came forward and took the Oath of Allegiance immediately after the

House had carried the formal motion, which is laid down in Standing Orders and which has been the practice for a number of years. However, the honourable member's point will not be overlooked and investigations will be made whether any further amendment is necessary to meet any such emergency as Mr. O'Halloran has visualized.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—We accept your assurance, Mr. Speaker, regarding procedure. I have paid some attention to what the Commonwealth Parliament has done from time to time regarding payments by people to certain organizations for medical, health and hospital benefits. This matter I consider of great importance to the public, particularly the people of South Australia. I have before me a list, complete up to the early part of this year, of 16 organizations which are registered and approved, mostly friendly societies, but included are the Mutual Hospital Association Ltd., South Australian Railways Employees Hospital Fund, South Australian Citizens Hospital Bed Fund at Peterborough, Whyalla Hospital Incorporated, South Australian Police Department Employees Hospital Fund and the South Australian Public Service Hospital Fund. All the remainder are friendly societies. Having ascertained that certain companies were advertising medical health and hospital benefits, I communicated with the Treasurer in March last, asking whether he would make the necessary investigations into the operations of these companies and ascertain from their balance-sheets the amounts alleged to have been paid to members under their benefit schemes. I mentioned the Blue Shield Health Benefits (Aust.) Ltd., whose registered office is at 40 Pirie Street, Adelaide. It was registered as a private company on March 6, 1952. I understood its capital was to comprise 4,000 shares of £1 each. We must remember that people may have subscribed to it under high pressure salesmanship. The paid-up capital would appear to comprise two £1 shares. This company is not a registered organization under the Federal scheme having to pay the 4s. a day as mentioned in the Commonwealth hospital benefits scheme, and I do not know whether, in the event of an epidemic, it would be compelled to pay. I understand that contributions amounted to £8 16s. yearly for each member. Another company I mentioned to the Treasurer is the Community Hospital Benefits of South Australia Pty. Ltd., which has a registered office at 35 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, with Mr. S. H. Metters as managing director. It

was registered on February 3, 1949, but since then has changed its address. It has come to my knowledge that there has been an attempt to sell the assets to some other company. I do not know whether the subscribers to these organizations will ever receive any compensation. The Treasurer was good enough to reply in a letter dated March 28 the salient points of which were that before the Crown Solicitor could give an opinion it was necessary to provide brochures issued and particulars of a case in which a subscriber to such a company had not received the promised benefits. Replying to that letter on March 31 I said I was surprised to know that more information was required than was contained in the brochures and other material issued by the companies, which were readily available to anyone, and that I believed that the onus was not on me to present tangible evidence as the information should be readily available from the Registrar of Companies. I said that I was concerned as to whether these companies, in view of their small amount of paid up capital, would be able to meet their liabilities, and consequently I considered that the information contained in my letter of March 12 should be sufficient to warrant an investigation in the interests of subscribers. In enumerating the companies registered I mentioned Mutual Hospitals Association Ltd. Although I am not here to parade its virtues I can commend it by saying that it is a registered company and is in a position to meet its liabilities in any emergency, which I cannot say for all of the companies. I took the matter further by communicating with the Victorian Government from which I ascertained that on November 7, 1951, legislation was introduced to provide for the registration of sickness, hospital, medical, and funeral benefits associations, for the Victorian Government had already recognized the seriousness of the situation. As a result of this enactment, 12 organizations went out of existence because they were unable to comply with the provisions of the Act which, as far as I am able to judge, provides every safeguard necessary to protect the public. I know that some members of this House have had to make representations to certain companies on behalf of old age pensioners. In some cases relatives of deceased pensioners have failed to obtain payment of benefits, on the grounds that proper representation had not been made to the company's office. However, in some instances I find that these offices are usually closed, and I believe that in certain cases the police have been asked to investigate.

In view of the number of companies that have commenced operations in South Australia and the fact that 12 such companies in Victoria have been forced out of existence by the Victorian legislation I desire to know why His Excellency's speech contained no reference to any Bill to deal with this situation, or any appropriate amendment of the Companies Act. There should be some guarantee that subscribers can secure the benefits for which they subscribe. The Victorian Act provides that the business transactions and financial position of such companies shall be made known to Parliament. It also limits the amount of the benefit. I do not want to quote all the Victorian Act. The Treasurer should indicate whether he is prepared to amend the South Australian legislation, or introduce an Act similar to the Victorian Act, so as to safeguard the interests of these people.

Sitting suspended from 12.52 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I think that if the organizations I have mentioned had authority to pay sums fixed by the Commonwealth Government under its health scheme the interests of the people would be safeguarded. I mentioned the Mutual Hospital Association Ltd., which I believe is in a position to pay benefit during times of sickness or emergency. Probably some of the other organizations I mentioned are also in that position. Recently, because of the position in Victoria, the Victorian Government passed an Act to safeguard the investments of subscribers to such organizations. I ask the Government to give early and favourable consideration to the introduction of legislation similar to that in Victoria and amend the Companies Act to provide that companies set up for the purpose of providing benefits to people during times of sickness should be compelled to produce balance sheets.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I have no desire to delay proceedings, but there is one matter which I think should be brought under Parliament's notice today. I refer to the Harbors Board's storage regulations, which were adopted in February this year. I believe that they were introduced upon a recommendation made by Mr. Basten, the English harbors expert, who came here and investigated the waterfront position in Australia, and by Mr. Bishop (Auditor-General), who investigated the position from the State's angle. I have had the pleasure of reading their reports and I think they are, in the main, satisfactory. Mr. Basten considered the best way to expedite

the handling of cargo was by levying charges after three days. Mr. Bishop said that discretion should be used in the levying of such charges. These authorities agreed that cargo could be stored in the shed for eight or nine days so long as a steamer did not delay the working of another at a particular section of a wharf. That is why I think Mr. Bishop said that discretion should be used.

The regulations make it clear that after three days the Harbors Board can make a charge for incidental expenses connected with the storage of merchandise. It would be wrong to disallow the regulations. I agree with the Government, the Harbors Board, Mr. Basten and Mr. Bishop that some penalty rates should be fixed, otherwise certain importers will continue, as in the past, to use sheds for the storage of cargo until it is required; but unusual circumstances exist on our wharves today. One of these is the embargo that has been placed on overseas imports by the Federal Government. I believe that shipping merchants at Port Adelaide desire to remove cargoes from the sheds expeditiously, but because no licences can be obtained delays occur and the cargo has to remain there for some days. Let me instance the case of the s.s. *Chakrata*, which came here during March last with three cases of antique furniture, occupying 1,189 cub. ft. The consignees desired to take early delivery of the furniture, but because of their inability to obtain a licence from the Customs Department the cases were taken into the Harbors Board shed known as the Currie Street shed, Port Adelaide. The Harbors Board carted the furniture to the store, charging £20 0s. 7d., with a charge of £14 7s. 4d. for housing and unhousing. The furniture was stored from April 9 to April 28, the charge being £75 15s., or a total charge of £107 2s. 11d. Although the consignees had to foot the bill, the charges will naturally be passed on to those who use the furniture.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—They were luxury goods.

