

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, June 25, 1953.

The House met at 11 a.m. pursuant to proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor (Air Vice-Marshal Sir Robert George).

The Clerk (Mr. G. D. Combe) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

At 11.2 a.m., in compliance with summons, the House proceeded to the Legislative Council, where a commission was read appointing the Hon. Sir Mellis Napier (Chief Justice) and the Hon. Sir Geoffrey Reed (a Judge of the Supreme Court) to be Commissioners for the opening of Parliament.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

The House being again in its own Chamber, at 11.10 a.m. His Honor Sir Geoffrey Reed attended and produced a commission from His Excellency the Governor appointing him to be a Commissioner to administer to the House of Assembly the Oath of Allegiance or the affirmation in lieu thereof required by the Constitution Amendment Act. The commission was read by the Clerk, who then produced writs for the election of thirty-nine members for the House of Assembly.

The Oath of Allegiance required by law was administered to and subscribed by all members except the Hon. T. Playford and Mr. O'Halloran, who were absent, and Mr. Christian, who made an Affirmation of Allegiance.

The Commissioner retired.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I remind the House that it will be necessary next to proceed to the election of a Speaker, and I have much pleasure in nominating the Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Acting Leader of the Opposition) seconded the motion.

The Hon. Sir ROBERT NICHOLLS (Young)—I am deeply sensible of the high honour proposed to be conferred upon me, and in accordance with Standing Orders and with the traditions of Parliament I humbly submit myself to the will of the House.

There being no other nomination, Sir Robert Nicholls was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder.

The Hon. Sir ROBERT NICHOLLS—Standing here on the upper step leading to the Speaker's chair I gratefully acknowledge the

high honour members have conferred upon me, in unanimously calling upon me to preside over the deliberations of this House. I go to the Chair in the full knowledge that the best work will be done by the co-operation of every member. All members have a substantial knowledge of the Standing Orders and procedure, and with their willing co-operation the conduct of this Parliament will be satisfactory to all, with the majority obtaining the decision but the rights of the minority respected. Together we will seek to conduct the business of Parliament in accordance with the highest traditions and practices. We may have to make precedents as well as follow them.

The SPEAKER then occupied his seat.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I am sure I have the support of all honourable members in conveying to you, Mr. Speaker, our very sincere congratulations on your again being elected Speaker. You, Sir, have given outstanding service since you were first elected to this very high and dignified office in 1933. During your continuous occupation of the chair for the succeeding 20 years you have done great credit to yourself and to the State. Because of your outstanding knowledge of Parliamentary procedure and your impartiality at all times, you are indeed a very fit and proper person to hold this office. It is largely because of those qualifications, I believe, that this Chamber, in the regard in which it is held, is second to none in the Commonwealth.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I have pleasure in supporting the Minister's remarks. With you as Speaker, Sir, we look forward with a great deal of satisfaction, knowing that when requested to give a ruling you will do so with strict impartiality. I have every reason to believe that during the session your guidance will be sought, but if that is done it will not in any way involve personal recrimination upon any member. If we on this side happen to reflect upon the Government at any time I hope it will be appreciated that we are not indulging in personalities. I point out that at times some honourable members get away with fairly elaborate second reading speeches in asking questions. The honour which has been conferred upon you, Mr. Speaker, has the full support of the Opposition.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I should like to associate myself with the congratulations offered to you, Sir, upon your being once again elected Speaker. In this Coronation Year, in view of your 20 years' service in the Chair and your knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, it is

fitting that you should be again chosen as Her Majesty's Speaker of this House. It will be an inspiration not only to honourable members but to the general public to show their allegiance to Her Majesty. Your impartiality is well-known, and I feel sure that during the next three years that impartiality will be an inspiration to honourable members to uphold the dignity of this Parliament as in the past.

The SPEAKER—I sincerely thank the Minister and the two other speakers for their kind remarks and congratulations. I shall endeavour to maintain the Standing Orders and assist on any constitutional points that may arise; also to maintain the Sessional Orders which Parliament will be agreeing to later, and to follow the best procedure of the Parliament so as to give every honourable member a full and fair opportunity. There are important things which honourable members have to do for their districts and the public and if at any time while I am Speaker I can assist any honourable member in connection with the work of Parliament or his work in it I shall be very glad to do so. We are fortunate in having two youthful and capable officers in Mr. Combe, the new Clerk of the House of Assembly, and Mr. Dodd, Clerk Assistant and Sergeant at Arms, and members will find these officers at all times willing and competent to assist and advise them. I thank members for electing me, and assure them that it is my desire and determination to see that the best rules for the conduct of Parliament shall at all times prevail.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to have the Speaker presented to him at 12.30 p.m.

[*Sitting suspended from 12 noon to 12.25 p.m.*]

The SPEAKER—It is now my intention to present myself to His Excellency the Governor and I invite as many members as may desire to do so to accompany me.

At 12.26 p.m., attended by a deputation of members, the Speaker proceeded to Government House.

On the House re-assembling at 12.40 p.m.,

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that, accompanied by a deputation of members, I proceeded to Government House for the purpose of presenting myself to His Excellency the Governor. I informed His Excellency that, in pursuance of the powers conferred on the House by section 34 of the Constitution Act, the House of Assembly had this day

proceeded to the election of Speaker and had done me the honour to elect me to that high office. In compliance with the other provisions of that same section, I presented myself to His Excellency as the Speaker and in the name and on behalf of the House laid claim to members' undoubted rights and privileges, and prayed that the most favourable construction might be put on all their proceedings; whereupon His Excellency expressed satisfaction at the choice of a Speaker, and assured me of the confirmation of all the constitutional rights and privileges of the House of Assembly.

[*Sitting suspended from 12.43 to 2.15 p.m.*]

SUMMONS TO COUNCIL CHAMBER.

A summons was received from His Excellency the Governor desiring the attendance of the House in the Legislative Council Chamber, whither the Speaker and honourable members proceeded.

The House having returned to its own Chamber, the Speaker resumed the Chair at 3.8 p.m. and read prayers.

NEXT DAY OF SITTING.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, July 21, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved—

That Mr. Dunks be Chairman of Committees of the Whole House during the present Parliament.

Motion carried.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

The SPEAKER—I have to report that, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the 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 speech I have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

DEATH OF QUEEN MARY: ADDRESS OF CONDOLENCE.

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that I have received from His Excellency the Governor the following reply to the Address of Condolence presented on the occasion of the death of Her Majesty, Queen Mary:—

To the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Assembly—The Governor informs the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Assembly

that he has received the undermentioned Message from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations:—

"I have it in command to request you to convey to the members of Parliament of South Australia, through the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly, Her Majesty's sincere thanks for their loyal and dutiful address expressing sympathy with her in the great loss which she and her family have sustained by the death of Queen Mary."

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House to make appropriation of the sum set forth in the accompanying Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government during the year ending June 30, 1953, for the purposes stated therein.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands), having obtained a suspension of Standing Orders, moved—

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

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—I draw members' attention to the matter of potato supplies, a serious matter for consumers. Why has this Government not abolished the Potato Board? South Australian Potato Distribution Centre Limited, a separate company formed for distributing potatoes, commenced business on November 1, 1949. All shares in the company are held by Wholesale Fruit Merchants of Adelaide Limited, an association of fruit and vegetable merchants comprising 44 members, each holding 10 £1 shares, with a paid-up capital of £440. Wholesale Fruit Merchants of Adelaide Limited performs the work of the S.A. Potato Distribution Centre Limited and charges that company for services rendered. It took over the distribution of potatoes early in 1942 and, although while it handled potatoes under Commonwealth control its activities were nil, later it made huge profits from the sale of potatoes. The secretary of the Potato Board is also secretary of S.A. Potato Distribution Centre Limited and also of Wholesale Fruit Merchants of Adelaide Limited, so all three bodies operate from the same address in Rundle Street, although Mr. Strickland, as chairman of the Potato Board, would have a different address. I assume that, as an officer of the Department of Agriculture, he would be under the Minister of Agriculture. The chairman is responsible for the supervision of the quality of potatoes grown in South Australia, and his

staff, I understand, are doing a splendid job. However, though the Potato Board has delegated its business to the S.A. Potato Distribution Centre Limited it still charges the grower a levy of 3s. a ton, S.A. Potato Distribution Centre Limited, as primary wholesaler, receives 12s. 6d. a ton and Wholesale Fruit Merchants of Adelaide Limited charges a fee for the work performed by its staff out of the 12s. 6d. To abolish the Potato Board would mean a saving of 15s. 6d. a ton, and we would then revert to the condition of pre-war trading under which the grower sold direct to wholesalers. The *Advertiser* of June 17 contains the following report:—

S.A. Potato Shortage "Not Artificial."—The shortage of potatoes in S.A. was not artificial, but very real, the president of the Onkaparinga potato growers' branch of the S.A. Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners' Association (Mr. L. B. Pfeiffer) said yesterday. There was a Commonwealth-wide shortage, he added, due to adverse seasonal conditions and grub infestation. Criticising the S.A. Prices Commissioner (Mr. W. F. J. McCann) for describing the shortage as artificial, Mr. Pfeiffer said that S.A. was in a better position than the eastern States regarding supplies. Owing to the unrealistic attitude adopted by the Commissioner, however, large quantities had been sent interstate, where better prices were obtainable.

That statement is a slur on the Prices Commissioner, a man appointed under State legislation. Under Commonwealth price control the consumer's interests were protected, but we were told by the Government leaders in this House that the States could do a better job in protecting those interests. The South Australian potato shortage is yet another example of this Government's failure to honour its obligations and promises to the people. According to His Excellency the Governor's speech prices legislation in this State is to be continued and the powers of the Prices Minister and Prices Commissioner are to be retained. I assume that the Department of Agriculture will still be under the control of a Minister, but the fact that the Potato Marketing Act is administered by the Minister of Agriculture does not mean that he has the power to ensure a better distribution of potatoes. Section 16 of the Act provides:—

The Board may for the purposes of carrying out the duties and functions imposed on it by the other provisions of this Act—

- (a) buy or take a lease of any premises;
- (b) buy or hire any personal property;
- (c) sell any property no longer required by it;
- (d) delegate any of its functions and revoke any such delegation.

It would appear that the board has delegated its functions to South Australian Potato Distribution Centre Ltd., which is associated with Wholesale Fruit Merchants of Adelaide Ltd. Has the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible for the administration of this Act, delegated his powers to another person? Have growers who are dissatisfied with the price received for their potatoes appealed to the Minister under section 23 of the Act? Section 23 (1) states:—

A person dissatisfied with a decision or action or proposed decision or action of the board, may, in writing, request the Minister to review that decision, or action, or proposed decision or action.

That indicates what the Minister may do, but I should be glad if he would indicate whether any growers have been dissatisfied with their prices or whether they have been persuaded to withhold supplies until a certain date. Has he received any protests from growers? The potato problem is apparently one that has not been investigated by the Minister, though many people are perturbed about it. Section 3 (2) of the Act states:—

This Act shall not apply to potatoes the subject or trade, commerce, or intercourse between States, or required or intended by the owners thereof for trade, commerce, or intercourse between States.

The Government is asking many people to grow potatoes, but Parliament cannot lay down where they are to be grown. Why continue this legislation if the Government cannot have it enforced? The Government has completely failed in its endeavour to rectify matters. The provision I have just quoted should never have been included in the Act, for the Government knew it could not prevent growers from trading between the States. We were told in the Governor's Speech that the Government will continue prices legislation, but the appointment of a Prices Minister and the retention of the Prices Commissioner will not increase the supply of potatoes. Members opposite may argue that the Prices Commissioner refuses to grant an increase in the price of potatoes because the growers desire to place their products in cold storage, but that argument will not stand investigation. If there were a glut and not all the potatoes dug were being consumed it would certainly be desirable to have them placed in cold storage, but would we get an extra potato on the market in one month's time if those now being dug were placed in cold storage, or would they be disposed of elsewhere? One of our weekly newspapers stated there were several thousand tons in storage. I do not know whether they are

still there; but probably the Minister could tell us. Will he explain the necessity for continuing this legislation, or will he say that I am right in stating that the Potato Board should be abolished? If it were abolished no service would be removed from the public because the board is not now performing any. Parliament did not intend that a board should be constituted to perform a duty in the interests of the community and then delegate all its responsibilities to some interested party.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—It is refreshing to hear the Acting Leader of the Opposition enunciate a policy which I have from time to time enunciated myself since the end of World War II., namely, the abolition of controls. I hope we shall hear more on those lines from him. Many controls were necessary as war measures, but it is almost a decade since hostilities ended. Many will agree with the Acting Leader that during the war certain people, by virtue of controls then operating in the potato industry, made large profits. I believe they did. He said that if we abolish the board about 15s. 6d. a ton will be saved, either to the grower or the consumer. Perhaps they could split the difference and each save 7s. 9d. He also said if we abolish the board the growers could deal with a group of merchants formed in 1949, but does he think that the growers would get a fair deal? Is it the policy of his Party to pass these producers back to people who have brought about a coalition for their own good? If so, I disagree with it most heartily.

We did not have a big potato harvest this year, certainly nothing like the previous year's. Moreover, there has been much woolly-brained thinking and reasoning about the minimum and maximum prices of potatoes. The Prices Commissioner never fails to point out that he only fixes the maximum price. Does any reasonable man think that when a maximum price is fixed anyone will sell below it? What would members opposite say to an argument that a workman in industry under an Arbitration Court award should accept less than the award rate? It is begging the question to suggest that last year we could have disposed of more of our potato crop by growers accepting less than the maximum price fixed. The same thing has arisen this year. The potato growers I represent are just as unhappy this year as last year. A paltry ½d. a pound would have saved for South Australia some thousands of tons of potatoes which have gone interstate. We cannot get them back. We will get potatoes, possibly from Tasmania or Western Australia, but they will not cost a

paltry $\frac{1}{2}$ d. more, but more likely 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. or 2d. a pound more, to replace the potatoes lost. That is the policy which has been pursued.

This House is responsible for the legislation it passes. Mr. Walsh mentioned one fact which is not very important. He referred to the interpretation section which gives the grower freedom to trade across the borders of the sister States. Section 92 of the Federal Constitution provides for that, and the existence of that section in our State law is only an indication that we understand the purport of the Federal Constitution. We cannot override the superior law of the Commonwealth. The growers approached the Government for this legislation but I do not know they got everything they asked for. Possibly they got as much as they could get, and hoped it would work. For instance, they did not get as much as the egg producers got—a board with complete power over prices. We have denied potato growers, who are represented on the Potato Marketing Board, any say in fixing the price consumers will pay. Let us go back to the time before there was such a thing as control and growers sold on the open market. We were in no way concerned that the growers, knowing the actual supply position, decided that they would increase the price of their product by £5 a ton because of a shortage. It is the ordinary marketing arrangement to which we have been accustomed, and I can see no harm in it. After all, these opportunities come very infrequently to the grower. Last year there was a surplus, and growers actually sold below the cost of production. Many growers in my electorate believe that the sooner they get away from potato control the better it will be, but with that I disagree. I believe there is some value in the orderly marketing of primary produce. Where we have, as in this instance, direct grower representation, there could be no fairer method of control. They have to keep their market, otherwise their produce will not be required. I believe that if we amended the law to give the Potato Board complete authority over prices, as we have done with the Egg Board, practically the whole of this criticism could be ironed out, and the difficulties of supply would certainly be cured almost overnight. We have just had a very dry autumn, with an infestation of grubs throughout the potato growing areas, and this reduced the crop materially. That happens from time to time in South Australia. Therefore, I cannot promise that we shall become self-sufficient in potatoes, but I can promise that an important step towards self-sufficiency is to give complete control to growers.

I do not object to Mr. Strickland remaining chairman of the board. He is an excellent officer, with high principles and good judgment, but in his present position he has very little authority. Practically the board's power is to regulate the supply of potatoes from the farm to the market. It has no authority to fix prices. If, in the opinion of board members, it would have saved the public considerable sums, as in my opinion it would have done, to allow an increase to meet the interstate competition, and it had the authority to meet that competition, potatoes could have been kept in cold storage and thereby we would have had sufficient supplies to last until September or October, when possibly supplies would have been forthcoming from Western Australia or Tasmania. That is almost our only hope; and they will be pretty dear potatoes, and may not be as good in quality as those we sent away. We will be buying on a market in which the seller has all the advantages and the buyer all the disadvantages. It is the custom to cold-store potatoes in South Australia, and it should always be the custom. Cold storage applies not only to potatoes but to another important item of diet—butter. It is well-known that during the spring we cold-store practically every pound of first class butter made. Rarely do we make sufficient for our own needs. As regards potatoes, after the hills crop is finished there is an interval before the plains crop comes in. Cold storage can provide against that. If the board had complete authority in this field I am certain that potato surpluses would be cold-stored and would then be available for our own use. I regret that I had to come into the debate at this stage, because today is more or less a formal day, but I did not think it wise to allow the statement of Mr. Walsh, who obviously did not set forth the complete facts, to pass unanswered.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—It is indeed refreshing, five years after I expressed doubt as to the ultimate success of the legislation which controls potatoes, to find from both sides of the House an expression of the very doubts I then put forward. I said, on November 16, 1948, speaking on the Bill:—

I address myself to the Potato Marketing Bill with some misgivings. . . . I fear that this legislation will lead to two things—gluts and famines. I can see nothing which will compensate the grower in the event of gluts, but I think it tends more towards famines than gluts. . . . How is this legislation, in the face of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, able to protect growers in the event of a big glut of potatoes in Victoria? Can we do anything about it?

Can we do anything when there is a shortage of potatoes in this State and supplies are regimented to a minimum price, with higher prices being offered interstate? In that event naturally they go interstate. No-one can blame the grower for that.

Mr. Lawn—It is the capitalistic system.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is not. It is a sensible system. It is what the honourable member or anyone else would do if offered £5 a ton more for his product. I would think it a reflection on a man's intelligence and perhaps his sanity if he accepted a price £5 lower than he could get. In my 1948 speech I also said:—

Although I would like to see security given the potato grower, I am not certain that this measure would help him much. We cannot control the importation of potatoes from Tasmania, Victoria, or Western Australia, and even if we had a bountiful crop here there is nothing to prevent shiploads coming from other States . . . I know we can draw on other States, but when all States have a plentiful supply of potatoes growers will not be protected against gluts.