Mr. TAPPING—Whether they were luxury or non-luxury goods, the cost must be passed on to the user. I think that members desire to arrest the trend of inflation, but if we increase the cost of consumer goods, whether furniture or otherwise, we only add to the inflationary spiral. In fairness to the Harbors Board, concessions were made in some cases. In the case of the *Strathmore*, which was at Outer Harbor a few weeks ago, the board made a 50 per cent concession. Some formula for charges by the board should be

laid down where merchants are unable to procure licences from the Customs Department. The following charges are imposed on the first day on which penalty rates are payable in the various Australian harbours; Port Adelaide 1s. a ton a day, Melbourne 1s., Sydney 3s., Fremantle 6d. The Sydney charge is much higher than that at Port Adelaide, and I have no complaint in that regard, but the charges with regard to the 18th day on which penalty rates are payable are as follows:—Port Adelaide 69s. 6d. a ton a day, Melbourne 40s. 6d., Sydney 54s., and Fremantle 34s. 6d. A comparison of those figures shows South Australia in a very unfavourable position. I appeal to the Minister to act to give some alleviation to the shipping men and to consumers generally. An extract from the *South Australian Road Transport Journal* of May, 1952 states:—

The penal charges for rent on overdue goods, and more especially the rent on goods removed to Harbors Board store are fantastic. After a period the rent in store rises to 7s. per ton per day, against the rent allowed by the Prices Branch to carriers for goods stored by them at 6d. per ton per week.

It appears that the Prices Commissioner has deemed 6d. a ton a week to be a reasonable charge in respect of privately-owned bonds or stores, but the Harbors Board must go as high as 69s. 6d. This is not fair, and I ask that consideration be given to this matter. Because of these exorbitant charges the spirit of co-operation which should exist between the shipping interests and the Harbors Board is breaking down. The Harbors Board employees at Port Adelaide are doing a magnificent job but they should be given latitude to extend concessions where desirable. The Minister should take action to engender a spirit of co-operation between the shipping interests and thereby ensure a quicker turn-round of shipping in the harbour.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I did not intend to anticipate the Address in Reply debate nor do I now propose to do so, but it is evident that members of the Opposition have an eye on a period early in 1953, and for their benefit I quote a quip which I believe has been attributed to Oliver Cromwell: "Trust in God and keep your powder dry." I notice the Leader of the Opposition raised a point with you, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the inability of the member for Gawler to vote on a certain motion.

The SPEAKER—Order! At this stage the honourable member may not discuss that matter because it deals with a motion that has been decided.

Mr. SHANNON—I am discussing not the pros and cons of the question but the reason why the Leader did not proceed to the obvious step of calling for a division.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member may not debate that because that motion has been moved, seconded, debated and resolved. The motion now being debated is, "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. SHANNON—I do not desire to discuss the previous resolution but merely to point out that the Leader of the Opposition did not draw the trigger on that occasion, my only assumption being that he and his colleagues have not taken due care to keep their powder under cover. This debate is a further proof of my contention. Mr. O'Halloran raised a matter worthy of some consideration—the control of South Australian uranium deposits—and made it abundantly clear that in his view the present Federal Government was bungling Rum Jungle. I do not doubt that, looked at from his point of view, Rum Jungle is being bungled, but I would like to put him and his colleagues back on the rails. Firstly, Rum Jungle is not a problem to be dealt with by this Chamber.

Mr. O'Halloran—I said that.

Mr. SHANNON—I will not quote the honourable member verbatim. He said and read much about Rum Jungle which I took as a criticism of the Federal Government, but I point out that the control of uranium deposits must be looked at from the point of view of the British Commonwealth of Nations, for there are known deposits in Canada and South Africa also. The first thing the British Commonwealth must do is to provide for its own security. It is no use our having a tremendous potential wealth in any one territory if we do not maintain that territory as a part of the British Commonwealth. If we say, as the isolationists of America have done, that we will look after ourselves and let the rest of the world go hang, it will not be long before other people take over our island and look after it for us. The first major principle we have to accept is that whoever has been charged with the authority to say what shall be done in the field of safety for the English speaking peoples should be heard first. In other words, if we do not use our own resources for our own security it will be a poor lookout for generations yet unborn, for they will not inherit the earth that we inherited.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is precisely what I said.

Mr. SHANNON—The Leader of the Opposition said more than that. I think he said that

press reports indicated that the Rum Jungle field was to be developed and that countries outside of Australia, namely the United States of America and the United Kingdom, were to share in the results of uranium mining operations there. I think he said further that a portion of the ore would be kept within Australia for stockpiling and suggested that as this wealth was in Australia it was up to Australia to do the developing and provide the machinery for winning the final product, thereby contributing to our own defence.

Mr. O'Halloran—If you read my proofs tomorrow you will see what I said.

Mr. SHANNON—At any rate, that is my summing up of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. If it is his view that Australia should adopt that policy I remind him of what would be involved. I think an ordinary stockpile of refined uranium would cost about £100,000,000. The United States is spending tremendous sums in this direction. Australia has only 7,000,000 people, but the United States has 130,000,000. Obviously, they could afford to spend much more on this work than we can, even if our natural resources were equivalent to theirs. However, the United States of America is one of the most favoured of all continents as regards natural resources, such as fuel and raw materials. Further, that country has the machinery required for this purpose. Australia is nothing like as well favoured as the United States. If Rum Jungle is to be developed by the Commonwealth, obviously the next step is that Radium Hill should be developed by South Australia. If the Leader of the Opposition desires to take his argument that far I suggest that South Australia is very deficient in power sources. We have Leigh Creek, but practically nothing else. We hope that one day we may get power from the Moorlands coalfield, or even from somewhere else, but does any member suggest that we can afford to use large volumes of Leigh Creek fuel to develop Radium Hill?

Mr. O'Halloran—You are suggesting that the deposit has little value?

Mr. SHANNON—No, it is of excellent value. I suggest that we in Australia should be guided by those overseas who are more intimately associated with world affairs. After all, we are the southernmost tip of the English-speaking people. We should listen to those in the United States and the United Kingdom who would be our one hope of survival in the event of another catastrophe hitting this world. We would have no hope of survival if they did not survive.

These two major nations should be the deciding factor in matters of security. The Hon. A. A. Calwell addressed a public meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall recently and I think from press reports that he told his audience much the same as the Leader of the Opposition told us today. It surprised me that a Minister of a former Commonwealth Government should so far forget his duty to this country as to suggest that Australia could become isolationist in the matter of uranium, for that was virtually what he said. That is a very small-town outlook. He should have said that in this field Australia has everything to win by using the resources, brains and science available from the other two countries where hundreds of millions have been spent and years of difficult research undertaken. If we were left to our own resources it would take us years to get anywhere. We could not afford to employ the great number of scientists who have been employed by both those countries on these projects; we would be impoverished. The Leader of the Opposition would be well advised to allow other people to make use of our deposits of uranium for our good.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you know what the Government proposes to do?