The Acting Leader of the Opposition today seeks to break down control. This is refreshing, seeing that his Party has always supported control. Mr. Shannon evidently had his doubts in the beginning, but he wants to continue some form of control. There is only one form of control of any value for primary products such as potatoes, and that is grower co-operative control—a system set up by the growers whereby when there is a surplus they can put it in cold storage and retain it for use during the period between crops.

Mr. Shannon—The Egg Board works the same way.

Mr. QUIRKE—A potato is an entirely different commodity from an egg, and can be handled under different conditions. Potatoes can be best handled by co-operative grower control, in the same way as other foodstuffs. It would be the only effective way to deal with the matter and it would render unnecessary the operations of the present marketing board. Factors which come into this question are price control, marketing control, section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, and short crops. When there is a short crop the price should be allowed to rise. The grower should get more when he has a poor crop. That is only fair and reasonable. When there is a glut the price should automatically drop. Under co-operative grower control the price could be properly regulated and use could be made of cold storage. The potato is a stable article of diet for practically all Australians. Most

people regard the potato as a necessity; therefore potato supplies should be the concern of this Parliament. Our present control measures have broken down hopelessly. Price control has worked against the best interests of the people, and it has meant that potatoes are beyond the reach of most South Australians. The present form of control should go. The potato grower must take the initiative. He must see that salvation lies not in statutory boards but in a control by grower organizations. The sooner there is control of that sort the sooner there will be stability of price and stability of supply.

This is such an important subject that Parliament should consider appointing a committee to investigate potato supplies, as well as all phases of price and marketing controls. Then Parliament could be informed of the facts. Without such an investigation there will be continuous debate on the subject with the facts being uncertain. Because of fluctuating seasons it is obvious that the potato position cannot be controlled by a statutory board. Dame nature cannot be controlled, and consequently there can be no certainty about crops. In fairness to the grower, there should be a good price when the crop is short. It is unjust to tell him that he must not sell his potatoes for more than a certain price. Under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution he can sell his potatoes in any State where he can get a higher price, but this leaves many South Australians without potatoes. I was pleased that Mr. Frank Walsh brought up this matter and I was interested in Mr. Shannon's remarks, but the only way to overcome the present position would be to appoint a committee to make an investigation as I have suggested. When the facts are known Parliament could take the necessary action to prevent a repetition of the present position.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—The fixing of the price of potatoes should be in the hands of the board. For many years the marketing of onions was a bugbear in the South-East of this State and in Victoria, but the growers formed a growers' association to deal with the matter. They were enabled to know within a few tons the quantity of onions that would be available for sale in the various districts. Information about prices in other States was available. In one year thousands of tons of our surplus onions went to other States. This could happen in connection with potatoes. Losses suffered by potato growers have been mentioned. In the South-East we had a bad-good year. Because

of the good rains we should have had eight to 10 tons of potatoes to the acre, but because of ravages there was a return of only one to two tons an acre. That meant a loss to the growers because they had to purchase sacks for the larger crop, and although they had to dig the whole area they got a reduced crop. I would have liked this matter to be introduced later in the session, but I now support Mr. Quirke's suggestion for the appointment of an investigating committee.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—It is most distressing for the housewife to try to buy potatoes. Many of our womenfolk in the metropolitan area find it almost impossible to get them. If they are lucky they get some after much searching, or get a rationed supply if regular customers at a store. Mr. Quirke said that the growers can get about £5 a ton more in other States than they can get here. I do not blame any grower for selling his product where he can get the highest price. It is the only thing he can do under our present system. Capitalism breeds greed, and the person with something to sell endeavours to sell it where he can get the highest price, but he always tries to get his labour at the cheapest possible price. We have a glaring instance of that today. When the labourer tries to get the highest reward possible for his labour he is condemned by many Independent members and all Government members.

Mr. Quirke—By none of the Independents.

Mr. LAWN—Last session I heard Mr. Macgillivray repeatedly put certain questions to the Premier when employees in the wine industry were fighting for better wages and conditions. He asked the Government what it would do.

Mr. Shannon—What did the Premier say last year when an approach was made to the Arbitration Court for a reduction in wages and an increase in hours?

Mr. LAWN—I remember the attitude of the Premier and every other Government member when session after session the Opposition has introduced a Bill to amend the Industrial Code so as to bring rural workers within its ambit. Then members opposite have voted against giving those workers a chance to enjoy a basic wage and decent working conditions. Striking workers have been attacked by all Government and some Independent members. I do not condemn growers who under a capitalistic system sell their products in another market for a higher price, and members should not condemn workers who ask for higher wages and better

conditions. The Industrial Court should be given the power to fix wages and conditions for workers in the potato industry. The cost of production of potatoes could then be ascertained and a fair price fixed by the Prices Commissioner.

In 1948 Labor members told the people what would happen if price control were administered by State Governments, and their predictions have been fulfilled. Prices legislation cannot be adequately controlled by six State Governments, and what has happened in the potato industry has occurred in other industries in previous seasons in this and other States. At one time New South Wales was selling primary products in Queensland because of the higher prices received there. The fault lies not with the producers who seek a higher price but with State control. I condemn not the Prices Commissioner but the capitalistic system. Our womenfolk cannot buy potatoes although they are being plentifully produced in this State. The call for increased production has been answered but South Australian consumers have been unable to reap the benefits to which they are entitled. The member for Stanley said that we would probably have to go to Western Australia or Tasmania for our potatoes. What sort of an economic system do we live in when we cannot buy potatoes grown in this State because a more profitable market is available in another State, yet later potatoes may be imported to meet the local demand? Liberal members, who say they are opposed to Socialism but who really do not know what it implies, are trying to introduce Socialism in this State, whereas under a truly Socialistic system the distribution of potato supplies would not be bungled as it is today.

Some people say they do not want Government control, but the Governor in his opening speech reviewed such Socialistic projects as pine forests, the Leigh Creek coalfield, and the Electricity Trust. They may be Socialistic projects, but unfortunately the wrong people are administering them. Under a competent Socialistic administration South Australian potatoes would not be sold in Victoria nor would we have to buy Western Australian and Tasmanian potatoes. Federal price control is necessary, but failing the introduction of that remedy this Government should acquire all South Australian grown potatoes to ensure their fair distribution amongst consumers at a fair and reasonable price to both consumers and growers.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—The activities of the Potato Board have been discussed, but they are in no way related to the activities of the Prices Commissioner. If the board were given power to fix prices it would view this matter much more sympathetically from the viewpoint of the growers than does the Prices Commissioner. I do not condemn the Prices Commissioner for he is in a different category from the Potato Board in that he must consider other factors. The member for Adelaide said Independent members had not supported his Party's Bill to amend the Industrial Code so that rural workers would be brought within its scope, but I point out that it is hard to get potato diggers at any sort of award rate for they want piece work.

Mr. Davis—They are not covered by the Industrial Code.

Mr. STOTT—Even if they were you could not get one at an award rate. Recently I heard of a potato digger who received £110 for nine days' work, and under those conditions workers could not be obtained at an award rate. The member for Adelaide said that the solution to the problem lay in the acquisition by a Socialistic State of all potatoes produced, but the growers would not produce potatoes under a Socialist system. In interpreting the meaning of section 92 of the Australian Constitution the High Court has ruled that interstate trade shall be free, and if growers can get a higher price in Victoria they will sell their product there notwithstanding the activities of the Prices Commissioner, the Potato Board, or this Parliament. The solution of the problem is simply to give the growers a price at which it will pay them to sell their potatoes in this State. Something should be done about the current potato shortage and a conference held between the Prices Commissioner and representatives of this Government and the Potato Board in an effort to overcome the difficulty.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—Early in this debate there appeared to be considerable agreement on what should be done about this matter, but the more we proceed the greater is the diversion of opinion. The present control of potatoes is unsatisfactory and something should be done to remedy the position. I support Mr. Quirke's suggestion. I have never heard it said that he was a seventh son of a seventh son, but I am prepared to believe it, for years ago he predicted exactly what would happen under the legislation we passed at that time. He having forecast what

would happen, this House, and particularly the Ministry, should take notice of his present suggestion and set up an impartial committee of inquiry to decide whether this legislation should be continued and, if so, what amendments would make it function with satisfaction to growers—for this is a growers' organization. Secondly, it should see what can be done for the consumer and that merchants get a fair and reasonable return for their labour. The press and the public are busy laying charges as to the responsibility for the present potato shortage. We have read in the press that the Prices Commissioner is responsible because he has refused to increase the price to growers, who are consequently exporting their crop (I believe they have already exported interstate 60 per cent of the supplies that were available in South Australia). The Prices Commissioner says that statement is incorrect and that he is not responsible for the lower prices which growers obtain.

On the other hand, we are told that merchants are cornering supplies and are deliberately keeping potatoes off the market so that eventually they will be able to charge an enhanced price. The merchants' spokesman says that that is incorrect and that all that they propose to do is to keep a certain quantity of potatoes in store so as to spread the supply over the period of shortage. Mr. Lawn more or less suggests that the growers are exploiting the public and are demanding a higher price. I recall that Mr. Shannon last year mentioned that the price—£32 17s. 6d. a ton—was too high and that because of the high price the consumption of potatoes was curtailed. I think he suggested it might be wise to reduce the price. This year growers are saying that they have had a very light crop and that the price will not cover the cost of production. I was surprised to hear Mr. Shannon say that South Australian primary producers had weather conditions to contend with and that at times they get too much rain and at others insufficient. It is obvious, however, that this set-up is not peculiar to South Australia. Every part of the Commonwealth and every primary producer throughout the world has always to contend with weather conditions. I am firmly of opinion that although price control and other controls are satisfactory to secondary industry where manufacturers can set their machines working, employ a staff, and know exactly what their output will be at the end of the week, the primary producer is not in that fortunate position.

Mr. Lawn suggests that the cure is Federal price control, but that would make confusion worse confounded. Let us imagine what would happen with a centralized authority. Take last year, when South Australia had a bumper crop of potatoes and the eastern States had a poor crop. Growers in New South Wales would need a much higher price for their potatoes, but in South Australia we could accept a lower price because of the costs entailed. On what basis would the Federal Prices Commissioner assess the price? Would he work out the costs to provide for a fair and equitable return for the grower of bumper crops in South Australia, or would he do it on the lower crops in New South Wales? Mr. Lawn assumes that if we could get workers into the potato industry under some award and under terms and conditions fixed by the Trades Hall in Adelaide it would solve the potato growers' problems.

Mr. Lawn—Independents always oppose that type of legislation.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—It would not matter much to workers in the country because today we cannot get workers there in any form of industry for less than the basic wage; in fact, we often have to pay them more than the basic wage. For years we have paid award rates and conditions in the dried fruit and grape growing industry, but that has not solved our marketing conditions. I do not think that our primary industries are suited for controls unless they have an export problem. The dried fruits industry exports 80 per cent of its production. It is obvious that if the Commonwealth market pays a higher price than the export market the tendency is to sell on the Commonwealth market. Under such conditions we need some form of control, like the Wheat Board and the Egg Board. The Potato Board is different because it has no export market.

Two years ago, because of floods in New South Wales, the price of trombones rose from between £10 and £12 a ton to £120, and, I believe, in one instance went as high as £140. What was the result? The next year, when trombones were grown again, they became a drug on the market because there was an ample supply. Of necessity and because of the very nature of things, primary producers have to take these risks. I am glad to see that a co-operative movement is starting in the hills to handle our potato production. If any co-operative movement fails, it is only because its members will not take an interest in it and accept the responsibility of keeping it going.

Mr. Lawn—Who irrigates the land in your constituency?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—It is done by the sweat and labour of the men engaged on it.

Mr. Lawn—Who paid for it?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The workers on the land are still paying for it. The biggest difficulty in the irrigation areas is not a problem of Nature or of prices but the problem of the Socialistic controls that were used. I trust that the Ministry will institute some kind of inquiry into the position. The present controls are not satisfactory, but the Government must not fly in the face of public opinion. All who have spoken for the growers and the control of marketing are unanimous that some alteration is necessary, otherwise the legislation should be wiped out.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—The Supplementary Estimates for the financial year 1952-53 now before the Committee provide for expenditure on essential and urgent matters totalling £1,175,500. Provision will be made in the Appropriation Bill for the use of Loan Funds or other public funds if the general revenues of the State and grants from the Commonwealth are insufficient to meet the expenditures provided for in this Bill. It is not anticipated that any substantial amount will be required from this source. Provision is made for grants to the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the Queen Victoria Maternity Home; also to Kalyra Sanatorium and the South Australian Institute for the Blind, Deaf, and Dumb. Parliamentary authority is also being sought for the expenditure of £30,000 in connection with the Coronation celebrations, and representation of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition overseas. Some payments have already been made on this account from the Governor's Appropriation Fund. Many more claims in connection with commitments by the Government in respect of the Coronation celebration have now come to hand and it is desired to pay these accounts before the end of the financial year.

Under the heading of "Treasurer" £200,000 is provided for a grant to the Municipal Tramways Trust towards its working expenses. The Estimates passed with the Budget provided for £500,000, but from a reliable estimate which has now been obtained from the tramways, and examined by the Treasury, it is clear that the loss on the tramways for the year ending June 30, 1953, will exceed £700,000. The newly

appointed Tramways Board has adopted measures to arrest the drift in tramway finance, but it has not yet had sufficient time to decide on the policy necessary to reduce the heavy losses being made in connection with the running of the tramways. This further contribution towards working expenses is therefore necessary to enable the trust to continue its operations on the present level.

Last year the people living in the emergency housing areas were considerably inconvenienced during the wet season because of the absence of made roads and street drainage systems. The position is not substantially better this year as to date no permanent road or drainage systems have been possible for these areas. The Housing Trust have advised the Government that the provision of temporary roads will make conditions much more bearable for these people and the Government has provided £20,000 on these Supplementary Estimates to enable work to commence immediately on the provision of such temporary roads to better living conditions in the emergency housing areas. Under "Minister of Education" further provision is made for a grant of £40,000 to the University of Adelaide. The University budget covers a calendar year and the grants made by the Government to the University Council for each calendar year appear in the budgets for two financial years. The grants made to the council from the Budget are considered each financial year in relation to the calendar year budget of the University Council.

Under "Minister of Agriculture" provision is made for a grant of £20,000 to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. This grant will be made to the University of Adelaide, which controls the institute, and will in turn be made available to that institution. This will permit the institute to carry out important research, particularly in connection with soil erosion and sand drift control, and for this purpose the institute has plans to carry out extensive research on Younghusband Peninsula which, it is hoped, will eventually be converted into an asset of considerable value. At the same time this work will provide important information which will be of value in combating the sand drift problem which is extensive in this State.

Under "Minister of Local Government" £200,000 is provided to be transferred to a trust account for the purpose of the Minister making grants to local authorities in connection with storm damage to public foreshore property.

Cabinet has set up a committee to advise the Minister as to the making of grants to assist municipal bodies and district councils in both metropolitan and country areas, and this committee will thoroughly examine all proposals submitted by these local authorities to ensure that the expenditure of the money gives the greatest possible security in the future. It is necessary to transfer this amount to a trust account as the Minister is unable to make commitments for grants unless Parliamentary authority is given for the expenditure and the funds have been set aside for the purpose. As most of the work to be carried out from the grants is urgent it is necessary that the amount required should be voted in these Estimates.

Provision is also made under this heading for transfer to the Highways Fund of £120,000 to provide roads of access to War Service Land Settlement areas. When the War Service Land Settlement Agreement was entered into between the Government of this State and the Commonwealth it was agreed that the State would provide services to these areas which included schools, hospitals, and roads. Some roads have been constructed in the areas at Loxton, in the South-East, and on Kangaroo Island, but if the settlement work is to continue many more miles of road must be provided, particularly in the South-East and on Kangaroo Island, otherwise it will become impossible for the Development Executive to move its plant about and impossible for the settlers to gain access to their blocks.

The sum of £500,000 has also been provided for construction of developmental roads and for repairs and maintenance to roads in country areas. The moneys available in the Highways Fund for some time have been insufficient to enable the department to carry out all the maintenance and construction work in country areas which the Government desires to have done. Many country roads are in a bad state of repair, and particularly does this apply to roads which have been carrying heavy traffic. It is therefore essential that funds be made available to the Highways Commissioner for the department to carry out maintenance which had to be deferred due to lack of funds. I move the adoption of the first line.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.
Miscellaneous—£75,500.

MR. FRANK WALSH—Some time ago I was told that Parliament would not be called together before July. Then I was informed that it would be necessary to summon Parliament before July, but only to appropriate £200,000 for repairs to foreshores, particularly

metropolitan. Yet now we are asked to appropriate a total of £1,175,000 for various purposes. The Minister should have given a far more detailed explanation of the necessity to vote such a large sum, especially the £200,000 to reconstruct our foreshores. I understand the Government told heads of departments to prune expenditure throughout this financial year. Can the Minister say whether sufficient economies have been effected to meet the £200,000 for foreshore reconstruction? How can I and my colleagues be expected to agree to appropriate large amounts without being given detailed explanations? We may be accused of trying to withhold Supply if we ask for further information, or we may have to take drastic measures to enable us to get it. I notice that £30,000 is listed to meet the cost of Coronation celebrations. They were a success, but I regret that some people had to ask for alterations to be made to the official programme. As Acting Leader of the Opposition I received invitations to attend religious services and to be present on the official dais to witness the march through Adelaide by army personnel one hour earlier than the time published in the official programme. I inquired why the time of the march had been brought forward but there seemed to be a lack of understanding somewhere. In some instances church services were going to be curtailed. People who were given a holiday to attend Coronation services were to be catered for to enable them to attend sporting fixtures and apparently it was forgotten that the Coronation service was to be of a highly religious nature. After I communicated with the Minister for Army the march was put back until 11.30 a.m., so apparently some of the matters I raised were acknowledged as important. The remainder of the celebrations were successfully carried out.