Mr. SHANNON—I am prepared to trust my Government. Too much talking about this topic is not wise. The less said about this matter that can be of any use to a potential enemy the better. Talking about this subject loosely might enable some of our enemies to make use of the few trickles of information which may be thought of no value, such as the volume of work done and the number of men employed. These are the things they want to know. I am prepared to trust this Government to see that South Australia's interests are conserved in the use of this very valuable commodity for our own domestic needs in times of peace.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer)—A number of matters were raised by the Leader of the Opposition and it will be realized that I could not go into all the details at short notice. His first question related to the sale of uranium overseas and the development of South Australia's uranium deposits. Mention was made of certain statements that appeared in the press from time to time. None of the statements that he mentioned emanated from this State, nor were any of them attributed to any State authority. The South Australian Government does not control the press of Australia nor any of the statements it publishes, and in many instances

does not know whether the statements are correct or not. I agree with two or three statements made by Mr. Shannon on the subject. It will be accepted that at present uranium is the most sought-after strategic material in the world. Many honourable members would probably go further and say that the prominence of the United Nations in atomic research and resources has played a very big part in the maintenance of world peace. It therefore becomes apparent that any loose discussion on our uranium production or the method of dealing with our resources must be of immense value to a potential enemy.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you implying that I sought any such information?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but that is why the State Government has not made many pronouncements upon uranium matters. A study of the statements made by the State Government will indicate that they were all necessary for some reason or other and were not in any way of a nature that would be debatable from a security point of view. The first statement of importance on uranium development in South Australia appeared in the Governor's Speech last year when opening Parliament. He said:—

Investigation of the uranium deposits at Radium Hill has revealed the presence of appreciable quantities of uranium and the Government is now considering the problem of extracting the uranium from the ore and its use as a source of power.

That was followed by an official statement this year, and if the Leader of the Opposition examines it I think he will find that answers nearly all the queries he has raised. Today, the Lieutenant-Governor, in opening Parliament, stated as follows:—

At Radium Hill the existence of extensive deposits of uranium-bearing ore has been proved and expert opinion confirms their importance. The mining of these deposits on a large scale has commenced and is being accelerated in every possible way. A favourable arrangement has been concluded with British and American authorities and the Commonwealth, which will enable work on the field to be expedited and will secure for the State technical information as to methods of extracting the uranium. In the opinion of my Ministers, the recent developments in connection with Radium Hill bring appreciably nearer the time when South Australia will use atomic power to generate electricity not only for secondary industries but also for primary industries, and in particular for irrigation on a greatly increased scale The long-range plans of my Government envisage the establishment in South Australia of an atomic pile, as it is by this means that the natural deficiency of the State in fuel can be overcome,

and full development secured. A Bill dealing with several aspects of uranium mining will be introduced.

Mr. O'Halloran inquired about current negotiations for the development of radium which have been reported in the press. I have no knowledge, apart from what has appeared in the press, whether negotiations are even proceeding. It was stated in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that arrangements had been concluded to expedite the development of the Radium Hill field, and therefore there can be no suggestion of any other arrangement which can sidetrack or push into the background the development of the deposits there.

The second point raised by Mr. O'Halloran was whether this development will be a South Australian project, whether it will be dominated by the Commonwealth, or whether it has been handed over to the Commonwealth. Members will recall that very early in the piece, when it appeared that uranium would be a mineral of some importance, this State passed legislation dealing with it. It was the first State in Australia to take such action. I believe the first reservations in this connection appeared as long ago as 1943. The legislation declared that all uranium resources in South Australia belonged to the South Australian Government. Subsequently the Commonwealth Government, with Mr. Chifley as Prime Minister, passed a Bill which provided that, on proclamation, all radium mined in Australia would become Commonwealth property. We therefore had the position that the mines undoubtedly belonged to the State of South Australia, but the product of these mines could at any time be taken by the Commonwealth upon proclamation, which would make it impossible for the State to work its mines.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Commonwealth Government would have to show that it required the product for defence purposes?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Obviously this is a highly strategic material and the Commonwealth must have first call upon it for defence purposes.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Has not the Commonwealth complete control over the export of uranium?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has complete control of all commodities which leave this country just as it has complete control over all imports. As this State desired to open up its uranium deposits the Government submitted further legislation and, after many long negotiations with Mr. Chifley, a compromise was reached to the effect that South Australia would go ahead with the development of its

uranium fields but, at the Prime Minister's request, we should include in our legislation the provision that no uranium should be disposed of until the Commonwealth was first consulted. That was in accordance, not only with the policy of the Government but, I believe, with that of this House which realizes that strategic materials must be held ready for a national emergency. That, I am pleased to be able to say, is the position today. The opening up and working of South Australian uranium resources will still be controlled by this Parliament through its executive in the form of the Government and its departments, and uranium will be made available, at the request of the Commonwealth, to Great Britain and our allies. An agreement has been effected which will make available to those allies for war purposes a certain percentage of our uranium. I assure members that the policy of my Government in this matter has always been a long term policy to cover our deficiencies in fuel oil and power. That policy has not been altered. When I came back from America in August last I stated—although at the time it was considered to be an exaggeration in some quarters—that in my opinion in 10 years' time the technical problems associated with developing industrial power from uranium would have been solved. It was therefore rather interesting to read only a few days ago that President Truman, when laying the keel of the first atomic powered submarine, stated that the U.S.A. had solved those problems and I believe that to be substantially the situation. There may be technical details to overcome, and in my opinion any atomic power which might be built for industrial purposes today would become obsolete in a very short period because of the tremendous strides being made in research in this matter. I believe that, even today, if our resources were not needed for other purposes an industrial atomic pile could be built. Be that as it may, as stated by His Excellency today, plans have been made which give us ample time to develop our resources and take advantage of what science has to give us before we have to call upon those resources for our national economy.

Mr. Stephens—Has the Commonwealth full power over disposal of radium?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not think the Commonwealth has taken power over radium; it is of such minute quantities and low war potential that I do not think any control has been assumed by the Commonwealth. However, it has treated this State well. The

agreement is fair from every angle and one which will give not only some security to Australia, but will confer long lasting benefits on the whole community, for it enables us to get technical information which we could not have obtained in any other circumstances.

The Leader of the Opposition said that since the last Loan Council meeting and the cut in loan monies available the Government had made no pronouncement on the loan programme for this year, and that as a consequence the Opposition and the public generally were not in a position to know what works were going forward and what were not. The usual procedure in connection with the loan programme for the year is that when the proposals are fully drawn they are submitted to Parliament in the form of Loan Estimates, which give the fullest details of the proposals which can be got on with. The Leader of the Opposition had some doubt as to whether all the monies voted last year had been spent, but the curtailment of the loan programme that we have been discussing has no connection with last year's Estimates, which went along in the normal way. In connection with this year's programme, however, I give the House the assurance that one of the first matters which will be brought before it will be the Loan Estimates. Their preparation is in a fairly advanced stage and they will be brought down early in the session.

Mr. O'Halloran—We have seen a statement about the sale of 500 prefabricated houses to New Zealand.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No one would deny that there have been some statements in connection with this; I thought that I had made a couple of very good ones, although I do not know whether the honourable member will concur in that view. The policy the Government has sought to implement is to complete works which are in a fairly advanced state so that the community will get the benefit of them. I think every honourable member realizes that it would be foolish to stop a work where a large sum of money has been spent and where a benefit will accrue rapidly to the community, in order to start a new work. The Government has sought to continue the employment of its employees to the greatest possible extent and to see that there is no breakdown in the services which the community has a right to expect. This has been borne in mind in the preparation of the Loan Estimates. When they have weighed up the position fairly, members will admit that the repercussions of the cut in expenditure have been spread to occasion as

little dislocation as possible. We have not, as in some States, resorted to wholesale dismissals of public servants.

Mr. O'Halloran—Can you assure us that it is not likely to happen?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. We do not contemplate wholesale dismissals. The Government has always stood for stability, although it may not have always been achieved. Stability is brought about only by providing as much employment as possible for people who are prepared to do an honest day's work. There has been a large cut in the loan programme. The Loan Council agreed to a larger programme for this year than last year, when it was £225,000,000. This year it is £247,000,000. Last year the amount of the loan was underwritten by the Commonwealth Government, and we knew that all the money voted would be available. This year the Commonwealth Government will subscribe only £125,000,000, and the remainder of the loan must come from the investing public. At present we cannot budget for more than £180,000,000. I do not say that we will be able to employ all those now on the payroll, but the Government believes it can avoid the wholesale dismissals which have taken place in other States, not only this year, but last year. One of our greatest problems is that for a large public work plans must be made some time ahead to purchase material and machinery. When the work is held up large quantities of this machinery and materials are left on hand. In many instances it is not possible to prevent their arrival, and in some instances there is a legal position which cannot be avoided. This has applied in regard to prefabricated houses. When we believed we had a large loan programme we agreed to a large house importation scheme, but now there has been a cut in the programme we have had to delay the delivery of some of the houses and to place others elsewhere.

The Leader of the Opposition also mentioned the Tramways Trust, which has been making large losses. A committee, appointed by the Government at the request of the trust, has made a thorough investigation of trust affairs and presented a report containing a number of important recommendations. The Leader of the Opposition says that they are in accordance with his Party's policy, but I doubt it. One recommendation is that the lighter-paying routes should be handed over to private enterprise, but if that were done only a few routes would be left to be run by the Government, and I do not think that recommendation is in accordance with Labour policy. There was no

recommendation that employees of the trust should assist directly in the control of the undertaking. I thought the Leader of the Opposition suggested that they should assist in that control. I did not hear him say that, although it may be necessary to give financial assistance immediately, there should be a permanent drain on the revenue of the State. I suggest that he examine that recommendation. Then there is the question of rating. If he examines that recommendation he will see that it is diametrically opposed to his suggestion. To some members the recommendations are like a curate's egg—good in parts. They will agree with one and say that it is a good recommendation, but disagree with another because they do not accept it. It was mentioned in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that the constituent councils, the owners of the undertaking, have been called together to discuss the report with the Government. The conference will be held next Friday. The constituent authorities have accepted the invitation to attend the conference.

Mr. Christian—They want to give the trams away altogether.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Various opinions are held by the legal owners of this undertaking, but I do not doubt that this problem is capable of solution if the best brains and goodwill are put to it. Mr. O'Halloran went back to 1907 to point out that this undertaking had lost £1,332,000, but I am reliably informed that the Sydney tramways—a government undertaking—will lose over £2,000,000 this year.

Mr. Pattinson—You don't have to go to New South Wales, for we have one or two such undertakings here.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. The general attitude of the Government is to accept that part of the committee's report which states that some assistance must be given to the tramways undertaking. On Friday I will tell the constituent authorities that the Government is prepared to recommend to Parliament that, within the limits of its resources, some assistance be given. On the questions of control and organization the Government will consult the constituent authorities to ascertain their views.

Mr. Macgillivray—Have not those bodies been represented on the Tramways Trust?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At present the councils are divided into three zones, each of which appoints two members to the board, and two members are appointed by the Government.

Mr. Macgillivray—It seems that those representatives have been lax in their responsibilities to the ratepayers.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not wish to take the matter further than to deal generally with the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition, but I believe that owing to the extremely rapid rise in costs and other factors tramway systems all over Australia are in difficulties.

Mr. Pattinson—So are the railways.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Every public utility is in the same difficulties.

Mr. Macgillivray—Why not try private enterprise?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—We may have to do that, but that is the opposite of what the Leader of the Opposition now recommends. Early proposals will be submitted to the House after the matter has been discussed with the constituent authorities.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised the question of insurance companies under the Commonwealth health plan. It is true, as he stated, that he brought to my notice the case of two companies operating in South Australia and told me that he believed those undertakings might not be able to stand up to their obligations in the event of an epidemic or some other heavy call on their resources. That matter has been investigated and not allowed to lapse. Insurance is one of the matters which, under the Commonwealth Constitution, has been reserved to the Commonwealth Parliament, and that Parliament has passed laws concerning the obligations of insurance companies to their subscribers. One obligation is that every insurance company shall make a substantial deposit so as to ensure that contributors to its policies shall not suffer because of default through lack of funds.

Mr. Frank Walsh—The two companies I mentioned are not in the same category as an insurance company.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not want to go into categories, but to say that this matter has been taken up with the Commonwealth authorities to see whether the deposits required by the Commonwealth law have been paid so as to protect the insuring public. I express no view on the Victorian legislation, for I have not examined it, but, when I receive the Prime Minister's communication on the matter, it may be found necessary to introduce legislation to cover it. If so, legislation will be introduced, but if it is covered by Common-

wealth legislation that legislation will take precedence over any which this Government may pass.

The honourable member for Semaphore raised the question of penalty charges in respect of cargo held by the Harbors Board, but I think he was a little astray in his arguments as to the purposes for which the cargo sheds at Port Adelaide were erected. He said that the Prices Commissioner had provided that a certain sum a week be paid to private companies for the storage of commodities and that the charges prescribed by the Harbors Board were very much higher, but I point out that the cargo sheds at Port Adelaide were intended not as storage but as transit sheds. The fact that merchants have sought to use them as merchandising sheds and advertised their goods ex the ship at Port Adelaide has occasioned all the difficulty. These sheds are provided to enable anybody with other commodities coming into the State to have some place protected from the weather, in which to stow goods whilst taking delivery of them. I first went to Port Adelaide, not at the invitation of the Harbors Board, but at the request of the men working in those sheds, who pointed out that their working conditions were intolerable because many importers did not take delivery of cargoes, thus blocking the entrance to the shed when a new ship came in. I visited Port Adelaide and verified that that was the position. I found that the carriers would not take anything from one shed—I think No. 17—because the cargoes had become mixed up. Cargoes discharged from five ships were still lying there higgledy-piggledy and blocking the gangways. Some of the materials had been there for weeks. That was the position when we allowed people to use our sheds as storage rather than transit sheds. I agree with the member for Semaphore that drastic regulation, if not used with discretion, can become harsh, but I assure him that the Government will do its utmost to see that the regulations are administered reasonably. However he said we should provide easy storage for those who have not procured an import licence, but where would we get with that policy? In the next few months many goods will be reaching Australia without the necessary right of entry, and there will be a danger that the transit sheds at Port Adelaide will be used as bond stores. In that event our sheds will not be able to be used for the purposes for which they were built. In a few weeks this Government will have over 3,000 tons of commodities coming forward without import

licences. Further, the owners of many goods coming here are not anxious to take delivery because that would involve payment for them, so large consignments are conveniently left at the cargo sheds. The Minister has given instructions that the regulations are to be administered sympathetically, but unless there is an authority to see that cargo sheds are cleared before another vessel discharges it will be impossible to work the port efficiently and the work of the stevedores will become more difficult. The turn-round of ships is thereby slowed down.