An amount of £200,000 is provided to assist the Tramways Trust. It is time the Government heeded the Opposition and decided to run the concern instead of appropriating monies to keep it operating. We have already voted £500,000 to assist the trust; now an additional £200,000 is required and by the end of August we will probably be asked to appropriate further sums. It would be interesting to know what the Tramways Board is doing to improve the position. I expected some fuller explanation of the necessity for this appropriation but it was not forthcoming.

Mr. Shannon—Instead of making this appropriation would you prefer to increase tram fares?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The only way the trust can improve its revenue is to increase the number of passengers. The sooner the board realizes that it must encourage people to use the services the sooner it will obtain revenue. It is not merely a matter of raising fares every time there is an increase in the basic wage. If that is done people who normally use the services will prefer to purchase pushbikes or travel by other means. I wonder what time is lost in the delays that occur in King William Street and what wear and tear is involved in running the system? It took a number of years to prevail upon the trust to run services east and west through King William Street but I see no necessity why trams from Fullarton, Glen Osmond and Kingswood should travel down North Terrace, along King William Street and out of the city through Wakefield Street. Much time must be wasted and depreciation must result because of the numerous hold-ups. As the Government has a representative on the board a comprehensive report should be brought down indicating why a further £200,000 is required. I do not know what Government country members will say when they return to their electorates and tell the people that the Government, through the inability of the board which has been appointed, has found it necessary to ask the people to subscribe that amount to keep the system in operation.

Mr. Teusner—What evidence of inability have you?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—It is not my duty to place everything before Parliament. It is the duty of Ministers to fully inform members of what is required. Government members may have been given information but the Opposition has not. I am not a member of the Tramways Board and unless I am given information I do not know why this amount is needed. I was told that the Government, through careful manipulation by various heads of departments, was able to earmark £200,000 for the purpose of assisting councils to effect repairs to the foreshores. It is a wonder the Government did not consider it advisable to curtail some other activities to provide £200,000 for the trust. An amount of £20,000 is provided to enable the Housing Trust to make temporary roads. It would be interesting to know whether those roads will be made of cinders or metal and whether later a coat of bitumen will be applied. In many instances people living in Housing Trust areas suffer grave handicaps and my sympathy is with them, but I would like further information about the composition of the roads.

It is proposed to transfer to the department's trust account £200,000 for grants to councils in connection with storm damage to public foreshore property. A committee has been set up to investigate the matter. I should like to know whether various Government departments were asked to make specific investigations and prune expenditure. The Public Service Association submitted a case to the Public Service Board for increased salaries about a year ago, but when the board issued its determination early this year it provided increases to certain high ranking officers and some others, apparently to make the determination appear *bona fide*. The official excuse given by the board was that it did not feel competent to adjudicate on the question of classification according to the depreciation in the value of money, although it is supposed to have power to hear and determine any factor affecting salaries. The position of the majority of public servants appears to be unfavourable compared with that of employees in corresponding occupations outside, and needless to say, there is much dissatisfaction at what appears to be Government interference with the operations of the board. I was wondering whether the Government prevailed upon the lower classifications to forgo increases in order to provide the £200,000 which the Government seeks to appropriate for expenditure by councils on the foreshore, or was it a question of the Public Service Board increasing the salaries of the higher paid officials at the expense of the lower classifications? Possibly this warrants an investigation. I do not know whether it is proposed to spend the whole of the £200,000 mentioned on repairing storm damage.

I am reminded that the Minister of Marine, in replying to a question by Mr. McAlees in 1950 regarding a fishing boat haven at Wallaroo, said:—

Everything depends on factors over which I have no control—the availability of manpower and the order of urgency . . . The Government has undertaken the construction of about £250,000 worth of boat harbours throughout the State, all of which, so far as possible, are being carried out in order of priority.

On August 23, replying to the same member on this question, the Minister said:—

Since then the Government has had to concentrate on areas not so well favoured as Wallaroo and Moonta Bay, having some appointments which are not thought adequate. The only bottleneck is the supply of manpower and the materials and our engineers are obliged to use them to the best advantage on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number, fishermen included.

In the course of those replies the Minister in a general way promised the provision of fishing havens, but from reports I have received the Wallaroo people are still waiting for the work to be commenced.

As to the expenditure of £200,000 on repairs to the foreshore, I do not know whether the Government intends to strengthen the committee by the addition of a country representative. I noticed that the member for Rocky River had advocated in the press that the country should be included in whatever amount was set aside. Is he satisfied to leave it entirely to the administration of the committee as constituted, or does he desire country representation? The country should be represented, and I would like the honourable member to indicate his views in this regard. It is not a question of the city versus the country, but of the country having some representation. I feel confident that protection of the foreshore against further damage cannot be adequately provided for by the use of steel reinforced concrete. Have the engineers or the special committee considered what effect the volume of water released from the land into the sea has on natural channels? Not many years ago there was almost a straight outlet from the Patawalonga into the sea, but that position has been changed. A huge volume of water enters the sea at Henley Beach south when the Torrens river is in flood and there is continual erosion of sand into the sea. I would like to know whether it would be possible to construct an outlet at Henley Beach south on somewhat similar lines to that adopted at Outer Harbour by providing on either side a wall of granite or some similarly hard material to prevent further erosion on the foreshore. Furthermore, I would like to know whether the Government has ascertained from the committee whether it thinks it advisable to make any further breakwaters along the foreshore. It may be necessary to erect a structure 10ft. high or even 20ft. high at low tide mark.

Mr. Quirke—It would be better no height at all.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—It would need to be of such a height as to make the sea work for the engineers, for I firmly believe that each high tide would deposit a body of sand on the landward side of any such construction, and in the process of years this would build up a large body of sand which would form a protection against further scouring of the foreshore. The soundness of my contention can be illustrated in a very simple manner. If one places,

say, a tub in the water at the low tide mark some sand will be found to have been deposited in it with each tide, and in my opinion a barrier to the waves in the form of such a breakwater as I suggest would have a similar effect. Although Glenelg is not within my constituency and I have no desire to trespass on another member's territory, I would use it as a simple illustration and suggest that foreshore improvements be taken back as far as the original seawall and that no further encroachments be made upon the beach seawards. On the other hand, if we continue the practice of the past I feel sure that Parliament will be called upon to contribute annually much more than the sum now involved. I sincerely trust that this money will be devoted solely to repairing foreshore damage and if the Minister had indicated the whole of the purposes to be covered we should probably have had no need to seek further information in the short time at our disposal this afternoon. On the other hand, if we found that it was proposed to effect other things on the foreshore we would be entitled to refuse Supply. The Government has sought to impress upon the public that it desires to assist local governing bodies in meeting this heavy and unexpected burden, but I confidently believe that the Government has not given the matter the fullest consideration for had it done so it must have reached the conclusion that, instead of £200,000, an amount nearer £2,000,000 would be required to do the job satisfactorily.

In general, we are asked in the measure before us to appropriate the sum of £1,175,500 although it has been made to appear that Parliament has been called together for the purpose of approving an appropriation of £200,000 to the Local Government Department and that otherwise the matter could have waited until July. It behoves the Government, when it next asks Parliament to approve of an extraordinary appropriation, to give members much more than the meagre information we have before us today.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the measure, but I must express my extreme disappointment at the fact that we must vote a further £200,000 to the Municipal Tramways Trust in order that it may carry on its functions. When we approved a grant of half a million pounds last year I held the view that that would suffice to get the trust out of its difficulties and that in future it would stand on its own feet, but apparently my hopes were unfounded. It would be unfair to condemn the

new organization for it has not yet had time to prove its efficiency and because of that I shall not criticize it for not having made the progress I should like to have seen. However, members have the right to criticize a body charged with the responsibility of spending the taxpayers' money and I believe that the new organization has made some errors. One, though perhaps of a minor nature, is the fact that it has deprived mayors and town clerks of the right of free travel on the system. I suppose the sum involved would not exceed £250 a year for most of the men concerned possess motor cars and seldom wish to avail themselves of free travel on the tramway system, but because of the excellent part these men have played in municipal government it is most unjust to deprive them of the privilege hitherto enjoyed.

If the trust is to pay its way it must take cognizance of what some private bus proprietors are doing in and around the city. Two such services which I believe are showing handsome profits to the proprietors come readily to mind. Parliament has the duty to watch the doings of the trust, and the trust the duty of administering its affairs in a manner that will enable it to show a profit and thereby relieve the taxpayers of unnecessary contributions. The Adelaide-Kilburn bus service is undoubtedly a prosperous concern which should be acquired by the trust in order to reduce its financial losses and we must make up our mind whether or not we are going to have both private enterprise and the trust system. Because we, as members of Parliament desire that the trust shall pay its way we should relieve the private owners of that service because I believe it is showing an enormous profit which should go to the coffers of the Tramways Trust. Another such service is the Glenelg-Henley Beach-Port Adelaide service. While the trust continues to follow the present economic policy its financial losses will continue. When I spoke on the Tramways administration last year I told this House, as did others on this side, that the policy of increasing fares was economically wrong, and it has been proved beyond doubt that pursuance of this policy has lost much patronage to the tramways system. As Mr. Walsh said, people have been induced to use their own motor cars and many have adopted the practice of picking up friends who contribute something towards the cost of petrol. Consequently, instead of increasing revenue this policy of increasing fares has driven people away from the trams and the State's economy has suffered

accordingly. Therefore, we have a right to be concerned about the additional £200,000 now sought as it could be used to much better purpose; for example, in providing more houses and more hospitals. Despite my criticism, however, I have faith in the tramways administration which has been in office only a few months and I believe it will see the anomalies to which I have referred and endeavour to rectify them.

Having criticized the trust I now wish to commend it. About a month ago it decided that on race days trams to Victoria Park would be replaced by buses. It had also been the practice for taxi cabs to operate to and from the course, and this had caused traffic congestion. Now that the alteration has been made we have an efficient bus service. If this policy is continued the trust will go from success to success, and the taxpayers will be saved unwarranted expense.

I represent the Semaphore and Largs Bay areas and, with Mr. Frank Walsh, I think the information given today by the Minister about foreshore repairs was inadequate, not giving members a clear picture of the proposals, so that they are unable to do justice to the people they represent. I do not think £200,000 will be sufficient. If it were confined to metropolitan area beaches it might be adequate, but we have not been told how the money is to be spent. I understand that at Moonta Bay the estimated cost of repairs is £9,000. Much damage was also done to the Port Germein foreshore, and no doubt at other country places repair work is necessary. The appointment of the committee was hurried. It would have been better to acquaint country councils with the proposals and give them the right to appoint representatives. Since 1946 I have said repeatedly that the city and country are inseparable. It would have been courteous to give country councils the right to appoint representatives to advocate their claims. City beaches are visited by many country people. People in my district claim that Semaphore has the best beach in South Australia, if not in Australia. It is safe, and there is a progressive spirit amongst the residents. During the summer Semaphore has a carnival, and the beach is outstanding for its attractions. It has been proved that more people visit it than other beaches. Because a large number of country people are attracted to Semaphore and Largs Bay we should reciprocate and do our best to help country areas. Semaphore and Largs Bay have excellent bus and train services, and many

people come there on holidays, particularly from Broken Hill. We should do all we can to maintain our beaches in a condition attractive to visitors.

Over the years we have had storm damage. This year we have had two severe storms. Some years ago the swimming baths at Glenelg and Largs Bay were destroyed. I have sufficient faith in Mr. Meyer and the other engineers on the committee to know that the money will be spent wisely and that the restoration work will be done efficiently. I have no doubt about the ability of the committee members, but it would be better if there were a country representative on it. In considering storm damage we should go further than the damage to foreshores. For instance, at Birkenhead during the last storm there was a flooding of much of the area adjacent to General Motors Holdens works, and hundreds of homes suffered water damage. This sort of thing will occur again because in abnormal storm periods the drainage pipes cannot get the surplus water away to the river. The task of improving the drainage of the area is too great for one council; it is a matter for the Government. I am glad that Semaphore and Largs Bay did not suffer as much as other beaches during the recent storms. It is estimated that repairs there will cost only £2,100, and this is largely due to the set up being different from beaches further south. The water at Semaphore beach is more shallow than at other beaches and as there is not the same wave pressure the damage is not so great.

When the committee is discussing the matter of expenditure on foreshores I hope it will remember the damage done to sheds occupied by swimming and life-saving clubs. We appreciate the excellent service rendered by them, and to some extent it has been recognized because the Royal Lifesaving Society each year receives a Government grant of £200. Some of the sheds have been totally destroyed. Because of their yeoman service in saving lives and teaching people to swim we should repair their sheds and enable them to function again. During the last storm some of the jetties, including those at Largs Bay and Semaphore were severely damaged. I thank the Minister of Marine and the Harbors Board for having expeditiously attended to the repair work at Semaphore, and the jetty is now more or less back to its normal condition. So far the Largs Bay jetty has been overlooked, but being a patient man I know that in due time the repair work will be done. Some people suggest that jetties should be demolished, but I think

they should be retained to attract tourists. If there were no jetties at Semaphore and Largs Bay the number of visitors to the area would fall considerably. When the Glenelg jetty disappeared the number of visitors to that town was reduced. It is hard to assess the value of a jetty. Because of the attractions at Semaphore and Largs Bay the buses and trains serving these areas are well patronized, and this means added revenue for the State. Those who suggest the demolition of jetties have little foresight.

I did intend quoting something about improvements at Largs Bay as far back as 1882, but time will not permit me to do so in full. The Largs Pier Hotel was built in 1882 at a cost of £11,000, and the furnishings cost an extra £8,000. Members who know the hotel will realize that it is a mammoth construction. When it was built there was no Outer Harbour, and cargoes from other States and overseas were lightered to the jetty from vessels offshore. From the jetty the goods were taken by trucks to Adelaide. The additional revenue I have mentioned, through visitors to Largs Bay and Semaphore using the bus and train services, should be remembered, and the Largs Bay jetty should be repaired as soon as possible. I do not want money to be expended unnecessarily to the detriment of hospitals and housing, but the expenditure of the £200,000 is justified because more people will be attracted to our beaches, not only from the country but from other States. From time to time it has been said that the best beaches in the Commonwealth are in South Australia.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I am surprised that the Supplementary Estimates do not show in greater detail how the amounts provided are to be spent. Various sums have been provided for hospitals and other institutions, the Municipal Tramways Trust, the South Australian Housing Trust, University of Adelaide, the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, the repair of storm damage on foreshores, and work on country roads. When members are dealing with the main Estimates of Expenditure they are given details as to how the amounts shown are to be spent, but here we do not know, for instance, whether the sum of £620,000 provided for developmental roads in country areas and repairs and maintenance to country roads is to be spent on the West Coast, in the Murray mallee, or in the South-East.

Mr. Hawker—It is all to be spent in the district of Burra.

Mr. STOTT—I take the honourable member at his word and enter my most emphatic protest. Why should this sum be spent in Burra or any other district for that matter? The roads in my district are in poor condition, and my constituents will want to know what I was doing in this place when this sum was provided for work in the Burra district while none was provided for work on their roads. The honourable member has frequently told us that he is a true democrat who does not believe in taking the lot, so I think he should protest in an effort to see that other country districts share in this amount. Who is responsible for the lack of information on the Supplementary Estimates? Why was this amount of £620,000 not provided in the earlier Estimates for 1952-3?

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Don't you want it?

Mr. STOTT—Details should be given of the way it will be spent. I do not know, for instance, whether any is to be spent in my district. The Government deserves a mild reprimand for the way these figures have been presented. The sum of £200,000 has been provided for the Municipal Tramways Trust and a further £200,000 for repairs to public foreshore property. In the dying hours of last session, together with some other members, I protested vigorously against the provision of £500,000 to remedy the effects of mismanagement and inefficiency in the Tramways Trust. I was ridiculed when I said that more money would be required for the trust this session and was told that £500,000 would be sufficient, but now we are asked to provide another £200,000; yet when the Estimates are introduced later this session I doubt whether one penny will be provided for the erection of bridges across the River Murray.

Mr. Macgillivray—Why do you mention that now?

Mr. STOTT—to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that, although all this money has been provided for the Tramways Trust and for repairs to public foreshore property, nothing has been provided for bridges over the Murray.

Mr. Macgillivray—Will the Government continue to ignore public opinion?

Mr. STOTT—I express the concern of my constituents at the lack of attention by the Government to transport difficulties in the Murray districts. Will the money provided in respect of storm damage be spent on jetties, stone walls, or breakwaters? Members are

asked to give *carte blanche* approval to £200,000 for such repairs. Many of our jetties were erected years ago, and some of this money will be used to repair some which are probably worn out now. The Glenelg jetty has been washed away and the Brighton and Largs jetties have been considerably damaged. Most members have seen the damage caused by the storm and were probably appalled at its extent, but I am more appalled that £200,000 is to be spent to repair something which will probably wash away in 12 months. Money will probably be thrown away into the sea for nothing, for no overall plan of repair has been outlined. At Glenelg bulldozers may be seen pushing sand into parts worn away by the sea, but another high wind will probably destroy the effect of this work. The Minister should present an overall plan rather than a figure of £200,000 for temporary repairs.

Mr. Davis—Hasn't the Government learned by experience?

Mr. STOTT—No, for it has repeatedly ignored my plea for an overall plan. The expenditure of £200,000 on the Tramways Trust is premature in view of the probable early appointment of two additional Ministers, one of whom will be Minister of Transport.

Mr. Davis—This sum would set him off to a good start.