Mr. Stephens—Don't you think there has been too much sympathy for some people in the past?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The purpose of the regulations is to overcome that. I appreciate that the member for Semaphore did not ask that the regulation be rescinded; in fact, he said the regulation is necessary. He only desired an undertaking that it be administered sensibly, and I give him that assurance.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply Supplementary Estimates for 1951-52 totalling £370,000 (railway expenditure) were considered and adopted.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

The Supplementary Estimates having been adopted by the House, an Appropriation Bill for £370,000 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. T. Playford and read a first time.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill authorizes the payment of £370,000 by the Railways Department as the amount previously authorized by Parliament under the Appropriation Act for the year ending June 30, 1952, was insufficient by £370,000 to meet expenditure involved in the Railways Department. Clause 2 provides for the issue of the amount of £370,000 and the appropriation of the General Revenue for the purposes of Railways Department expenditure. Clause 5 gives power to issue money other than revenue or money received from the Commonwealth if these monies are insufficient to meet the purposes of this Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through remaining stages.

Later it was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the following projects:—

- Deep sea port at Port Victoria (interim and final).
 - Electrification of Adelaide suburban passenger train services (interim).
 - Gepps Cross primary school.
 - Glenelg-Brighton foreshore improvements (interim).
 - Mount Gambier sewerage system (interim).
 - Minlaton new high school.
 - Roseworthy Agricultural College new accommodation block.
 - Mount Gambier new hospital (interim and final).
 - Taperoo and Morphettville Park new primary schools (second).
 - Port Augusta sewerage system (interim).
 - Port Lincoln hospital extensions.
 - Port Lincoln sewerage system (interim).
 - Port Pirie sewerage scheme (interim).
 - Ridley Grove infants school.
 - Sassafras Engineering Plant Depot.
 - Gilles Plains water supply and sewerage.
 - Glenelg-Brighton foreshore improvements—Acquisition of land for reserves (first progress).
 - Hampstead school.
 - Highgate infants school.
 - Nailsworth boys technical school (additional workshop).
 - Northfield Mental Hospital additions (interim).
 - Parkside Mental Hospital (male tuberculosis block).
 - Royal Adelaide Hospital (Northfield wards, new nurses' quarters).
- Ordered to be printed.

LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement on:—

- Acquisition of land in the hundred of Conmurra.
 - Proposed Milang irrigation area.
 - Southern Yorke Peninsula development.
- Ordered to be printed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1953.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee

of the Whole to consider a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon T PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That towards defraying expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1953, a sum of £5,500,000 be granted; provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1952, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service, or by any regulation, or by any award, order, or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Resolution agreed to, adopted in Committee of Ways and Means, and agreed to by the House.

Bill introduced by the Hon. T. Playford and read a first time.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill provides £5,500,000 out of the general revenue of the State for carrying on the public services of the State from July 1, and it is probable that this amount, together with the £400,000 available from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, will be sufficient until the end of August, when a further Supply Bill may be necessary. The Estimates will be prepared and placed before the House as early as possible, but it is proposed, because of the somewhat drastic alterations to be made in the loan programme, that the Loan Bill be dealt with first. Clause 3 of the Bill provides that no payments shall be made which exceed last year's estimates, except where increases of salaries or wages have been prescribed by any body empowered to prescribe salaries or wages.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

Later it was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

QUESTIONS.

PORT FOR SOUTH-EASTERN PRODUCE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—A report in the *Border Watch* of May 22 stated:—

The Victorian State Development Committee, which arrived in Adelaide on Tuesday for discussions with South Australian Ministers and other departmental officers, is particularly interested in the development of road, rail, and

port facilities as they affect the Western Districts of Victoria and the South-East of this State. The Committee's Chairman, Mr. Shepherd, M.L.A., stated that successful development could not be undertaken without full co-operation between the two States. The Committee, which is spending a week in Adelaide, is mainly interested in the development of Portland, one of the principal outlets for produce from the South-East.

Did a conference take place between South Australian Ministers and departmental officers and the Victorian Development Committee in regard to transport and the development of the South-East generally, and was Portland considered as an outlet for the produce of that area?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A communication was received from the Premier of Victoria asking whether we would make information available about plans for the development of the South-East so that the Victorian committee, which was investigating certain questions on the Victorian side of the border, would know our proposals. The committee came to Adelaide and took evidence from various people. The members discussed with me generally our proposals for the South-East but, unfortunately, one of the members died during the committee's visit, so it did not conclude its hearing of evidence. I do not know what discussions it had with other Ministers or departmental officers, but it discussed with me the question whether Portland could adequately serve the South-East and take the place of the proposed port near Kingston. I said that Portland would draw a certain amount of trade from the extreme South-East, but that in my opinion it could not take the place of Cape Jaffa as an outlet for the main part of the South-Eastern produce. I said that our plans were to develop Cape Jaffa as a deep-sea port, that the matter was before the Public Works Committee and that in due course we hoped to establish a deep-sea port in this important part of the State to enable development to proceed. In general terms, the committee was seeking information to help it in determining the Victorian problem and I am sure it had no desire to interfere with South Australian development.

INSTITUTIONS FOR THE AGED.

Mr. MOIR—Does the Government intend to include in the Estimates a sum to secure rest homes for old age pensioners who need minor medical treatment, which they cannot get if they live on their own and have no relations to help them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government has certain institutions assisting elderly folk, but the Estimates dealing with such matters

have not yet been prepared and I am unable to inform the honourable member what will be included in them.

SATELLITE TOWN AT SALISBURY.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—In view of the fact that Loan allocation has been drastically curtailed, does the Government intend to persist in the coming year with its proposed so-called satellite town in the paddocks north of Salisbury when much less expenditure would be involved if the State used the facilities already existing in an established town, such as Gawler?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government did not at any time propose to establish a satellite town near Salisbury. The position is that Parliament has established the S.A. Housing Trust, an authority which consists of independent members, most of whom are not associated with Government departments. They have been given the duty of building houses wherever there is a need for them. The trust is erecting houses in various parts of the State and at the request of the Government has even gone to the extent—and I announced this recently—of agreeing to erect houses on individual persons' properties in any part of the State, particularly on farming properties. Just where houses are to be built is determined largely by where people want them to be built and where land is available. Regarding Gawler, the Housing Trust has publicly stated that it desires offers of suitable land for building there and it will then proceed to meet the demand of that town, as with every other town. It has already undertaken some building in Gawler.

BROADENING OF SOUTH-EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. McLACHLAN—In view of the reduced Loan moneys available this year will the progress of the broadening of the gauge in the South-East be retarded? Can the Minister of Railways say when he expects to have the opening at Kalangadoo?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Since the opening ceremony at Naracoorte in February, 1950, introducing broad gauge passenger train working as far as Naracoorte, the station yard at Naracoorte has been completed and was opened for broad gauge freight and livestock working on February 6, 1951. In the meantime every effort has been made to push on with the main line work towards Mount Gambier. Supplies of material and manpower have

improved, and if the present rate of progress can be continued it is expected that the broadening will be completed as far as Kalangadoo about September. When the gauge reaches Kalangadoo this then will become the temporary terminal of the broad gauge working and the broad gauge will run right through to there. This will facilitate further improvements in the service to the South-East generally and also better transport to passengers and goods even as far as Mount Gambier. The balance of the work will proceed with all possible dispatch. The Government places a high priority on this work and ardently desires its early completion. One of the main objectives, too, is the transfer of perhaps old, but valuable, rollingstock for use on Eyre Peninsula and on the Cockburn line. Thirty-three of the 45 miles of track between Naracoorte and Kalangadoo have been relaid with a third rail. The earthworks for the main have been completed, also the filling for the station yards to Kalangadoo. Buildings, stockyards, and platforms at Kalangadoo are practically complete, and similar work is well in hand at Penola.

GOODWOOD-MARINO RAILWAY DUPLICATION.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Some time ago I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Railways regarding the grade separation on the Goodwood-Marino railway at Cross Roads and South Road, and also the duplication of the railway from Goodwood to Marino. Has the Minister anything to report on the grade separation, and can he say when it is expected that the duplication will be completed?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The duplication will proceed with all possible dispatch. As already indicated by the Premier, it is the Government's objective to complete first all those works already in progress. The question of the grade separation is a different matter. It was contended that the extra duplication would involve greater danger. The Railways Commissioner and the Highways Commissioner do not concur in that view. They point out that with the duplication no more trains will be run, and other major jobs would have to be delayed to enable that work to be proceeded with. The honourable member should be pleased that the main work—the duplication—has been undertaken. The other matter must stand on its own feet, and will be considered with other works of equal priority.

TYPHOID OUTBREAK AT WOODSIDE.

Mr. SHANNON—A mild outbreak of typhoid has occurred at the Woodside military camp, some four men being infected, and this is causing some concern to Woodside residents, and particularly to officers of health, who are perturbed because of the proximity of this camp to the Woodside township, and also because some of these men might mingle with civilians and cause an outbreak of this disease on a calamitous scale. Can the Premier, through the Minister of Health, inquire what steps, if any, are being taken to protect the civilian population within range of this camp?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will refer the question to the Minister of Health. I am sure he will take any practicable steps to confine the outbreak.

PORT PIRIE HARBOUR FACILITIES.

Mr. DAVIS—Last January the chairman and other members of the Harbours Board visited Port Pirie, and inspected the wharves and harbour and then discussed the matter with the town clerk and myself. They told us that a long-term plan would be formulated to relieve the harbor position and give better wharf facilities. Has the Minister of Marine received any report from those officials, and, if not, will he call for one?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have not received any report other than that the board, in the ordinary course of its duties, made an inspection of various ports, and would formulate plans accordingly. I have received some reports on minor matters associated with Port Pirie of which I shall be glad to give particulars, but in regard to a major plan I will let the honourable member know later.

HOUSING TRUST HOMES.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Following on the announcement that the Housing Trust would build prefabricated houses for primary producers anywhere in the State, can the Premier say if, after those demands have been satisfied, a similar offer will be made, firstly to decentralized secondary industries and then to any person who wishes to buy such a house?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

DEVELOPMENT OF RIVER MURRAY AREAS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—About two months ago the Premier, and I take it the Minister of Lands, inspected land adjacent to Lake Alexandrina, following which the Premier was quoted in the press as saying that these lands

were very suitable for development, especially for vegetable growing and so on. Later the Premier was reported as saying that these lands, because of the low levels, would not require such expensive headworks as were necessary for settlements in the Upper Murray. That has been taken in certain quarters to mean that it is not the Government's intention to develop any further settlements higher up the Murray adjacent to Berri, Barmera, Loxton or Renmark. Can the Premier make any statement on the matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I know the honourable member would not expect me to make a long statement of policy in reply to a question, but the position in South Australia at the moment, as reported to me by the Minister of Lands recently, is that South Australia's allocation of water would enable her to plant another 50,000 acres. The Government feels that every possible step should be taken to secure that land and put it under development. It is the only sure way of holding our right to the water. Although that right is secured to us by an agreement, the agreement would be hard to enforce if South Australia were not making use of the water and another State were prepared to do so. There are several ways in which expansion can take place—first by an extension of Government plans, some of which have been submitted this week to the Commonwealth Government for approval. Secondly, it could be done by the encouragement of private pumping plants where practicable. In this field a good deal of success has already been achieved by a number of people. Thirdly, consideration could be given to Government plans for a different type of irrigation of the lower lift areas, where we might avoid the heavier costs associated with the intense culture area the honourable member particularly refers to, and undertake such things as mixed farming rather than the growing of dried fruits or other intense culture at present undertaken on the Upper Murray. Each of these methods warrants investigation. One is not being undertaken at the expense of any other. It is the Government's desire to expand this development to the extent of 50,000 acres.

ELECTRICITY EXTENSIONS.

Mr. McALEES—Can the Premier give any more definite answer than has already been given as to when electric power will be available for Wallaroo, where a number of industries are waiting for it? The posts have already been erected, but there is a hitch in attaching the

cables. We have a new industry in the old grain distillery, but it is practically a shell, because I understand nothing more can be done until power is available.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Tomorrow I shall forward by post to the honourable member the latest information I can secure on the matter. In connection with extensions generally, we have had difficulty in securing cable from overseas and locally, although every attempt has been made to get it. I fancy the position is somewhat easier, but I will get the precise information and let the honourable member have it.

Mr. Shannon—If you publish it, it will be of interest to many people.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The difficulty is that every project has a different time of completion. The member for Wallaroo referred to one specific project. I frequently get inquiries as to the time different projects will be completed and invariably the information is forwarded as quickly as possible. I cannot give a time when all projects will be completed. I assure honourable members that every effort is being made in the matter. It took several months to get an import licence for the cable I personally purchased in America. We had it one day, but then it was cancelled following a review of American dollar imports, and I am not sure whether the licence has been re-issued yet. That is the type of difficulty we are up against.

Mr. Stephens—Are the import restrictions holding it up?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—All import restrictions affect the position. The difficulty in a sterling area is to get a seller, and it is not so much the import restrictions here. It is difficulty to get someone to supply the cable, because of the world-wide shortage, particularly copper cable, due to re-armament programmes. I will get the information for the member for Wallaroo, and if any other member has a specific project in mind I will get for him the latest information.

HOMES FOR PRIMARY PRODUCERS.

Mr. STOTT—Some time ago a statement appeared in the press that the Housing Trust was in difficulties over 500 prefabricated homes that had been purchased from overseas, and it was said that because of the curtailment of the Loan programme those houses were offered to the New Zealand Government, which refused the offer. Can the Premier say whether any of the 500 homes will be available under the Housing Trust plan to provide homes for

primary producers, and, if not, what is to happen to them? Furthermore, if a primary producer could not build a house on his property, but had a block in the nearest town where it could be built, would the Commonwealth Government's 20 per cent depreciation allowance apply in regard to taxation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot answer the last point of the question because I am not sufficiently familiar with the new taxation law, but I believe the allowance would apply. That is only an opinion, however, and the matter could be cleared up quickly by an approach to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation. Mainly imported houses are to be erected on farmers' holdings. There will be some local constituent parts in each one, but mainly imported materials will be used. The New Zealand Government was unable to purchase the houses offered because it had already purchased 1,000 houses overseas, which was as much as its Budget could stand. The houses are available for purchase in Australia, either erected or not, if anyone is interested in them.

INSPECTOR OF SOLDIER SETTLERS' BLOCKS.