Mr. STOTT—I disagree, for the Minister may evolve an overall plan for Adelaide's rail, tram, and road transport, whereas the money would not be properly spent in bolstering up the Tramways Trust. The new Minister of Transport, who would be in charge of the Tramways Trust and the Railways Department, could tell Parliament how this money could be best spent, and then members would be able to judge the effectiveness of such a plan rather than give away £200,000 willy-nilly to the Tramways Trust without having any details of how it will be spent or whether such expenditure will dovetail with the suburban electric railway and the Housing Trust plans. The proper responsibility of this Parliament is to say how such an amount should be spent. I have told the House before how some departmental heads have wasted thousands of pounds through lack of planning. Later they have refused to take the blame and told Parliament, "You are responsible for you did not give us sufficient money to do the work." If a public servant does not do his job properly the Minister cannot sack him, because of the Public Service Act. We should not be asked to vote £200,000 willy-nilly. The

amount should be held over until we know who is to be the Transport Minister. He should be able to produce a plan for the electrification of our railway system. If the Housing Trust purchases certain land it should ask the Transport Minister what form of transport is to be provided. We have seen the stupidity of trams competing with buses and of buses competing with the railways, but if we raise a query we are told that the railways charge lower fares in order to attract patronage. A Transport Minister should be able to bring forward a plan for an overall transport system for the metropolitan area. I am sick of repeating that there is a lack of planning in this direction by the Government. I am trying to impress upon Ministers the necessity for putting a proper plan before members. Consider the traffic congestions at the North Terrace-King William Street and the North Terrace-West Terrace intersections every day. Unless something is done to overcome the present position chaos will continue and increase. As to foreshores, we should endeavour to build up a proper protection system to cope with the storms.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—You would not say these things if you had read the terms of reference to the committee.

Mr. STOTT—I have no confidence that the committee will spend the £200,000 in a proper way.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—You have been away from South Australia too long to know what has happened.

Mr. STOTT—I have not been out of South Australia long enough—and with my eyes open—not to vigorously protest at the way the Government is wasting money. I trust that the Minister will heed the warning I am issuing. I have repeatedly said we should have one Minister of Transport, with an overall plan.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—And more control, to which you object?

Mr. STOTT—There should be a Minister controlling railways and tramways, but I oppose handing the tramways £200,000 for nothing. I also want to know who will get the £620,000 for roads. I cannot support the vote of £200,000 to the Tramways Trust nor the £200,000 for foreshore improvements until overall plans are placed before members.

Mr. McALEES (Wallaroo)—It would be impossible tonight to go through all the items mentioned in the Estimates. I do not know yet how the money will be spent. Doubtless we will have plenty of time to deal with these

matters, item by item, when Parliament meets later. I agree with Mr. Stott's remarks about granting £200,000 to the Tramways Trust. As I have said previously, the Government should take over the trust's activities. Parliament voted £500,000 last session to enable it to carry on and it is evident that it thinks there is plenty more money where that came from. I am greatly concerned about the storm damage along our foreshores. I do not agree with Mr. Stott that any improvements carried out will be washed into the sea by the next storm. That is a poor way of looking at things. Apparently all the money is to be spent in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—No, that has been denied a number of times.

Mr. McALEES—I shall be satisfied if some of the money is spent on our storm battered outports, but £200,000 will not go far. I could talk for a long time about the damage at Moonta and Wallaroo. We had the highest tide and the worst storm that have ever occurred in my district. I was told that such a tide and storm would never simultaneously occur again, but within a month we had a similar tide, though not such a bad storm with it. The people I represent are only looking for a fair share of the £200,000. The Minister did not visit Moonta, Port Victoria, Wallaroo, or Port Pirie to see the damage done there. If he had he would have sympathy for the residents. The people of Moonta spent much money in building a caravan park at Moonta Bay. A large area of sand hills was levelled but they did not expect such a tide or storm. Unfortunately, much of the caravan park has been washed away. Mr. Tapping said that many people from Broken Hill and other parts of Australia spend holidays at Semaphore, but many visitors go to Wallaroo and Moonta Bay. The beach at Wallaroo is second to none in Australia, but we have little money to spend on foreshore improvements. The swimming pool at Wallaroo, which had a shark-proof fence, was a great attraction, but the fence and the bathing sheds were demolished by the storm. I hope the committee appointed to recommend how the money should be spent will not overlook the claims of my district. The promenade jetty at Moonta Bay has been there for, perhaps, over 70 years. The decking was washed away but the residents salvaged it and put it back into position pending permanent repairs. If a boat haven were provided at Moonta, the fishing fleet would have a far better shelter. I hope the Minister will not overlook my remarks when he directs the committee how the money shall be spent.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I would not have risen but for certain remarks by the Acting Leader of the Opposition. My name and district were often mentioned. Although it was said that I as a country member should support country representation on the committee I have the utmost confidence in the committee appointed. Mr. F. C. Drew, the chairman, and Messrs. J. R. Dridan, P. A. Richmond, and H. C. Meyer, together with the three nominees of the metropolitan seaside resorts, are competent to make recommendations. Much time has been wasted by previous speakers in not ascertaining the facts. I did not rush into print until I had ascertained the facts from the Minister of Works and the Acting Premier.

Mr. Riches—Do the terms of reference include anything about jetties?

Mr. HEASLIP—if you had read the Supplementary Estimates you would have seen £200,000 listed “to provide for grants to local authorities in respect of storm damage to public foreshore property.” Jetties are not mentioned, so there has been no need to mention jetties at all.

Mr. Davis—Why not?

Mr. HEASLIP—Port Germein is in my district and the jetty there suffered as badly as any in South Australia, but none of the £200,000 will be allocated to repair jetties. It will be spent on the restoration of foreshores. These facts were available to all members.

Mr. Stephens—Are you sure none of the money will be spent on jetties?

Mr. HEASLIP—Before I made any statements I ascertained the facts from the responsible Ministers.

Mr. Stephens—We have not been told no money will be spent on jetty repairs.

Mr. HEASLIP—You can ask, and before I make statements I always ascertain the exact position.

Mr. Stephens—We ought to know the position, as well as you.

Mr. HEASLIP—You would know if you asked.

Mr. Lawn—We should be told.

Mr. HEASLIP—if the honourable member does not try to find out the position he is not representing his district properly. We do not always get information unless we seek it.

Mr. Stephens—We cannot get it when we ask for it.

Mr. HEASLIP—I cannot accept that. I have not tried to get country representation on the committee because I am sure it will handle

the matter competently. The committee will consider the needs of every country foreshore in the State. It can only make recommendations to the responsible Minister. I resent statements that money will be thrown down the drain. Do members suggest that this Government, which has been elected by the people, will not spend the money to best advantage? I was surprised to hear the member for Ridley say that £620,000 was too much to be spent on roads. We could not spend it to better advantage. The sum of £120,000 is "to provide roads of access to war service land settlement areas," and settlers certainly deserve it. An amount of £500,000 is "to provide for developmental roads in country areas and repairs and maintenance to country roads." I cannot understand why the member for Ridley objected to this expenditure. Every pound spent in this way will result in greater production, which must ultimately be for the benefit of the State and the world.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I do not agree with the composition of the committee to investigate foreshore damage and recommend how the money to be spent on repairs should be allocated. I do not cast any reflections on its members, but the country districts should have had representation. People residing in the city have little knowledge of the needs of country people. I think most of the members on the committee are mayors of municipalities in Adelaide.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—There is not one.

Mr. DAVIS—Then I have been misinformed, but it makes my point stronger. Representatives from the municipalities should be on the committee.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—They are, but they are not mayors.

Mr. DAVIS—I suggest mayors should be on the committee because they have a vast knowledge of the damage that was done during the storm. Port Pirie is surrounded by an embankment which was erected many years ago to protect the town from high tides. In 1934 a tidal wave flooded Port Pirie and much property was damaged and two lives were lost. On that occasion the people of Australia and New Zealand came to the rescue of the unfortunate people who suffered damage and subscribed £25,000. During the recent storm people lived in fear because the embankment began to wash away in two or three places. Had the tide risen another foot parts of Port Pirie would have been flooded. In 1934 the Federal Government also assisted and spent

£5,000 on the embankment. The position is practically the same today and we have applied for a further £5,000 to ensure the safety of the town. I hope the committee will consider the embankment as part of the foreshore because it is in the interests of everyone that all precautions should be taken to see that life and property are protected. The question of safeguarding life should come before the restoration of beauty resorts.

I was surprised to hear the member for Ridley condemning the Government for proposing to spend £620,000 on country roads. He cannot know much about the country. The Port Pirie council considers that not half enough money is allocated to country councils for the maintenance of roads. The Government must realize its responsibilities to councils and render further assistance otherwise they will not be able to carry on. When allocating that money I hope the Minister will not forget the district of Port Pirie. I am pleased that the Government proposes spending money in Housing Trust areas. The trust has purchased a large area of virgin land in Port Pirie and when houses are erected roads must be built. Unfortunately that responsibility falls on the local council. When a new area is built by the trust it should be responsible for building the new roads. I agree with the member for Rocky River that it is not the responsibility of the committee to consider the restoration of jetties. It would be unfair for the Harbors Board to be able to claim on this proposed grant of £200,000. I hope the Minister will make a fuller explanation regarding how the money will be spent.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—Certain members have apologized for speaking because they did not desire to hold up the debate or delay the passage of the measure. I think participation in this debate is the greatest responsibility a member of Parliament can have because, whether one is a member of a council, or a member of a State, or Federal Parliament, the spending of other people's money is always the greatest responsibility any public man can have. Any member who does not give his best attention to this type of legislation is betraying his trust to his electorate. Because of that I make no apology for examining as closely as possible anything that is set before us in the Supplementary Estimates. I am not in favour of this type of Estimates. The best that can be said of them is that they might be a necessary evil. The Minister, in introducing them outlines what

moneys are to be spent and when the lines are before the Committee the Minister concerned explains more fully to individual members what the expenditure is for. Government supporters have asked us to believe that this is only a stop-gap legislation which we can pass in a few minutes but after all £1,175,000 is at stake. I still have a Scotch instinct to see that any money I am responsible for spending is put to the best use. I take no exception to the first line relating to the Chief Secretary and Minister of Health. It is designed to help the most unfortunate section of our community—people who are confined to hospitals, sanatoriums and blind, deaf and dumb institutions. Every member will support that type of expenditure without question.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What about the £30,000 for Coronation celebrations?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That expenditure occurs only occasionally and is one we hope will not be before us for another 50 years. I am prepared to agree to that without any question, but I am not prepared to agree to the next line. As a matter of broad principle I have opposed assisting the Tramways Trust from its inception. When the Estimates were before this House last year we were told that we would have to provide the trust with £500,000 annually for the next six years. It was suggested that it might be longer. We were led to believe that that £500,000 would be sufficient to meet any deficits which might be incurred by the system. I have no intention of going over the ground covered when the matter was originally before the House. Private enterprise was allowed to run transport systems only where the number of passengers was not sufficient to warrant the trust attending to the job, and they have made a success of it—although they may not have made a fortune, they made a reasonable profit. Such socialistic ventures as the tramways never pay because the pockets of the men controlling them are not affected. If one has to pay for one's mistakes, as those who manage private industry, then one is inclined to be more careful. I am not prepared to support the extra grant to the trust. If we are to look after the richest part of the State in this respect, I would expect the Government to support transport systems in country towns. Within my electorate there are at least a dozen routes being supplied by private enterprise and they have to get along the best way they can. If the Minister is prepared to assure me that in the event of any of these individuals not making a success of their venture they can come to the Government in

the same way as the Tramways Trust and get assistance after the Government has satisfied itself that a loss has been made, then I will be prepared to support this proposition.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Are not the co-operative movements in your district semi-socialistic?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—No. In their case a number of individuals get together for a specific purpose and are in control of their own business. If the board has not done its job as the shareholders think it should, then the members are changed, but that is not so with the Tramways Trust. Are members of the House ever consulted as to the control of tramways or any other State socialistic concern?

It is proposed to make a grant of £40,000 to the University of Adelaide. This is an item which should be carefully examined. Page 119 of the *Pocket Year Book* for 1952 shows what the University is costing the State. If the Government has money to spend on education, it could be better spent on our primary schools where the great majority of children must attend, compared with the small percentage who attend the University. The cost of this institution to the State is growing greater, whereas the numbers attending are growing fewer. The teaching and research staff in 1949 numbered 227, in 1950 it was 221, and in 1951 it had increased to 276; whereas the number of undergraduates in those three years was 2,523, 2,370 and 2,242, showing that whereas the staff had been increased the number of graduates had fallen. The number of post-graduates for the same years were 148, 386 and 238. The numbers attending the University had not increased commensurate with the added cost to the State. Students who were not undertaking degrees numbered 1,455 in 1949, 1,313 in 1950 and 1,240 in 1951. The numbers attending the Conservatorium for the same years were 649, 595 and 625. Whereas the numbers attending the University have been reduced, the combined South Australian and Federal Government Grants have increased from £142,582 in 1949 to £264,608 in 1950, and to £337,248 in 1951. The latest figure of the South Australian Government grant is £425,000, an increase of almost £300,000 since 1949. The Minister should give a full explanation for this additional expense.

I have at the back of my mind that when this matter was before Parliament last session the Treasurer gave the Committee to understand that in future, before any additional grants were made available to the University,

it would have to submit a statement showing why the money was necessary and how it had spent the money already provided. That is fair and reasonable. It is easy to spend the money of someone else and to make a good fellow of oneself by providing a grant. Many of our primary schools are sorely in need of additional rooms and in some cases new schools are warranted because the present structures are outmoded, the ventilation is bad, and the rooms are damp and almost falling to pieces. The Minister of Education's plea for not doing more for these schools is that the money is not available. If that is so, where will he get this additional £40,000 for the University? I do not believe there is one University in the Commonwealth better endowed with buildings than the Adelaide University. I have been informed by one of its professors that not only one room, but several, are allotted to some of the faculties. I very much doubt whether the added expense is warranted, and hope the Minister will be able to justify it.

I approve the amount of £200,000 being set aside to deal with the damage to our foreshore. If one part of the State happens to suffer severe damage from flood or storm, it is the State's duty to come to the assistance of the people who have suffered. I am not criticizing the committee which will investigate the foreshore damage. Following the recent storms, in company with the member for Stanley, I examined the damage and we were both shocked to see the primitive form of protection that had been provided at some of our beaches. At places the concrete was no more than 3in. thick. In some instances we considered that the reinforcing rods in pillars had done more damage than if they had not been included, because the rusting reinforcement had caused the concrete to fall off. To me as a layman it seemed futile in the extreme. I was brought up along the seashore in the north of Scotland. The fishing fleet had grown in such numbers that the harbour was not big enough to hold it. The pier was extended with a solid mass of reinforcing steel and concrete which experts said weighed over 2,500 tons, but it was not long before a severe storm dumped it some hundreds of yards back in the very centre of the harbour it was supposed to protect. I believe that the sea is the strongest force in the world, and if it can shift such masses as that it is futile to bulldoze the sand up and put a layer of 3in. of concrete on top of it. I was very interested in several letters in the *Advertiser* touching on the same point and referring to the construction of groynes at

right angles to the shore so that the prevailing wind and seas are prevented from scouring out the sand and shingle. Mr. Quirke and I observed at Henley Beach that a channel had been scoured out behind the embankment which had been constructed to keep the sea back. The only way to protect a foreshore is to make the sea shallow; if the sea is allowed to come in very little can be done about it, but if the foreshore is built up with sand there is a chance of minimizing the force of the waves and I agree with the writer who suggested that we should import one of the best harbour engineers from the Old Country.

Mr. Pattinson—Preferably from Scotland.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—When we think of engineers we naturally think of Scotland, but I said the Old Country. This sum of £200,000 is only a fleabite compared with what we shall be called upon to provide to repair even the damage that Mr. Quirke and I saw, and we shall have to do something far more constructive than putting down 2in. or 3in. of concrete. I am not objecting to this appropriation, but I hope that before the money is spent the advisory committee will go into the question and see whether it would not be advisable to get an engineer from overseas who has had experience in protecting foreshores.

I trust that the Minister of Agriculture will tell us more about the £20,000 for the Waite Research Institute. It is an organization which renders tremendous service to primary producers, but unfortunately the results of many of its labours seldom if ever reach the hands of people who could use it. I must confess that I am one who has had scientific pamphlets describing discoveries of the institute that I have been unable to understand thoroughly. I believe that the Commonwealth Government has made a grant to the South Australian Government for the extension of the work of organizations of this kind and for passing it on to producers. If this £20,000 is for that purpose we country members should give it our heartfelt blessing, but I hope that the Minister will give us the information I have sought.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—It was not until late this afternoon that the Supplementary Estimates were placed before members, and what we on this side complain about is that we have not been given enough details showing how the money is to be spent. Members are in an invidious position for they know that however much they may protest the amount will be approved. We would be out of order if we tried to increase the appropriation by an even £1.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—We could reduce it.

Mr. STEPHENS—If we did that the Minister would regard it as a vote of no-confidence. We are entitled to more information and should not be asked to vote this amount without knowing what it is for. As a director in a private company would any member agree to voting expenditure like that; indeed, some of the money has no doubt already been spent, so members are in a false position. Reference has been made to the Tramways Trust. I wonder that it lasted as long as it did in view of the way in which its members were elected and I think the Government was right in making an alteration. A sum of £20,000 is set down for the Housing Trust—provision of temporary roads and drainage—emergency housing scheme. I do not know whether this amount is only for the building of roads or whether it is for the erection of more temporary homes, but I have to vote on it. In its last quarterly report the Housing Trust stated that it did not propose to build any more temporary homes, so perhaps the Minister will tell us in more detail what this amount covers. One member said I could find out from the Minister by going to him privately, but no member should be given information which is not available to all members on the floor of the House. I have seen some of the storm damage on the foreshore and I lay a good deal of the blame on those responsible for what has been done in past years. This is not the first storm that has caused damage, but not one penny piece should be spent in replacing any structures within 100 yards of the highest known tide.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—If you say 100 yards nothing will be done.

Mr. STEPHENS—if I am wrong what distance would the Minister say?

The Hon. M. McIntosh—We have a committee to decide that.

Mr. STEPHENS—Would I be right in saying 50yds? The Government proposes to spend money all over the State. The ratepayers should be protected. The committee should prevent foolish councils from wasting money. If that is done we will not have the stupid expenditure that we have had in the past. In previous years we have protested against matters being brought before Parliament without sufficient information being given to members. After the Minister gave some details today he expected the Acting Leader of the Opposition to proceed with the debate without having had the opportunity to peruse them. I hope further information will be given by the Minister.

Mr. CORCORAN (Victoria)—Members on this side are entitled to more information than has been given by the Minister. We need it before we can more wholeheartedly support the matter before the House. I represent about 10,000 electors and as I regard myself as one of the custodians of the taxpayers' money I must see that it is spent to the best possible advantage. I do not mean that I lack confidence in the committee but I want an assurance that the best brains available will be used. I hope use will be made of the brains of Harbors Board engineers, because they are men competent to deal with the matter. I have heard no complaints about foreshore damage in my district but that does not mean there has been none at Beachport, Robe, or Kingston. Reference has been made to jetties, but that matter is ruled out because it is not mentioned in the proposals. If there has been foreshore damage at the three places mentioned favourable consideration should be given to all representations on their behalf. As to the manner in which the work should be carried out, I have nothing to say because I know nothing about it. It is reasonable to assume that the experiences of the past will be the guide for those entrusted with the work, but there must be something different from that done previously. If further information is available and the assurances I seek are given I will be able to make up my mind more easily on this matter than would otherwise be the case. An amount of £620,000 is to be spent on providing roads of access to war service land settlement areas, and for developmental roads in connection with the areas, and repairs and maintenance to country roads. Will all the money be spent on new work, or will some of it be used to reimburse councils which have incurred overdrafts? A council will spend as much money as its bank will permit, and then it applies to the Highways and Local Government Department for a reimbursement to meet the overdraft. Is anything of that sort covered by the amount mentioned. In his opening speech the Governor said that the State would have a surplus of about £40,000 at the end of the financial year. In deciding that was this proposed expenditure of £1,175,500 considered? I am happy to know that the £620,000 is to be expended on roads in war service land settlement areas. The greatest settlement has taken place in the South-East. Is it unreasonable to ask the Minister for an assurance that a fair proportion of the amount will be made available for soldier settlement areas in the electorate of Victoria? I know the hardship suffered on roads in those

areas at this time of the year but I realize that those conditions will not be remedied within the next month or two. However, it is gratifying to know that by next winter the needs of settlers will have been catered for in this regard. Provided the Minister can give me the assurances for which I have asked I will give the Supplementary Estimates my whole-hearted support.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I am happy that this debate has been free from regrettable country *versus* city feeling that has been frequently heard in this Chamber on matters similar to the grant of £200,000 for the repair of public foreshore property. Much credit for this friendlier feeling must go to the member for Semaphore because of the skilful way he linked up the needs of country and city areas by pointing out that we are all part of the one State and that this House represents all South Australians. I have heard much in praise of Mr. Corcoran and after hearing his very able speech I realize that all of it was correct. He will be an asset not only to the Opposition but also to the Parliament. I support the Supplementary Estimates, and for two reasons favour the granting of £200,000 to local government authorities for the repair of damaged foreshores. Firstly, it is necessary to assist councils whose areas have suffered storm damage and find it almost impossible, from their limited means, to effect the necessary repairs. Secondly, I look to this as a hopeful precedent for the future as it may foreshadow the silver lining for struggling councils who will be pleased to see it appearing on the dark financial clouds. Although not criticising the personnel of the committee set up to investigate this matter, in common with other members I feel that a wider representation would have been preferable, and I trust that even now some country representation may be given. My main reason for supporting the grant is that it inspires hope for the futures of local government bodies. I hope this is only the beginning and that other grants of a wider nature will be made to assist them.

The difficulties and liabilities of councils become greater every year. Indeed, I see the time fast approaching when country districts, with whose conditions I am more familiar than with those in the city, will have difficulty in finding men prepared to take on the onerous duties connected with district councils and corporations. Such men do a great work in an honorary capacity and the value of their

work is often forgotten, even though frequently it is performed in the face of enormous difficulties. Such bodies find difficulty in balancing their budgets at present. Recently the Minister of Local Government suggested to a local government conference that generally speaking council rates were not high enough, but country rates seem to be continually rising. In some country districts the rates are far too high and difficulty is experienced by pensioners and low wage earners in paying them. Men who retired off the land years ago and put their money into house property expecting to draw in rents sufficient income for the rest of their lives have found that due to inflation the higher rates are burdensome. More Government assistance is essential to local government bodies because of their heavy commitments.

My district contains the worthy and desirable institution known as the Hutchinson Hospital to which the ratepayers through the council last year contributed more than £1,000, other councils in the area contributing proportionate amounts. Other country districts contain similar institutions. Last year the Gawler Council contributed more than £1,000 to the Fire Brigades Board, and other councils contributed various sums. The Government is not contributing enough to such concerns, but this grant leads me to hope that more may be done in this regard in the future. The increased salaries and wages bills of country councils have meant that the roads can only be patched up and that the necessary long-range works cannot be carried out. It is a grand thing to have swimming and recreational facilities in a district, and perhaps some day projects such as the Gawler and Williamstown swimming pools may be completed.

I appreciate the transfer of £500,000 to the Highways Fund, but members are entitled to details as to how it will be spent. My district contains some very bad roads and it has no monopoly in that direction. One of the worst roads in the State is the Sandy Creek-Williamstown road, and if work is ever recommenced on the South Para Reservoir—and I have faith that it will be some day—that road will be made very much worse. I hope some money will be spent on that road, but at present together with other members I have no idea where this grant is to be spent. I trust members will be informed of those details in due course. I deprecate the remarks of the member for Chaffey with regard to the University grant. He claimed that the amount provided was too much for that body and said that it could be spent in a better cause.

Mr. Macgillivray—I did not say it was too much, but a greater proportion of the Education grant should be spent on schools.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The best brains must be attracted to the University staff, and, although I agree with the honourable member that more money should be spent on primary and secondary schools, unless we have University facilities qualified teachers will not be forthcoming for those schools. Indeed, I consider the amount for primary and secondary schools should be at least doubled.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the Supplementary Estimates. The Governor's Speech stated that a surplus of £40,000 was expected in the current financial year. Can the acting Leader of the Government say whether that figure has been arrived at after taking into consideration the total of these Estimates? With some other members I am a little disappointed that more details of the grants have not been supplied so that members may discuss them with a full knowledge of how the money will be spent. The member for Chaffey started off by saying that this House had a great responsibility, and I thought we were going to hear a carefully considered speech from a man conscious of a great Parliamentary responsibility whose every remark had been well thought out. As a member of the University Council, to which members of both sides are appointed, I know that all of its expenditure is closely examined. Careful consideration is given to every detail of expenditure by the Council, whose members give their time voluntarily. I challenge Mr. Macgillivray to prove that any University in the Commonwealth is more economically or effectively run than the Adelaide University. I am sure his statements are born of ignorance and misunderstanding and feel that he will take the earliest opportunity of retracting them. He has criticised men who have made great sacrifices in teaching the students. To show the sacrifices that professors at Adelaide University have made in past years and the meagre salaries they receive we should compare them with professors in the Sydney University. In Adelaide they receive £2,089 and in Sydney £3,000. Readers at Adelaide University receive a salary range between £1,489 and £1,689 and those in Sydney get £2,250. In South Australia senior lecturers receive from £1,239 to £1,489 and in Sydney from £1,725 to £2,050. Salaries for South Australian lecturers range from £839 to £1,239 whereas in New South Wales the rates are from £1,200 to £1,675.

Mr. Macgillivray wanted to know whether the amount proposed was to increase the salaries of our University tutors. My reply is that it would be a good thing, as no salary is too high for them. Culture is the foremost requirement of our nation. He should have examined the facts before making his statements.

Mr. Macgillivray also criticized the grant of £200,000 for the Tramways Trust about which I am concerned. We have reason to be somewhat disappointed at the delay in appointing a board. I have not received any explanation about it, but possibly we will get an explanation later. No transport service of a nature similar to that provided by the trust pays its way. It is a real service to the community. It may be correct to say that private buses pay, but they have not given the service that the trust has provided. An examination of the Port Adelaide, Semaphore and Largs Bay bus services will show that they pay handsomely. There has never been any criticism of the huge amount of money spent on irrigation. No member on this side of the house will begrudge money which is spent in the development of our irrigation systems.

A committee has been appointed by the Government to recommend ways of restoring foreshores in the metropolitan and country areas which suffered so much storm damage. I shall not take the opportunity of advertising the beaches in my electorate, although the member for Semaphore spent a lot of time boosting his beach and said that it was the best and safest in the Commonwealth. In saying that it was safe, I submit that a handbasin is safe because it cannot hold much water. There have been drownings at the Semaphore in 6ft. of water and under because it is impossible for people to determine whether it is the responsibility of Edithburgh or Semaphore residents. My constituents, who reside at Henley Beach and Grange, will not thank me for boosting those towns because they would be swamped with applications from people who desire accommodation. There is much misunderstanding about the restoration of our foreshores. I inspected that portion of my electorate as soon as possible after the storm and was greatly perturbed. I know that the rate revenue of the Henley and Grange corporation does not exceed £30,000 a year. I have known many of the residents for a long while and know that the members of the council have given sterling voluntary service to make the town one to be proud of. When I realized that in one storm 4,000ft. of seawall had been

wrecked I wondered how they could, with the limited resources of the council, repair the damage. Other damage included 21,950 cub. yds. of filling washed away, 2,000 sq. yds. of paving destroyed, 800ft. of 10ft. roadway ruined, and five major buildings covering 24,000 sq. ft. were severely damaged. Several blocks of conveniences were wrecked, and the St. John Ambulance, swimming club and life saving club houses were damaged. The mayor and councillors, with other seaside councils, approached the Government for a grant, and I am glad it will be coming forward. I do not profess to be an engineer, but on the committee appointed by the Government we have men with the interests of the State at heart. They will advise the town clerks and see that the money is not spent unwisely. Mr. P. A. Richmond, Commissioner of Highways, Mr. H. C. Meyer, General Manager of the Harbors Board, and Mr. J. R. Dridan, Engineer-in-Chief, are able men. They will have the assistance of officers who have successfully carried out big engineering works of which this State can be proud. The town clerks of Brighton, Glenelg, and Henley and Grange are also on the committee.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Are there any from the country?

Mr. HUTCHENS—No. I would not object to country representation, but it is not my responsibility to argue for it. Recently I was speaking to the mayor of Henley and Grange, Mr. Newlands, who said he would welcome country representation on the committee. However, the three Government engineers have always looked after the interests of the State as a whole. I am glad there has been no actual opposition to the expenditure of money on foreshore restorations. South Australia is fortunate that many seaside residents originally came from the country. They have been prepared to sacrifice time and money to make the foreshores attractive for people from the country and other suburbs. Many of the sons of beach residents have spent a great deal of time serving in the lifesaving organizations. Fourteen lives were saved in one day at three Adelaide beaches, ten at Henley Beach. Last year 70 lives were saved by these young men. The lifesavers at Henley Beach needed essential equipment. Last year they tried to secure it by their own efforts. They wanted a surf boat costing £400, a reel and belt costing £43, resuscitators costing £35, rockets costing £15, surf lines at £12 10s., and a new club house estimated to cost £6,500. These men, belonging to the Surf

Lifesaving Association of Australia (South Australian Branch), have not received one penny from the South Australian Treasury. In New South Wales the Surf Livesaving Association and the Royal Lifesaving Association conjointly receive £2,000 a year, and the Royal Life £100. In Victoria the Royal Lifesaving Society is granted £2,000, the Surf Lifesaving Association £500, and the Victorian Amateur Swimming Association £500. In South Australia the Royal Lifesaving Society has a grant of £300, and the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association gets £200 and £90 for posters. Parliament should be grateful that the Government has seen fit to give assistance to these people, and I hope that they will be encouraged to continue their efforts.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I am keenly disappointed at and resent the treatment Parliament has received from the Government on the opening day of this session. I have never known a Parliament to be treated with such scant respect, and have never known such unparliamentary procedure in giving us such scant information about items of expenditure we have been asked to consider.

The CHAIRMAN—I think the honourable member had better reconsider his reference to unparliamentary procedure. It is not the procedure he is criticizing but the way the matter is being handled by the Government.

Mr. RICHES—I was saying that the Government's action in asking us to consider items with such scant information was unparliamentary. I suggest that the Government has already decided to grant the Supply and subsequent to the discussion in detail on these Estimates we will be required to pass a Bill. It is unparliamentary and outside the generally accepted conceptions of the functions of a Committee of this nature for the Government to come before us with bare Estimates including three lines that were not on the Estimates for 1952 and ask us to discuss and vote on them without information as to where the money is coming from or going. In his opening speech His Excellency the Governor said that on the revenue accounts it was expected that a surplus of £40,000 or £28,000 more than the amount shown in the Budget would be disclosed. We are now asked to vote £1,175,000 and are not told whether that was taken into account in determining the surplus of £40,000. The inference is that the £40,000 is the surplus of revenue over expenditure budgeted for last year and that these Estimates either represent underestimation of expenditure or new

expenditure. We know that no loans have been raised, no Treasury bills issued nor any grant made and we should have details of where this money is coming from and also more information regarding its distribution. No-one will oppose the proposed expenditure of £500,000 on country roads, but we are entitled to more details about it.

Mr. Quirke—The Minister does not know.

Mr. RICHES—No, and yet we are expected to vote this money willy-nilly and hand over the function of Parliament to one or two departments. Is this money required for this financial year? If not, why is it in the Supplementary Estimates? If it is required there are only five days left and is it envisaged that £500,000 will be spent on country roads in that time or has it already been spent without authority? I suspect that most of it has been spent. I realize that the £200,000 proposed for storm damage to public foreshore property has not been spent. Naturally there was no line providing for that expenditure on the Estimates submitted last October and to have this put before us without explanation is something entirely new and I object to that procedure. The Estimates should be referred back to the Government and Parliament should be summoned again when we are given fuller information about them. No-one would object to the amount provided under the heading of Chief Secretary and Minister of Health but we should know why these institutions require additional money. Is it because of the inflationary trend? We are often told from the Treasury benches that the inflationary trend has been corrected. We are entitled to know why the Tramways Trust requires a further £200,000. No-one can suggest that we are justified in voting that amount on the information before us. Is it necessary because there was serious under-estimating when this matter was before us previously and has that money already been spent? When approaches have been made to the Government for more money for education we have been told that there is none available. Teachers are working under appalling conditions and when the Minister goes from centre to centre he says that the department agrees that certain things should be provided but cannot because of the shortage of money and that expenditure must be further cut. Why cannot money be found for education as it has been for the Tramway Trust and other items which appear on these Estimates?

Is the amount of £200,000 for storm damage to be spent within the next five days? Could not that item have come before Parliament

when it next meets and more information be supplied? I am not prepared to be told by the Minister of Works that if I want information on the matter I should read the *Advertiser* of 14 days ago. That is not Parliamentary procedure. As a Parliament we are entitled to some say in the terms of reference to the committee which has been set up. Are we not also entitled to a voice in the personnel of that committee?

Mr. Quirke—Not on your side.

Mr. RICHES—Apparently members opposite are satisfied and are not prepared to speak on the matter. The terms of reference have been variously referred to during the debate, some honourable members having said that provision will be made for the restoration of jetties, whereas others have firmly stated that there will be no such expenditure. This House is entitled to a statement from the Minister as to the terms of reference. Mr. Davis has sought improvements to the embankment at Port Pirie to give greater security to the town, but no provision is made in these Estimates for expenditure there. At Port Augusta swimming facilities are provided on a jetty on which a committee room is also built. Possibly it could not be proved specifically that this jetty was damaged during the recent storm, but we know it is on the point of falling down as a result of the ravages of the sea over the years, and must be rebuilt. The last storm weakened it considerably, and Port Augusta considers it is entitled to a grant. It is faced with exactly the same situation as the metropolitan seaside councils. In providing facilities for people living outside the municipality, Port Augusta is making provision far beyond the financial resources available to it. Therefore, it is entitled to look to the State for some assistance. If the committee appointed to examine the seashore damage is limited in the terms of reference, it will not be able to help country centres. Whether Parliament ultimately agrees or not with the terms of reference, or the viewpoint I am expressing, surely it will agree that members should have a say as to the terms of reference, and the membership of the committee. As it is now, the claims of country centres will be decided by a committee on which there will be three metropolitan town clerks, every one of whom will be looking for the maximum amount he can get for his own area. He would be letting his own area down if he did not adopt that attitude. They have equal representation with Government representatives.

Mr. Christian—Are there not four Government officers?

Mr. RICHES—I do not know. That is what I am asking. Unless we get such information these Estimates should be referred back to the Government.

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—I join with other honourable members who have complained about the lack of information supplied by the Government regarding the committee and the proposed expenditure. Members on this side of the House are getting a little tired of what happens every year when the House is called together two or three weeks before the normal time to pass Estimates to meet certain Government expenditure. During the early part of my term as a member, in the war years and subsequently, this did not occur. Usually there was sufficient money to see the Government through without calling Parliament together to grant Supply. I consider it shows lack of judgment on the part of someone in trying to estimate the Government expenditure. It is true that there must be regard to increases in costs which may impair their judgment, but that cannot be said as regards the last year or two, because, according to the Menzies Government, the financial position of Australia has become more stable and the inflationary spiral has been checked. Therefore, it is a reflection on those who are responsible for the submission of Estimates to Parliament when they make such errors as they do and it becomes necessary to call Parliament together to grant Supply.

There is another objection that when we are called together for the first day of a session certain necessary procedures take up a considerable time and it is generally expected that the sitting will last for only one day. I have no objection, and I do not think any other honourable member on this side has, to our meeting to grant Supply to the Government provided we are given sufficient time to debate it, but it is unfair and undemocratic when we are required to give only about 10 or 20 minutes to the debate, thus being prevented from considering the matter on its merits. If the amount proposed is justified I am prepared to give my approval. Some honourable members complain that sufficient money is not expended in their district, but I am not one concerned to that extent, although I dare say less money is spent in my district than in most others.