Mr. FLETCHER—Recently I was told by soldier settlers in my district that some of their blocks had been inspected by Commonwealth officers who said that in their opinion they were not living areas. Can the Minister of Lands say how many of these settlements have been inspected and reported upon by Commonwealth officers?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—That is rather a complicated question, but wherever a lease has been issued for a block that block has been inspected by a Commonwealth officer; otherwise the lease would not have been issued.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. STEPHENS—Municipal elections will be held shortly and voters rolls are being prepared. In the Port Adelaide municipality hundreds of people who voted last year have had their names struck off the rolls for this year's elections. That applies not only to people associated with dwellinghouses, but to shops, stores, warehouses and other business places. One prominent Port Adelaide businessman told me recently he had heard, not from the council, but elsewhere, that his name had been struck off the roll. His name has been there for 27 years and on inquiring he was told by the Town Clerk "We do not make the law. Other people make it and we have to administer it." I take it he meant it was the fault of Parliament. If it was legal for these people

to vote last year it should be legal for them to do so this year. I understand the trouble is caused through a different interpretation being placed on the law by various town clerks. I believe that the position at Port Adelaide does not apply in other parts of the metropolitan area where there is the same rating system. This matter is serious because the elections are to be held on July 5. Parliament should not be blamed for something for which it is not responsible. Will the Minister of Local Government take up with his officers the question of whether the Act has been correctly interpreted by the officers of the Port Adelaide Council?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member for Semaphore, who with the honourable member for Port Adelaide is equally interested, referred this matter to me, and, although it is unusual for the Crown Law authorities to be asked to advise local councils, in view of the fact that it was said that about 1,000 people would be taken off the rolls I thought the matter of sufficient importance to ask the chairman of the Local Government Advisory Committee, Mr. Cartledge, who is also Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, to look into the matter and see if the council's interpretation of certain sections of the Act was in his opinion correct. He informed me that he did not think it was. I realize this is not an issue between the Government and the council, for Parliament makes the law and it is for the councils to administer it according to their advice or their lights, but there has been some doubt about this matter for a number of years. The Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman considers those sections have not been correctly interpreted and he has taken up the matter with the town clerk. I understand that his opinion, a copy of which has been sent to the council and a copy of which is available to the two honourable members concerned, is to be fully considered.

CEMENT PRODUCTION.

Mr. DUNNAGE—During the last 12 months this Government has been greatly interested in the manufacture of cement in this State and has gone to much trouble to improve the position. I understand that, because of import restrictions, imported cement will now be in short supply. Can the Premier say how the new projects of the cement companies are proceeding and what the cement supply will be in the near future?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is true that the overseas importation of cement has been

somewhat affected by import restrictions and there is today a shortage of that commodity, but there is some evidence that supplies will be available from other States, particularly New South Wales where there has been a serious relapse in the building industry. As regards local manufacture, I understand that the project at Angaston is proceeding satisfactorily, that the plant will commence to operate in September or October, and that the plant at Birkenhead is scheduled to operate by the end of the year; but both those dates need to be confirmed.

NUDITY IN STAGE PRESENTATIONS.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier's attention been drawn to an article in the *News* of June 10, referring to the "Folies Bergere" stage show? It states that some girls in South Australia had lost interest in the possibility of a career with that company because they might have to appear in the nude. Will he call for a report to see if that statement is accurate and, if it is, will he act to ensure that the morals of the people are not impaired because of such a happening?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The article came to my notice, but the jurisdiction of this State is confined to its boundaries and it has no authority over what is done by our citizens in other States or over what other States permit. A close check is kept on all entertainments provided for the South Australian public, and if any doubt is experienced reports are obtained. I assure the honourable member that adequate authority exists in the Chief Secretary's office to censor any show considered likely to impair morals.

FORTY-FOUR HOUR WEEK CASE.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Can the Premier say whether his Government has considered participating in the application now before the Arbitration Court for the restoration of the 44-hour week? This Government was a party in opposing the application for the 40-hour week, and as it has since accumulated a vast amount of data about the cost of operating the 40-hour week in public works and Governmental activities, it should be in an admirable position to put a good case for the restoration of the 44-hour week.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the original application for the 40-hour week was before the Arbitration Court representatives of the South Australian Government did appear and give considerable evidence. It was not opposed to the 40-hour week itself, but believed—and

I think its views have since been confirmed—that the time was not then opportune for it. Be that as it may, the court decided in favour of the 40-hour week, largely because of the complications which arose in other States where legislation for a 40-hour week had been passed by State Governments. I believe that difficulty still faces the court, and I do not see how it can be overcome by the court. In view of those circumstances this Government is taking no action in this matter.

RADIUM HILL WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Premier say whether the investigations into the provision of a permanent water supply for the uranium mine at Radium Hill have reached a conclusive stage?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The matter is giving much anxiety to the department concerned for it is one of the most difficult problems associated with the development of this undertaking. To bring water from outside would involve a heavy cost which the Government is not anxious to meet. The matter was referred to the Engineer-in-Chief, who has drawn up a plan, which has already been partially adopted, for providing local water resources. That work is proceeding, and I hope that it will be at least partially successful. Owing to the difficulties of supplying water and certain technical information that has come to the knowledge of the Government, the original proposal to have the chemical treatment plant directly associated with the mine at Radium Hill has had to be abandoned and it is now to be established at Port Pirie. I assure the honourable member that every effort is being made to devise satisfactory projects. Notwithstanding the recent good rains in the district, for some reason Radium Hill almost completely missed out. Underground sources of supply have been developed and the Engineer-in-Chief has drawn up extensive proposals for the remainder of the requirements.

PRICE OF CUT LUNCHES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Visitors from New South Wales and Victoria, as well as people returning to South Australia, state that cut lunches—sandwiches, cakes, etc.—cost 25 per cent more in South Australia than in other States where the basic wage is higher. Will the Premier look into this matter and, if he finds the statements correct, take action to re-impose price control on such lines in order to carry out the promise he made in 1948?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The position in regard to restaurants and the food industry generally in this State is that great difficulty is being experienced in maintaining a service to the public. A number of important restaurants have closed down and others have given notice that they intend to do so. I doubt whether it is practicable to reduce the present charges by the re-imposition of price control. This is not a case where trade arrangements can exist, because everyone can make his own arrangements in this matter, but I will have the matter examined.

UNIFORM TAXATION.

Mr. DUNKS—I noticed in the press shortly after the last Loan Council meeting that the Premier of Victoria had threatened to apply to the High Court for the abolition of uniform taxation. I believe that from time to time the Treasurer of this State has stated that we are much worse off under uniform taxation than when we were collecting our own taxes. Is the Treasurer prepared to join other States, particularly Victoria, in a move to abolish uniform taxation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The action announced by the Victorian Government was that it would challenge the validity of uniform taxation in the High Court, and I understand it is still Victoria's intention to do so. The South Australian Government does not propose to join it in that action. I believe the uniform taxation system is not a good one and, that without it the States would be in a better position to carry out their functions, but no decision the High Court could make would improve the States' position. The court, for instance, will not say that the Commonwealth's taxation powers are invalid, nor that the Commonwealth's powers to make grants to the States are invalid. While those two things stand, the honourable member will see that, assuming all the rest of the uniform taxation provisions were declared to be invalid, we would still have the position that the Commonwealth could tax the citizens of South Australia and also make, or refuse to make, a grant to this State at its own discretion. The Commonwealth's policy has been to make a grant to those States that do not levy income tax, and we would have an empty victory if the High Court's decision were in our favour and we were denied re-imbusement from the Commonwealth. The only result would be additional taxation for the citizens of South Australia. Under those circumstances the only

real way of solving this financial problem is by agreement between the States and the Commonwealth for an alteration of the present system.