I wish to speak on two topics, one relating particularly to the amount allocated to the

Tramways Trust as a contribution to its working expenses. This matter was touched on at length by the member for Semaphore. Again bad judgment was apparently shown, and certain members are saying "I told you so." That was an occasion when the Government had a problem thrust upon it at short notice. The Tramways Trust was unable to pay its employees' wages and the question of arriving at an adequate amount to assist it had to be dealt with hurriedly so that it was quite easy for a mistake to be made and the amount miscalculated, hence the extra £200,000 required now. It is the responsibility of the trust to provide the most adequate and efficient service possible for the transportation of the residents of the metropolis, and although it is true that over the years the cost of administration, including the wages of employees, has risen considerably it would be most unfair to increase fares sufficiently to meet that extra cost, because it must be remembered that the majority of the people who are forced to use trams to go to and from their daily work are, in the main, those on the lower salaries. Therefore, it would be wrong to force them to meet the whole of the deficiencies by means of higher fares because they are the people who are rendering very valuable service, not only to the city but to the whole State in carrying on industries, and fares for them should be as cheap as possible. If there are deficiencies the whole State should bear them, just as the taxpayers are called upon to shoulder losses in respect of railways which were constructed for developmental purposes.

As suggested by the member for Hindmarsh, I believe that our tramway service compares favourably with that of any other service in the country. Those who have visited other capital cities will agree that there are no cleaner cars and certainly no employees who are more courteous than the drivers and conductors of the Adelaide trams. They are courteous and efficient because they are satisfied with their jobs, and to keep them satisfied they must be adequately compensated by decent wages and good conditions so that they will not seek other employment. Mr. Tapping referred to certain routes served by private buses and like him, I believe that some of the most remunerative routes are being run by private interests. I know for example, that one would be exceedingly lucky to get a seat on an Ascot Park bus towards 6 p.m. I remember Sir William Goodman coming before the Public Works Standing Committee on one occasion and stating, in

reply to a question by myself, that it was the intention of the trust to take over certain private services and that the one I have mentioned would be one of the first. That was over two years ago yet it is still being run by private enterprise. I hope that when the new Minister is appointed he will be in absolute control of all the transportation systems—not only the railways but road transport, be it private or municipally owned. As I reminded the member for Chaffey when he was speaking, certain industries in his area, such as wineries, packing sheds, to say nothing of hotels, are community owned and all are successful, so why cannot the principle be applied generally, particularly in respect of our transport and social services?

Competition is very serious as it affects the railways and tramways and I recall that Sir William Goodman appeared before the Public Works Standing Committee on another occasion when it was dealing with the electrification of the Glenelg railway, and particularly that portion proposed to link up Woodville and Glenelg via Henley and Grange. Very shortly afterwards he planned to run buses down Findon Road to the Grange; he already had trams down Henley Beach Road right through to North Grange yet he wanted to put trolley buses on the Findon Road. Can one imagine more serious competition for the railways? These are things which must be considered in planning the future of our transportation systems and I hope there will be greater co-ordination at least even if there is not full control by the Minister. I believe that buses are far more attractive and more efficient and will provide a more adequate service to the community than trams which, in the vernacular, are "on the way out." The sooner they go the sooner will traffic congestion in Adelaide be eliminated. In the main our broad thoroughfares run east and west, and there are only three—four including Hutt Street—running north and south, so that congestion must of necessity occur in King William Street, and it is easy to envisage the great improvement there would be if the centre poles were removed. It would make Adelaide easily the most modern city in Australia. My district does not include much of the foreshore damaged in the recent storms, because there has been no development along our foreshore. Unfortunately the people with authority to plan in the past went too far on to the foreshore. Sandhills have been levelled and building has taken place nearer and nearer to the water. In other States the building alignment is above high water mark and there

is no danger. I join with others in saying that country districts affected by storm damage, and covered by the expenditure of £200,000, should have at least a representative on the committee. I believe that the three Government engineers are competent to plan the expenditure, but I hope that there will be no suggestion to reconstruct jetties which are obsolete. They were used many years ago when we had no Outer Harbour. In those days ships used to lie off shore and lighter their cargoes. There is no need for jetties today, except as promenades, and that does not warrant a large expenditure.

I have some ideas in regard to foreshore improvements at places like Glenelg, Henley and Grange. At Coney Island in America there are about three miles of board walks over the sands. The walks are from 40ft. to 50ft. wide and thousands of people promenade on them during the season to get the benefits of the sea breezes. On South Australian beaches there is a lack of shelter from the sun or inclement weather, and if we had boardwalks, and they were made sandproof, the space underneath could be used as shelters.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I protest against the manner in which Parliament has been assembled to rush through legislation dealing with the expenditure of £1,175,500 without members being given full details of the proposals. Members have sought more information, and one Minister has interjected several times "Can't you read?" There is no detailed information on the paper showing the proposed expenditure, so I presume the Minister meant press reports. We should not have to rely on them. According to the press Parliament was to meet in July, and if I had relied on it I would not have accepted other information that Parliament was to meet today. It is wrong to leave members to get information from the press, because later it could be said it was not official. Parliament was hurriedly called together, which implies that only recently the Government realized it needed more money in this financial year. This shows a lack of planning. We on this side believe in planning everything. It was pleasing to hear Mr. Stott's remarks today, because I believe he has now become a convert to Socialism. Practically all his remarks were directed to planning in connection with topics discussed today. He supported Labor's policy on the co-ordination of transport and strongly advocated the proper planning of water-front

projects before the sum provided in the Supplementary Estimates was spent. He was speaking my thoughts, and if he is not already a Socialist he is on the verge of being converted. That pleases me for the spirit may spread to other Independents and once they are converted there is no telling what may happen to members opposite who, while professing to oppose Socialism, are always claiming that more money should be spent on their roads, irrigation channels, railway services, and wharf facilities. Other country people are continually asking the Commonwealth Government for improved postal and telephone services which are really the products of a Government socialist policy. While my Party has preached a policy on centralized planning, the Playford Government has bungled its job, particularly in the last 12 months.

I appreciate that in times of shortages of materials and rapidly rising wages the Government could not be blamed for a mistake of perhaps hundreds of thousands of pounds in its Estimates, but the Governor's Speech stated that the inflationary factors in the Australian economy had been greatly reduced in the past 12 months, therefore the Government cannot complain that its underestimation of expense is due to something beyond its control. Although the Government expects a surplus of £40,000 for the current year it has found it necessary to hurriedly call Parliament together, and, as the Government is a one-man band and information on administrative matters can be given by no Minister other than the Premier who is overseas, the Government is at a loss to find a way to rush these Estimates through the House in a couple of hours without a lengthy discussion on the matters involved and without being forced to give further details. The Government considered it best to bring the Estimates before the House on a day when a Test Match was being played in England in the hope that members would co-operate with the Government by going home to listen to the broadcast of the match in comfort, but although I have been a member for only a few years, I take my duties seriously, as I wish to give the State the best of my services in the same way that I gave the best to my private employer in industry. I am asked to agree to the expenditure of over £1,000,000 and, although the Government may not think that very much, I consider such a sum requires proper attention before being passed.

The member for Thebarton and other members said they would not oppose any sum

reasonably required by the Government because it was their duty to see that the Government was supplied with the necessary money for the proper administration of its activities in the interests of the people, but I will not become a rubber stamp for this or any other Government by silently voting for the expenditure. I do not always agree with the Speaker of the House of Representatives but I did recently when he criticized the present Commonwealth Government on rushing financial measures through the House without proper discussion and the supplying of members with detailed information. Such a practice should not be tolerated in this House and I will not be a party to it. More information should have been given on the items contained in the Supplementary Estimates.

The first line contains a grant for the departments of the Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, and members are entitled to know how that amount is made up. It may be that the Government has stabilized prices and wages and that the reduced labour turnover has resulted in increased production with the result that the Government is now able to get more work done in 12 months. If that is so members should be told that workers are producing more and enabling the Government to build more hospitals than was thought possible 12 months ago. If such is not the case, then members should be given full details of how this money will be spent.

Last session I supported the setting up of the new Tramways Trust board and the granting of £500,000 to be spent by the trust. This line contains a further sum of £200,000. I shall not oppose the granting of the £200,000, but I want to know what the board has accomplished and what it contemplates doing. Is the £200,000 to pay for wages or the purchase of new rollingstock? The board was appointed last year and, although one of its members is over 65 years, one of its first actions was to retrench all employees over 65. The Government has made it obvious that men over 65 are not wanted and all it can say is that it has established a high level for employees under 65. As to the £200,000 provided to repair foreshore damage, I agree with Mr. Stott that we should be sure we were not throwing the money into the sea.

Mr. Christian—Do you think that men like Mr. Dridan and Mr. Meyer would throw their reputations into the sea?

Mr. LAWN—I do not condemn them because they are only carrying out Government policy. The Government was to meet representatives

from the various councils, but two days before meeting them announced that it would make a grant of £200,000 to repair foreshore damage and would meet council representatives to ascertain what the damage was. I am certain that the men mentioned would give a good report if asked to report on a properly planned scheme for permanent foreshore improvements.

Mr. STOTT—Parliament relies too much on reputation; the matter should be placed fairly before the House no matter what their reputation is.

Mr. LAWN—The Government decided to make a certain sum available, but I do not think it has gone about the matter in the proper way. I would prefer to see a greater sum provided, but the public should know that the work will be permanent and that there will not be a repetition of the damage. The Government should bear in mind the construction of a marine drive from Outer Harbour as far south as possible.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—This House has claimed through you, Mr. Speaker, its rights and privileges that have been so jealously guarded for hundreds of years, and the time honoured reply by the Governor assured the House that its rights and privileges would be preserved. Within an hour or two of the recognition of our rights, however, the Government deliberately gave the greatest affront possible to those rights.

Mr. Macgillivray—Entirely through ignorance.

Mr. QUIRKE—I do not protest against the various amounts enumerated on the Supplementary Estimates, but I join with the wonderful protest made by Mr. Riches against the Government's action in expecting members of the various districts to agree to the amounts sought without full details being supplied. Members have been vested by the people electing them with a great responsibility, but that responsibility has been deliberately ignored today in the most ruthless manner I have ever seen in my 13 years in Parliament. I could not understand the Government's attitude, but I think the member for Adelaide has the solution, namely, that the Government and the members of the Government Party are a leaderless legion.

Mr. Macgillivray—They have lost their shepherd.

Mr. QUIRKE—if the Premier had been leading the House no such affront would have been offered the House. No other deduction

can be made than that those now in power cannot fulfil their duty to members, because they do not know how to.

Mr. Macgillivray—They are spineless and useless.

Mr. QUIRKE—We have been given a miserable explanation of the Supplementary Estimates and we are asked to "take it or leave it." The Government knows full well that a spineless majority will pass them. Members on this side of the House have voiced their opposition to the procedure. It is their duty to oppose, but this is a genuine protest against something that has never happened before in this House. What have we heard from the Government side? Only two Government supporters have spoken. Have they information that we have not, or are we to conclude that they are ignorant of the conditions surrounding this appropriation of funds? If they are prepared to submit to the present condition of things it is the worst instance of the brutal hammer of Party government that we have ever had in this State. Perhaps I should apologise for mentioning the hammer, because the concussion would be greatest on the hammer if it were used. I represent 5,000 constituents who have placed their trust in me to see that their money is spent to best advantage. It is my duty to see that the money is spent wisely, but we do not know whether this money will be. We know the wonderful work done by the Adelaide Children's Hospital, the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, the Kalyra Sanitorium, and the Institution for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind. No one wants to deny them a penny, but we are entitled to know the financial position of these institutions. Why, for instance, is it necessary now to grant a further £18,000 for the Children's Hospital?

I opposed the granting of £500,000 for the Municipal Tramways Trust last year and was accused of setting country against city. One member said he was pleased that city *versus* country had not reared its ugly head into the debate, but I am prepared to raise this ugly head. I abide by the decision of the majority in granting the original £500,000, but I am not prepared to vote an additional £200,000 unless I am told why it should be granted. I am only claiming my portion of the privileges and rights claimed on behalf of members by the Speaker today. A further £20,000 is proposed for the Housing Trust. We know roads are necessary for its vast blocks of homes and there is no criticism of

the general administration of the trust, but we should be told why extra money is required and the financial position of the trust. Parliament has given it power to borrow money, but now it wants £20,000 for a specific purpose. The member for Chaffey wanted to know the particulars surrounding the increased grant to the University. He did not criticize the professors or say they were being paid too much. He merely wanted to know why it was necessary to grant additional money to the University when attendances have decreased. Isn't he entitled to that information? Because he dared to ask for details about a supposedly sacrosanct institution one member said, "The University cannot have too much money." That may be correct, but we want to know why we should be asked to appropriate more money for the institution.

The member for Hindmarsh said that members on his side of the House stood for high principles, implying that the member for Chaffey was unprincipled. I take the member for Hindmarsh to task for making that comment. I have never heard such an unprincipled misconstruction placed upon a member's speech, though the member for Chaffey is quite capable of dealing with it. I join with other members in expressing appreciation of the magnificent work carried out by the Waite Institute. In the past it was starved for money but had the Government been more generous it would have been further ahead in its research. In recent years its magnificent work has been recognized by the Government and probably further recognition necessitates the provision of an additional sum of £20,000. The men at the institute are devoted to solving the mysteries surrounding the soil and production from it, and I can imagine no more interesting work. I am prepared to give honour and thanks to every member of the institute. They are highly technical men who use technical terms and record their findings in the libraries of that institution in language that a layman cannot possibly understand. Today it is realized that there must be an extension of that service and that the findings must now be presented to the producer in a non-technical language. Some magnificent articles are being published by the *Chronicle* from bulletins by the C.S.I.R.O. and Waite Institute and disseminated as widely as possible. That service needs money and possibly that is why this amount is required, but we are not told that. We should not blindly accept a statement that £20,000 is necessary. If we had more information we might decide that the Government is

still niggardly, that it is not giving the institution the money it is entitled to and that the amount should be doubled to enable that work to be carried on.

Recently we went to the South-East to witness the opening of the new broad gauge railway. It was a magnificent piece of work and the rolling stock that carried us was all that could be desired. It was a necessary project but it is not the beginning or end of what is necessary in the country. If the so-called, or mis-named, railway between Riverton and Spalding is not soon rebuilt there will not be any passengers travelling on it. Not many do at present and it must represent a heavy loss to the railways. No-one in his right senses would travel on the rail car between Clare and Riverton if there were any way of begging or borrowing a ride or stowing away on any other form of transport. I never leave Clare in my car unaccompanied on my weekly trips to Adelaide and every car that leaves Clare is the same. People will put off a trip for days in order to dodge travelling on that railcar. If they have artificial dentures it is almost necessary to take them out when the railcar starts. If any member thinks that is an exaggeration I suggest he undertake a trip on it. One railcar is used; every rivet is out of position and the rails on which it travels were worn out when they were laid in 1918. I may be accused of setting the city against the country but I am entitled to mention these things when I am asked to vote £200,000 of the taxpayers' money to the Tramways Trust.

I see no reason why the voting of an amount for foreshore restoration should be considered in these Estimates. A committee has been appointed to decide what must be done, and it would be a greater courtesy to Parliament to wait until its report is submitted and we know how the money is to be spent. I suggest that some of it should be invested in the purchase of heavy equipment to remove all the junk on the beaches and to dump it as far out to sea as possible, thus returning to the people beaches that could compare with Bondi, Coogee and Manly. In my youth one could travel to Glenelg by the old train which ran down North Terrace to St. Leonards or by the train which travelled from near the Supreme Court to Glenelg and step off the railway alongside the Town Hall on to the beach. On Sydney beaches one does not see unsightly rusty galvanized iron shelter sheds and bathing houses. The beaches are completely clear of such things. If I could do anything I would take everything off the beach right back to the high

tide mark and even behind it, because we shall never be able to defeat the irresistible forces of the sea unless we use natural methods. One such method was mentioned by the member for Chaffey and I have seen it in operation on the East coast of England—a method adopted to silt up the beach on a gradual slope up to the high tide mark through the action of the waves. Groynes are erected at the correct angles so that each succeeding tide leaves a deposit of sand, and then the direction of the groynes is altered to supply further deposits until there is a shelving shore from the water-line up to the high tide mark. Such shallow water does no harm, but what do we do? We erect a square-fronted obstacle so that at high tide in time of storm we have an obstruction against a wall of water 20ft. deep, and expect it to stand. One would never imagine that so much jerry-built junk could be put into a seafront unless one now had a look at the ruins of these queer structures along the Henley Beach seafront. They should never have been placed there. It is easy to criticize afterwards, and I may be taken to task for doing so.

The trouble will never be overcome at Henley Beach until the shore is shelved so as to stop every succeeding storm from cutting further into the roadway. The sea will reclaim what was taken from it, and we must see that we give it nothing to reclaim beyond the limits of its natural rights. Someone wrote to the press and said the trouble was that too many people tried to do things which King Canute failed to do, and I think there is an element of truth in that. I want to see our sea beaches uncluttered from the high tide mark to the sea itself. Give a wide expanse of beach, and let no one have any extra privilege on it. The life-saving teams on the great beaches in the other States have not unsightly premises on the sand, but nice structures out of the reach of the waves, so why do we have unsightly bathing boxes and sheds on our beaches? I trust that no money will be wasted on such junk.

It is proposed to spend £120,000 to provide roads of access to war service land settlement areas. I have had some little experience in the areas taken over for land settlement and know that roads are an imperative need, but where are they to be built? Are we to spend £120,000 on the lot? The work could never be completed for that amount, because it will not come within coo-ee of the job that is actually necessary. Will the money be spent in the one area—the worst area—or will it be distributed over all areas where probably the

good effects will be effaced within a few years? I should much prefer that each area should be supplied with one good road through the centre, but do we know anything about how the money is to be spent?

An amount of £500,000 is provided for developmental roads in country areas and for the repair and maintenance of country roads. Not even the Minister can say how the money will be spent, because he doesn't know. Once we vote the money, under the present highways set-up, we will have no say as to how it will be allocated, and neither will the Minister. We have been asked to vote this £500,000, and having done that, goodnight to it. Are we, as members, justified in saying, "Here is £500,000. Do what you like with it." That is what it amounts to. The Minister of Lands possibly has the answers to all these matters, and if so I congratulate him. He would have saved himself many hours and much work had he given the information at the beginning, and that is where it should have been given. During my 13 years as a member I have never had such a challenge thrown out to my rights, and that is why I immediately challenge those who endeavour to take from me the rights I have as a representative of my district. I expect an explanation of every item before I will be prepared to cast my vote in favour of any of them.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I feel that I should reply to some of the criticism. One would imagine that, because of its generosity in helping the various institutions, the Government had done something dreadful. I find honourable members rising and supporting the Supplementary Estimates and then, in many instances, bitterly attacking the Government. The main bone of contention is the £200,000 proposed to be spent in the restoration of the foreshores. I congratulate my colleagues on their quick action in doing something to remedy the great damage that has occurred. Almost before the storm had abated the Minister of Marine had made a personal inspection of the foreshores. At the time the Honourable A. L. McEwin (Chief Secretary) was in another State attending a Loan Council meeting, but hurriedly returned on a Sunday and, with the Minister of Marine, inspected the damage and called Cabinet together immediately. It was its unanimous decision that a sum of at least £200,000 should be made available. I feel that the Government acted very promptly in an urgent matter and I am pleased that most

members agree that the members of the advisory committee are very capable gentlemen who will do a good job. Some have stated that they do not know who comprises the committee so I will give their names. The chairman is Mr. F. C. Drew, Under Treasurer, and the other members are P. A. Richmond, Commissioner of Highways; H. C. Meyer, General Manager of the Harbors Board; J. R. Dridan, Engineer-in-Chief; F. A. Lewis, Town Clerk, Glenelg; J. H. Chaston, Town Clerk, Brighton; and R. E. Nash, Town Clerk, Henley and Grange. There has been bitter criticism of the fact that the committee contains no country representative and I was amazed to hear some members say that no assistance was contemplated for repairing damage in country areas. In rebuttal of that, the following councils have applied for assistance:—Port Germein, Noarlunga, Wallaroo, Whyalla, Salisbury, Encounter Bay, Yankalilla, Port Pirie, Minlaton, Port Broughton, and Moonta. I mention those names to make it known that country councils are aware that provision will be made for repairing damage in country areas. It has been suggested by almost every speaker that the Government should have made known to the House exactly what the committee has done, but I point out that it is still at work and has not yet had time to make that thorough investigation which is necessary when so much money is involved.

Mr. Riches—How many country councils can get assistance?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Any country centre that puts up a genuine case will get some assistance and the fact that those enumerated have applied shows that they are aware of it. Mr. Stott was not very pleased with the fact that £620,000 is provided for country roads including £120,000 for soldier settlement roads. Mr. Quirke also referred to this, but I think it is perfectly clear, and must be known to the honourable member for Stanley, that there are places in soldier settlement areas where the settlers have been unable to get in or out without the aid of a tractor.

Mr. Quirke—I know that, but why didn't the Minister say so in the first place?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Mr. Macgillivray referred to the £40,000 for the University for general purposes and the fact that rising costs have necessitated this additional sum. I agree with Mr. Hutchens that the University is run on a very economical basis and probably more cheaply than any other University in Australia. Its budget is scrutinized in the same way as the State's accounts are scrutinized by the

Commonwealth Grants Commission, so I was somewhat amazed by the honourable member's criticism. The member for Victoria, Mr. Corcoran, in a very brief speech, put his case quite clearly and asked whether some of the £120,000 for roads would be spent in his district. I know there are some very bad roads there and as far as I am concerned assistance will be given in that locality.

Mr. Riches—Has any of it been spent, or is it to be spent?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It is to be spent. Mr. Corcoran also asked whether Robe, Beachport, and Kingston would be assisted in respect of storm damage. I do not think they were amongst those I mentioned just now and I would suggest that they apply immediately.

The Acting Leader of the Opposition was very perturbed, and said he knew that Government departments had had instructions to cut down expenses in a big savings campaign. I give full credit to officers of the various departments and I think members should agree that they have performed a magnificent effort in effecting a saving of £450,000. Mr. Walsh was greatly concerned about a creek-bed at Henley which suffered storm damage, but this is something that will be investigated and reported on by the committee. The general criticism throughout the debate has been that members have not been given sufficient information, but I cannot but feel that some members could not have been in their places when I gave a full explanation, and when they read *Hansard* tomorrow they will see that most of the information they have been seeking was given. I regret that I should have to say this of the member for Stanley because we know his ability in debate, but some of his statements tonight, such as "The Leaderless Legion" and "Spineless individuals" were unbecoming, and I suggest that on future occasions such expressions might well be omitted. He mentioned the Housing Trust and Waite Research Institute, but he will find, when he reads *Hansard* tomorrow, that I gave a very full explanation of these items. Several speakers referred to the Tramways Trust, but let me put it this way: Let us suppose that an ordinary company was built up during the war with half a million pounds capital and its plant had now become obsolete. Would it not be in order for that company to raise another £200,000 in capital to restore its plant so that it could again show a profit? I believe that is what is happening with the trust. It was only in February that the new trust held its first meeting and I believe from reports received that the drift

will be stopped. I hope members will realize that there is a genuine attempt to help hospitals and other institutions, and bring about a better understanding, particularly with hospitals. I did not hear one member criticize hospital expenditure and I was pleased because our hospitals are doing a wonderful work for our sick people. I hope members will accept the explanations I have given.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I thank the Minister of Lands for his explanations and the further information he has given. According to the opening speech of His Excellency the Governor it is expected that at the end of the present financial year there will be a surplus in revenue accounts of £40,000. He also said that Supplementary Estimates amounting to £1,175,500 would be placed before members to meet expenditure in this current year. We now have those Estimates before us. The Minister indicated that various Government departments had made a saving of £450,000. Foreshore repair work expenditure will amount to £200,000. What is to happen to the other £250,000? If we take the £40,000 into account, there is still £210,000. Three Ministers have been in their places during this debate and there has been little attempt to supply the information sought by Opposition members. I have not heard every speech, but I have followed the trend of the debate. We now know that the proposed expenditure will cover repair work to country foreshores. It is not right that members have to get from the press the information they want. I am not satisfied that the details given by the Minister are all that is desired.

Mr. Heaslip—You were not present when I spoke.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I said that I did not hear all the speeches. Tonight I had to attend a public function and I was in the company of the mayor of Unley. It began at 8 o'clock. It is impossible for me to be in two places at once. I am entitled to attend a meeting in my district when I know there are competent members on this side of the House to continue the debate. I do not want to indulge in personalities, but if we must have them I suggest that we have a look at the record of the time I have been in the House during this debate and compare it with the time the honourable member has been here. If the Minister cannot supply the necessary information my Party will consider requesting the Government to adjourn this matter until he can satisfy the House on these points.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Earlier I explained that the savings in departmental expenditure as a result of the strict administration during the year were estimated at £450,000, which is included in the estimated savings on the 1952-53 Budget. The amount allowed in the Budget for cost of living increases but not subsequently required is £500,000. The saving on interest originally estimated at 4½ per cent but finally charged by the Commonwealth at the rate of 1 per cent per annum represented a saving of another £200,000. Those three items give a total of £1,150,000, but the sum of £40,000 is the estimated surplus to the end of June after allowing for all expenditure and revenue for 1952-53, including the expenditure contained in the Supplementary Estimates. I acknowledge the assistance of the Under-Treasurer and his staff which has enabled me to give this information.

Mr. RICHES—As one who protested earlier at the lack of information available I thank the Minister for the information which he has now given. Other States services, particularly education, could have been assisted out of these savings.

Line passed.

TREASURER, Miscellaneous—£220,000.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I move—

That the line “Municipal Tramways Trust—Contribution towards working expenses £200,000” be deleted.

As a matter of principle I have always opposed the granting of moneys to the City of Adelaide for transport purposes in view of the fact that other parts of the State do not benefit in the same way. In introducing these Estimates the Acting Leader of the Government advanced the specious argument that the new board set up to administer the Tramways Trust had not yet had the opportunity to correct the drift in its financial affairs, but this form of financial assistance was never contemplated by those who originally founded the trust. It was argued at that time that the running of the trams would so enhance land values away from the city that the people benefiting from the increased land values should be able to finance any loss made by the trust. If this sum of £200,000 is given to the trust we will be doing an injustice to the taxpayers for we should charge it up to the people who are benefiting from the trust's operations. If this grant is approved members will probably be asked later in the session to approve a further sum, but so long as I am here I will oppose such a grant.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Although the Tramways Trust is not getting along as well as I expected, I cannot agree to eliminate the £200,000 from the Estimates. I think we are morally bound to retain this service to the community. Even if the present service cannot be improved it would be wrong if we attempted, overnight, to delete the amount as it would be placing a hardship on people who use the service and a greater hardship on those engaged in it. I said this afternoon that it was time that the Tramways Trust appreciated the fact that its revenue came from public patronage. The board has an obligation to see how that patronage can best be improved. I cannot agree that we can increase fares and decrease the length of sections and expect people to patronize the service. It would be better if the board considered running a more frequent service at reduced fares, which would encourage more people to travel.

As regards the provision of £20,000 for temporary roads and drainage for the emergency housing scheme the Minister should inform members what materials will be used in their construction. There is a great need, particularly in the Centennial Park area, formerly known as Springbank, for a reconditioning of the roads.

Mr. LAWN—I do not know whether Mr. Macgillivray has found the sitting too long for him and has become apathetic, but he appears to be most illogical and misunderstanding and is not carrying out the responsibility placed on him by his constituents. He thinks that every matter that comes before the House has a Socialistic flavour. He is full of protests about the taxpayers' money being spent in the metropolitan area to provide a transport system at cheap rates, which not only benefits those who use the system, but also assists private enterprise, of which he claims to be the champion. Had he listened to the remarks of the member for Thebarton he would know that the basic wage is made up of certain items, including fares. He represents people in the district of Chaffey who grow grapes, which are sent to the metropolitan area and processed into wine and so on. If the cost to workers of going to and coming from their places of employment is increased there will be an increase in cost of processing products from his district. I deplore his drawing a line of demarcation between the country and city. At every opportunity he opposes the expendi-

ture of the taxpayers' money in the metropolitan area, but he is at the Minister day after day to obtain taxpayers' money to provide bridges across the Murray in the electorate he represents. He should be consistent. He cannot fairly object to expenditure of money in the metropolitan area if he wants bridges across the Murray. I represent a metropolitan electorate, but I give equally fair representation to country districts. I do not believe in discriminating between city and country.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—It is interesting to see how city members gang up against country representatives as soon as a country member tries to get some justice for his area. They say no one opposes a division between city and country more than they do, but that only applies when the city is on the receiving end.

Mr. Lawn—You don't suggest I am opposing bridges across the Murray?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I ask for money to be spent in this way, but that is of little interest to my district because over 54 per cent of the people of the State live in the metropolitan area and they would use the bridges much more than the 8,000 constituents I have. Every motorists' organization and municipal body is in favour of bridges. It was never intended in the past to subsidize losses made by the tramways. If the transport system of the city should be subsidized, why not subsidize transport in the country? The member for Adelaide wants fairness, but he wants it to begin in the city and finish in the city. His argument was unprincipled, unfair and unjust. He is in favour of spending money on this big wen of a city which is starving the country areas and living in idleness and luxury while country people are toiling on their farms to keep the city going. We should oppose a further £200,000 for the M.T.T. It would be far better to spend it in building bridges on the Murray.

Amendment negatived.

[Midnight.]

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Minister say where temporary roads and drainage for the emergency housing scheme will be constructed, and what is meant by "temporary roads"?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Last year some homes were erected in wet areas and others are being erected in such areas this year. It would be a waste of money to build temporary roads before drainage and water systems were installed. The Housing Trust could assist people in wet localities by constructing roads of a temporary nature.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—When the emergency homes are dismantled permanent homes will be erected. Cannot permanent roads be constructed instead of temporary ones, thus saving further expenditure later? Permanent roads may cost more, but a long-range plan may be better.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will seek that information.

Mr. STEPHENS—Will this money be spent by the Highways Department or by local governing bodies, or allocated to the Housing Trust?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I believe the Highways Department will do the work but I do not know how the money will be allocated. It is only a temporary measure to assist those who have great difficulty in getting in and out of their temporary homes during the wet season.

Mr. STOTT—I think it would be wise to construct the roads before the trust builds the homes. No doubt it would be suggested that it could not be done because the Engineering and Water Supply Department would tear up the roads to lay pipes. It should be a matter of co-ordination between the two departments and the pipes should be put down first.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—The question of materials arises.

Mr. STOTT—I have seen bricklayers and cement workers sitting waiting for materials which were in trucks stuck in the mud further up the road. We are not as short of materials as we were 18 months ago.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION: Miscellaneous—£40,000.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Earlier I drew attention to the fact that the number of students at the University had decreased yearly whilst on the other hand the grants from the Government had substantially increased. All I attempted to do was to ascertain why an additional £40,000 was necessary under existing conditions. The member for Hindmarsh took me to task but he was ably answered by the member for Stanley. I would have completely ignored him because I realize that he suffers from an inoperable inflated ego. There are 4,345 students at the University and about 90,000 children in our primary schools. If £40,000 is available the Government would be better advised to spend it on some of the poorer schools in country areas. No University in the Commonwealth receives more liberal assistance than the Adelaide University.

Because some members are on the University Council should we no longer be allowed to criticize it or to seek information?

Line passed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE:—Miscellaneous—£20,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—This grant will enable the Waite Institute to carry out research in connection with soil erosion and sand drift control. The institute plans to carry out extensive research on Younghusband Peninsula. Can the Minister tell me where Younghusband Peninsula is, whether it is the property of the Crown, and whether, if it is, it will remain the property of the Crown?

Mr. STOTT—I should like to know whether the amount on this line has anything to do with the Commonwealth grant for agricultural extension services, or whether it is an additional amount being made available by the South Australian Government for dealing with soil erosion?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The area referred to by the Acting Leader of the Opposition is a very sandy stretch of country subject to much drift, being situated between the Coorong and the sea. It was presented to the Government by the late Sir James Gosse, who suggested that work such as is proposed should be undertaken on it. The land belongs to the Crown. In reply to the member for Ridley, the work mentioned is to be undertaken by the South Australian Government and does not come under the Commonwealth Government scheme.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT:—Miscellaneous—£820,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Members agree that something definite should be done to protect our foreshores, and one method to overcome the trouble was suggested by the member for Stanley. Can the Minister say whether any plan has come under his notice in respect of the Torrens outlet at Henley Beach South, such as was suggested by me earlier in the debate? I hope that under no circumstances will the committee permit the Glenelg foreshore to be encroached upon.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I think I covered that point when I informed the House that the committee would report on any work necessary to be done. However, I will bring the honourable member's remarks before the committee.

Line passed.

Grand total, £1,175,500—passed.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands) moved—

That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty there be issued and supplied for the service of the year ending the 30th day of June, 1953, a further sum of £1,175,500 out of the general revenue of the State of South Australia.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—Though I do not oppose the motion, I ask the Government to offer fuller explanations of the items on the introduction of future Supplementary Estimates. The long debate on this occasion was brought about by the paucity of information given to members—

The CHAIRMAN—I think the honourable member is entirely out of order. The Supplementary Estimates have been agreed to and we are now in Committee of Ways and Means. The hon. member should have made that request in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I accept your direction, Mr. Chairman, although I think you will agree that any Committee is entitled to the fullest information in respect of the expenditure of public money.

The CHAIRMAN—The expenditure has been agreed to and it is out of order to discuss it in a Committee of Ways and Means, which simply gives authority for the expenditure.

Motion carried; resolution reported and adopted by the House.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

Bill introduced by the Hon. C. S. Hincks and read a first time.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Clause 2 provides for the issue of £1,175,500.

Clause 3 sets out the manner in which the amount of £1,175,500 shall be appropriated between the various Ministerial portfolios. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer may from time to time expend moneys authorized by the Governor by warrants issued by him and countersigned by the Chief Secretary, and the Treasurer shall be allowed credit for the amounts paid by him in accordance with such warrants. The receipts of the persons to whom the Treasurer pays the moneys shall be a discharge for the amounts paid by the Treasurer. Clause 5 provides for moneys to be used from Loan Funds or other public finances if the

moneys provided by the Commonwealth of Australia and the General Revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by section 3 of this Act.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Acting Leader of the Leader of the Opposition)—Clause 5 provides for monies to be used for Loan funds or other public finance if the monies provided by the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by section 3. I do not quite understand this procedure and I would be glad of further explanation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—“Power to issue money other than revenue or money received from the Commonwealth.”

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I would like an explanation of this clause. What relation is there between it and the expenditure of amounts set out in clause 3?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—The Committee has already agreed to the payment of amounts set out in clause 3. Clause 5 states clearly that monies may be issued to make good the deficiency out of Loan funds or other public funds or out of monies raised by way of bank overdraft. It provides an authorization for the expenditure of monies from those sources if monies paid by the Commonwealth and general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by clause 3.

Mr. STOTT—I think this is the position. The Bill authorizes the expenditure of £1,175,500. If sufficient money does not come in within the next five days to meet that expenditure the clause provides for monies to be issued to make good the deficiency.

Clause passed.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

Later it was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

His Excellency the 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, 1954.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I move—

That towards defraying expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1954, a sum of £6,000,000 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 ended June 30, 1953, 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.