SEEPAGE AT LOXTON.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Irrigation Department taken any steps to alleviate the problem of seepage which has occurred on some settlers' properties in the new area at Loxton? If not, will the Minister see that something is done soon? Several settlers are worried about this matter, and evidently nothing very material has been done by the department. Is it a fact that one pipeline serving several settlers was originally a 40 lb. line, that it was pulled up and a new 60 lb. pipeline laid, and that this has proved inadequate? Is it now proposed to put a 120 lb. line down, and is it not a fact that that will burst unless the department installs a surging tower to take the pressure off?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Unfortunately, seepage has unexpectedly occurred in the area. The same thing has happened in some of the new settlements in other States. At Loxton it is a saucer-shaped area and a system of boring has been installed. Owing to the type of strata under the ground the surplus water was not able to get away, causing seepage. The bores have penetrated that strata so the water can now get away through a sandy layer. I am not aware of what has been done in regard to the pipes. I know there has been some trouble, but I will get a report for the honourable member and let him have it in a few days.

LAND USED AS DUMP.

Mr. FRED WALSH—A strip of land running between Mile End and Glenelg was used by the old Holdfast Bay railway line. A portion between the South Road and the West Beach Road has recently been levelled by the Highways Department and is now being used, I believe by the Electricity Trust, as a dump or depot for big steel girders and wooden poles. People nearby are concerned as to whether this will be permanent. Can the Minister say what the department's intention is?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I cannot say what will be the long range policy, but if inconvenience is being caused to the residents we will do our best to alleviate the position. I will get a report and advise the honourable member of the result.

IMPROVED ROADWAY LIGHTING.

Mr. MOIR—Following on a recent statement by the City Coroner regarding recent accidents in Adelaide because of poor street lighting in some instances, will the Premier take the matter up with the Adelaide City Council to see if better lighting can be provided, which would assist pedestrians as well as motorists?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the matter investigated.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It would appear that the Federal Minister for Labor has given instructions to his department that it is not to make available figures indicating the number of people unemployed and receiving relief. It is estimated that 66 times as many are at present receiving this relief as six months ago, and it would appear that at least 50 people a day have registered during the last six days. Will the Premier endeavour to secure the cancellation of that instruction so that we may know the true position?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The instruction is one given by the Commonwealth Minister for Labor to his own department, and I have no power to direct him to cancel it.

YALATA STATION.

Mr. RICHES—There have been negotiations for the rehabilitation and rehousing of aborigines at the Yalata Station on the West Coast. Can the Minister of Local Government give an assurance that the natives, who seem to be among the last to be considered in this matter, will receive consideration so that, if possible, they can go into their new home before next summer?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I entirely refute the suggestion that the natives are the last to be considered. They are the first and their claims have always been first to be considered. It is not the fault of the Government that a decision has not been arrived at for future control of these natives. They were under the control of the United Aborigines Mission, but were moving into an area which came within the sphere of influence of the Lutheran Mission. Therefore, the issue arose who would have the future control of them. The Aborigines Board has done its best to bring about an arrangement between the two governing bodies, but without success. It was then put to each of them whether they would be prepared to take over the

stock and plant at valuation, as the Government did not desire to set up a replica of Point Pearce or Point McLeay. Neither has replied, but I understand that the Lutheran Mission, which came to our assistance very handsomely in connection with natives left at Ooldea, is favourably considering putting forward a proposal for the control of the natives and running the station somewhat on the lines of that at Koonibba. It was never intended that we should part with the area held. Some of the land on the eastern side is admirably suited for settlers in that area. It was purchased particularly because of its adaptability as a home for the natives. It was an excellent purchase and the Government is very proud of it.

ROAD FLOODING AT NURIOOTPA.

Mr. TEUSNER—In recent weeks there has been considerable inundation in the Barossa district, particularly at Nuriootpa, and people there had a similar experience last year. I understand the flooding in portions of Nuriootpa West was mainly due to inability of the culvert across the main bitumen highway between Nuriootpa and Greenoch, which receives the water from the Greenoch hills and the high-lying areas around Nuriootpa, to take the water after a heavy rainfall. In view of this will the Minister of Local Government instruct the Highways Department to take action either to increase the size of the culvert or install additional pipes to take the water away more rapidly?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Following on representations by the honourable member, I took up this question with the Highways Commissioner. A preliminary survey was made but it was not conclusive because more work is involved than was originally thought necessary. Owing to the shortage of staff an additional survey has not been possible. However, the Highways Commissioner assures me that at the earliest possible date he will send surveyors there to ascertain what is required and will then formulate plans to relieve the position.

NEW RIVER MURRAY BRIDGES

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (to the chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee)—Some time ago it was stated in the press that the Highways Commissioner had given evidence before the Public Works Committee regarding the building of additional bridges across the Murray and had said that for one bridge 800

tons of steel would be required. Has the committee inquired into the possibility of building these bridges of timber? Every other State uses timber extensively for both road and railway bridges. One in Queensland is more than a mile long and I should imagine its foundations would be more difficult than those required for bridges over the Murray. I believe that piles could be floated down the river from Victoria and would last a quarter of a century. The Highways Department is at present removing a bridge at North Lake which is in sound condition although it has been there a quarter of a century. Will the chairman of the committee get a report from the officers on the use of timber for the bridges?

Mr. CHRISTIAN—The committee has taken a great deal of evidence on the question of bridges across the River Murray, but has not specifically gone into the matter of timber bridges. As a layman I cannot say whether such a bridge would be feasible, but any bridge across a river on which there is traffic would have to be a fair height above high water mark. I believe the allowance is 40ft. above that mark. I doubt whether a wooden bridge would provide that, especially as it would be necessary to go down 30ft. below the river bed for foundation purposes, and the river itself may be 30ft. to 40ft. deep. In addition, there would have to be the clearance. I very much doubt whether sufficient timber would be available for such a bridge. However, I am prepared to get additional views on the matter in order to satisfy the honourable member.

EXTENSION OF IRRIGATION AREAS.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Lands Department intends to make further extensions to the existing Loxton irrigation area—towards the west of Paruna Road, or does the curtailment of the loan programme prevent any extension? If so, can he say how many soldiers allotted blocks at Loxton will be affected?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This week State officers will discuss with Federal officers the question of extensions to irrigation settlements. Included in the discussions is an area at the end of the present Loxton settlement, and areas in other parts of the State. It is hoped that we will secure another 3,000 acres, which would be sufficient to meet the requirements of irrigation settlers.

M.T.T. INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH laid on the table the interim and final reports of the Municipal Tramways Trust Inquiry Committee.

Ordered to be printed.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

Standing Orders—The Speaker, Messrs. Macgillivray, Moir, and O'Halloran.

Library—The Speaker, the Hon. S. W. Jeffries and Messrs. Stephens and Tapping.

Printing—Messrs. Brookman, Geoffrey Clarke, John Clark, Michael and Riches.

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of Sessional Committees.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That it be an order of this House that, in view of the creation of the Joint House Committee under the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, a Sessional House Committee be not appointed under Standing Order 404.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Shannon, Whittle, Geoffrey Clarke, Pattinson, and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor in reply to his speech on opening the Parliament, and to report on Tuesday, July 22, 1952.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, at 2 p.m.