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

Bill introduced by the Hon. C. S. Hincks and read a first time.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time. This Bill follows the usual form of Supply Bills and the amount for which authority of Parliament is being sought for expenditure for the public service of the State for the financial year ending June 30, 1954, is £6,000,000. This amount will be sufficient to carry on the services of the State for approximately two months. Clause 2 of the Bill provides for the issue of an amount not exceeding £6,000,000. Clause 3 provides that no payment shall be made out of the moneys provided under clause 2 in excess of the rates voted for similar services on the Estimates for the financial year ended on June 30, 1953; except that increases in salaries or wages fixed or prescribed pursuant to any award or determination may be paid. Clause 3 (2) provides for the Treasurer having the power to pay such increases out of the moneys voted by Parliament in this Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Acting Leader of the Opposition)—I support the Bill. As has been the practice in the past it contains ample safeguards, and the amount voted should tide the Government over the next two months.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—As some time will elapse before the Budget is presented I take this opportunity of asking the Acting Leader of the Government to indicate his Government's intention with regard to the West Terrace Crematorium which I understand is in a shocking condition. Representatives of the various municipalities and the public generally

would be interested to know whether the Government intends to replace the present building in the near future with a new one embracing modern facilities.

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

Later the Bill was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

REPORTS OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works (together with minutes of evidence) on the following projects:—Croydon boys technical school, Encounter Bay water district improvements, Gilles Plains primary school, Morgan to Barmera railway (final report), Parkside Mental Hospital (men's admission block), Radium Hill water supply and Salisbury sewerage scheme; also first progress report on the Onkaparinga Valley water supply (supply to Nairne pyrites deposit) and second progress report on Glenelg-Brighton foreshore improvements (Patawalonga Creek diversion and reclamation).

Reports not already printed ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement on acquisition of land in the Hundred of Townsend (South-East) and proposed Loxton Irrigation Area Extension.

The first-mentioned report ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS.

CEMENT SUPPLIES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that the Government announced last session that cement would be readily available to users early this year, but I have since learned that it is the intention of certain people who deal in cement to seek the importation of supplies. I understand that the Government was interested in providing a certain sum to assist the cement industry to accomplish what was anticipated. Since the Building Materials Act ceased to operate and controls were removed the position has become most embarrassing, and daily I receive requests, not only from members of this House, but from outside people, as to where supplies can be obtained. When controls operated I could rely on the Wool Bay Lime

Co. supplying orders. Can the Minister representing the Premier say whether cement can be obtained and, if not, could the Government assist those people who desire to use imported cement to get supplies? Also, can he indicate whether the Government is getting sufficient supplies of local cement to carry on its works?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I could not follow the honourable member very well. The tonnage output in this State has increased considerably, but recently there have been one or two serious breakdowns at one of our biggest cement-making establishments. I shall be happy to get a full statement on the position and let the honourable member have it.

WHEAT STABILIZATION PLAN.

Mr. GOLDNEY—Has the Minister of Agriculture any information to give regarding a wheat stabilization plan for the Commonwealth?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—As honourable members are probably aware, the Agricultural Council met recently at Canberra and a wheat stabilization plan was agreed to by a majority decision. New South Wales and South Australia voted against it, but the plan may be reconsidered when the Council meets again about the end of July. It was aware of the implications and the difficulties which might arise if the stabilization plan were defeated by a vote of growers. Consequently, the council also carried a resolution asking the State Governments to pass Bills to enable the Australian Wheat Board to operate as a buying and selling organization for at least 12 months and possibly for the period of the International Wheat Agreement—that is if the agreement receives the sanction of Australia and the other countries concerned. The agreement must receive the consideration of the various State Governments, and I expect the South Australian Government will consider it and inform the Commonwealth Government whether or not it will introduce legislation to give effect to it. The stabilization plan has not yet been considered by the South Australian Government. A report will be made to the Government by me as Minister of Agriculture and then we will consider our attitude and whether we are prepared to take a ballot on the suggestion made by the Agricultural Council.

POTATO PRICES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister representing the Premier noticed press reports to the effect that buyers in Victoria are paying

up to between £30 and £31 a ton for potatoes whereas the price fixed in South Australia by the Prices Commissioner is £27 a ton? No doubt after full and sympathetic consideration growers in this State are disposing of hundreds of tons of potatoes interstate, thus creating a potato famine in South Australia. In view of the possible serious effect of this upon wholesale and retail dealers and local consumers, will the Minister cause investigations to be made whereby the power contained in section 33 of the Prices Act may be brought into operation to acquire such quantities of potatoes as are required for local consumers?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Earlier in this sitting there was a considerable debate on this matter. I assure the honourable member that the Prices Commissioner and his officers are active in investigating all phases of prices in connection with controlled articles and food-stuffs and this includes potatoes. This policy will be continued so long as the prices legislation remains in force. The honourable member mentioned the price of potatoes in Victoria. Actually there it is 4½d. a lb. to the consumer, and in South Australia 4d. a lb.

EUPHORBIA MARGINATA.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—The gardening page in the *Mail* recently referred to a plant known botanically as *Euphorbia Marginata*, but commonly as “snow on the mountains.” It said that the plant is not only extremely poisonous to stock, but if children walked through a paddock of it barefooted or with bare legs they could easily be poisoned and become seriously ill, and even die. I remind the Minister of Agriculture that wild onion weed and water hyacinth were first introduced here as garden flowers, but subsequently became serious pests. Is the Minister aware of the existence of *Euphorbia Marginata*, and will he have the matter thoroughly examined so that appropriate action may be taken?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have already asked the adviser on noxious weeds for a report on the plant. From the *Mail* article it appears that it is a dangerous weed. Following on the receipt of the report every possible step will be taken to eradicate the plant.

EUDUNDA-BARMERA ROAD.

Mr. MICHAEL—Following on the recent report of the Public Works Committee on the Barmera-Morgan railway proposal, will the Minister of Local Government confer with the Highways Commissioner with a view to expediting the bituminizing of the Eudunda-Barmera

Road as the quickest means of providing transport between upper river districts and the metropolitan area?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think it goes further than conferring with the Highways Commissioner. It becomes a matter of high policy as to what the district most requires and what is best for it, as a large sum of money is involved. We have a road north of the river and it is not a necessity to have bridges at Blanchetown and Kingston. I ask the honourable member to give notice of his question. Following on that I will take up the matter with Cabinet which has not yet had an opportunity to consider it.

BROKEN HILL ORE TRUCKS.

Mr. DAVIS—For a considerable time I have received complaints about the condition of the floors of trucks used in the ore trains between Broken Hill and Port Pirie. The trucks are unloaded by electric shovel and the position has become serious. People at Broken Hill cover the holes in the floors with all manner of things, including bags, pieces of wood and iron. The men at Port Pirie are contemplating refusing to unload the trucks because of the danger to life and limb. The matter has been brought under the notice of the officials of the Smelters and they have taken it up with the Superintendent of Railways at Peterborough, but with no result. Will the Minister of Railways take up the matter with the Superintendent with a view to having repairs effected and the trucks taken off the road until repaired?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will take the matter up with the Acting Railways Commissioner, but not with the Superintendent at Peterborough, because that would be overriding the Acting Commissioner. I will take it up at the highest level and report back.

WINKIE TOWNSHIP.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—My question relates to the proposed township at Winkie. The Minister of Lands knows that the settlers have gone to considerable trouble to get the information he desired before proceeding with a water supply scheme. A number of the settlers want to build homes in the proposed township. Is the Minister making provision for the water supply, the survey having been completed, so that applications can be made for blocks?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—As the honourable member indicated to me that he would ask this question, I have been able to get a reply for him. As he knows, I told the deputation that

attended me that I would do everything possible to accede to their wishes. The report is as follows:—

The design for a water supply scheme for the proposed town of Winkie has been approved. An amount of £9,000 has been included on the 1953-54 Loan Estimates to cover the cost of the work, and the installation will proceed if, and when, funds are available for the purpose. The survey of the allotments was completed in November, 1952. Purchase of the land being involved, the matter was referred to the Crown Solicitor in December, 1952, for settlement but this has not yet been finalized because of the delay by one lessee in complying with the requirements. Until the purchase has been completed, the town cannot be proclaimed or the land offered for allotment. After compliance with all requirements by lessees, essential formalities in proclaiming the town and offering the land may take up to eight weeks to complete. The matter, however, will be expedited as much as possible.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REFRactories LIMITED.

Mr. McALEES—Some time ago a company, South Australian Refractories Limited, was formed with Government assistance to develop an industry at the old Wallaroo grain distillery, but operations were held up because of a lack of electricity supplies. Resident were told that as soon as those supplies were available the plant would operate at its full capacity. Eighty men were engaged at the plant before the electricity was connected, but as soon as supplies were obtained all but four were put off. I do not know the reason, but Mr. Pascoe, the manager of Pascoe Limited, told me that there were now more than adequate supplies of insulators and firebricks in Australia. As the Government and my constituents are interested in this matter, can the Minister of Works say when the plant will be operating at full production again?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am afraid I cannot give a reply for I do not know the facts, but I will look into the matter and let the honourable member have a reply as early as possible. I do not know whether the Government can do anything more than has been done, but if anything can be done it will be done.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE PARKING SPACE.

Mr. LAWN—For some time the daily press has contained reports of a Royal Commission appointed by the New South Wales Government to inquire into the activities of one Reginald Aubrey Doyle and his association with an ex-Cabinet Minister in that State. Evidence taken during those proceedings has elicited the fact that he enjoyed certain parking

facilities at Parliament House, the imputation being that something shady was going on if he, not being a member of the New South Wales Parliament or of a Parliamentary staff, enjoyed such a privilege. Can you, Mr. Speaker, say whether any person other than members of State Parliament or Parliamentary officers has any parking privileges either in the front or at the rear of this House? If so, what are the registered numbers and types of such vehicles and the names of their registered owners? Could a person other than a member of Parliament use these parking facilities if in a member's car?

The SPEAKER—There is limited space under the shed at the northern end of the premises, in the yard behind Parliament House, and a certain space is required to be kept clear for vehicles whose drivers must conduct their normal business with the House. There is space for 16 cars under the shed and there is some other space for the use of State members and one or two officers of the House. Supervision is well conducted by the caretaker and his assistant. In the front of the House many people other than members park their cars, but that is not under my jurisdiction and has nothing to do with me as Speaker.

GAWLER SEWERAGE SCHEME.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—For some years my constituents in the town of Gawler have unsuccessfully sought an expansion of sewerage facilities to that town. Will the Minister of Works let me have a progress report on the possibility of that expansion?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes.

EIGHT MILE CREEK WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FLETCHER—It appears there is a great variation in the quality of the water on some blocks in the Eight Mile Creek area, and, although samples which have been tested are quite good, the stock water is far from being of the high quality of the Blue Lake water or of that which is flowing from the Eight Mile Creek itself. Some stock on the blocks refuse to drink the water at the homesteads because it is not of the quality to which they have been accustomed on the swamps on which they have been grazing. In another case I know that the quality of the water has affected the cans being used. Has the attention of the Minister of Lands been drawn to this state of affairs and is it the intention of his department to try to overcome this disability? Would it be possible

in cases where the inferior water exists to run a water pipe from the windmill on the swamp where the good supplies exist?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Apparently there are various types of water in the Eight Mile Creek area. I suggest that stock, like human beings, acquire a taste for a special beverage. Perhaps there are waters of different salinity and a cow, having become accustomed to one type, may refuse to drink another type. I will take up with great interest the suggestions the honourable member has now made and let him have a report later. He told me recently that he had sent a sample of water to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for analysis. I received the following report from that department:—

A sample of water was received from Mr. Fletcher, M.P., on May 12, 1953, taken from a well on the property of Mr. D. S. Irwin (location not given). It was stated that stock would not drink this water. Inorganic analysis and microscopical and physical examinations on the sample submitted disclosed no reason why stock should refuse this particular water.

LOCAL OPTION POLLS.

Mr. TAPPING—Can the Minister representing the Premier state whether it is the intention of the Government to amend the Licensing Act regarding local option polls, seeing that such polls held in the district of Semaphore in 1950 and 1953 proved farcical and costly?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This matter is being considered by the Government.

MILLICENT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on the proposal to provide a water supply for Millicent?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The question is now before the Public Works Committee and until its report is received no steps can be taken by the Government.

SUBSIDIES FOR SCHOOL COMMITTEES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Will the Minister representing the Minister of Education indicate the total amount raised during the current financial year by school committees for the provision of facilities in State schools qualified for subsidy, and state the amount of subsidies paid during the year?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will have that information available for the honourable member at the next day of sitting.

ELECTORAL REFORM.

Mr. JENNINGS—My question is prompted by the result of the recent State election which

showed beyond doubt that the Government had lost the confidence of the people and that only a violently undemocratic electoral arrangement prevented a change of Government. Will the Government alter the electoral laws, and then resign and submit to a fair election?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I am sorry I cannot agree to the suggestion. One likes to assist a new member in every way possible, but I suggest that he gives further thought to the question, and if he wishes he can then consider putting the question on notice.

MANNUM-ADELAIDE PIPELINE.

Mr. STOTT—I understand there are difficulties in constructing the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline on account of the import restrictions policy of the Commonwealth Government. Has the State Government purchased the electric motors and plant for pumping the water, or is the Government ordering them?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—They have been ordered. There was some slight hitch, but that has been overcome.

Mr. Stott—When do you expect delivery?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As soon as we can get it.

WEST TERRACE CREMATORIUM.

Mr. LAWN—What are the Government's intentions about the West Terrace cemetery crematorium?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Government desires to discontinue the running of cemeteries because they are not public works. They are usually run by municipalities or by co-operative effort. Many years ago we suggested to the councils that they should run the West Terrace cemetery and crematorium, but they decided against it, and the Government considered it was not desirable to continue the crematorium. The Enfield and Centennial Park cemetery trusts submitted that they should be allowed to each establish a crematorium. At that time there was a great shortage of materials and the Government considered it was not desirable to divert men and materials for establishing crematoriums when they would be better applied to providing houses. That time has passed and the Government has before it applications from the Enfield and Centennial Park cemetery trusts for licences to establish crematoriums. They are now before Cabinet and I think both will be granted. It is not desirable or appropriate for the Government to continue running the West Terrace crematorium longer than necessary.

F

HOUSING TRUST SECOND MORTGAGES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Is it the policy of the Housing Trust to continue making available second mortgage loans to purchasers of the trust homes over and above the maximum amount allowed under the Advances to Homes Act of £1,750?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up the question with the Minister concerned and get a report.

NARACOORTE SEWERAGE.

Mr. CORCORAN—I understand the Government is considering the provision of sewerage facilities at Naracoorte. Can the Minister say whether any finality has been reached, and if so, when the work is likely to be commenced?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Government's policy is to go ahead with country sewerage as soon as possible, but unfortunately, although the amount of loan money available is greater than ever, it does not go so far as it did before. Therefore, the Government must do first things first. We have not got to the stage where we can give priority to country sewerage works, much as we would like to do so. When that can be done, among the places entitled to very high priority will be Naracoorte, because of its importance and the nature of the country. Port Pirie and several other towns are also involved, but the position is the Government has not sufficient funds to finish works that are in hand, and it would be futile to proceed with other loan works until the Government can see its way clear to complete the works in hand.

WOOMERA ROCKET RANGE.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has been approached in connection with the proposed extensions of services at the Woomera Rocket Range following on the announcement that it is to be a permanent site for experimentation with atomic bombs?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It may happen that the request was directed to the Premier. It has not come to me.

SEWERAGE CONNECTIONS AT CROYDON PARK.

Mr. JENNINGS—Is the Minister of Works aware that a large number of homes at Croydon Park, which is only a mile or so from the Sewage Farm at Islington, have not sewerage connections? I understand owners have been told that they have no hope of getting a connection until the Sewage Farm is removed,

or some additional pumping installations are available. Can he promise any action that will enable these people to enjoy the amenity?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I never make promises. I do not know the facts, but will make inquiries and let the honourable member know the result.

RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAMME.

Mr. RICHES—The following paragraph appeared in the Governor's Speech:—

The Housing Trust has now decided to carry out its rental housing programme under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement.

I understand that under that agreement the trust will be able to obtain money from the Commonwealth at three per cent interest. Will the Minister representing the Premier ascertain whether tenants of Housing Trust homes will be eligible for rent subsidies, which I understand are available in the other States?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will get the information for the honourable member.

HOUSING TRUST HOMES, LOXTON.

Mr. STOTT—Homes which have been built by the Housing Trust in the Loxton township have evidently been erected on such poor foundations that terrific cracks are now developing. Some owners are so perturbed that they obtained a report from a well-known Adelaide building contractor. I ask leave of the House to read his report.

The SPEAKER—It is quite competent for a member to explain his question, and with the indulgence of the House to go a little further, but I hope the honourable member does not propose to read a long opinion which might be the subject of controversy. However, he may submit what he considers would help to explain the question.

Mr. STOTT—In his report this contractor stated:—

In my opinion, after surveying these houses, I consider the foundations were not large enough. In Adelaide they put down larger foundations for fences. The mixture was very poor, definitely the worst I have ever seen. There is not enough steel in the foundations. I feel there could have been better supervision on the job at the right time and I regard the value of your dwelling as it stands today as being equivalent to the value of secondhand salvage material. I am afraid I cannot suggest any satisfactory remedy to repair the damage. I would strongly recommend that no further expenditure be incurred, as I feel that this would be a total loss. I am of opinion that underpinning would be useless owing to the poor foundations.

In view of that, will the Minister representing the Premier take up the matter with the Housing Trust and see that proper foundations are provided in future in accordance with accepted specifications?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—When visiting Loxton some time ago I specially visited the houses referred to. Undoubtedly a few of those in the township are very badly cracked, but I believe that can always be expected when solid type homes are built in sandy drift country. I was told that there was a sandhill there and probably it had drifted up, and that may be the reason for the cracks in these homes. On my return to Adelaide I spoke to the chairman of the Housing Trust and he assured me that everything possible was being done, and that it was hoped eventually to bring the homes back to what they should be. The trust was putting down extra foundations and underpinning and doing everything possible to make them 100 per cent efficient. I will get a further report from the trust and let the honourable member have it.

HOUSING TRUST TEMPORARY HOMES.

Mr. STEPHENS—Recently we were informed that the Housing Trust had decided it would build no more temporary homes. At the same time they are building houses for letting at a high rental, £3 10s. or £3 15s. a week. Is this to be the policy pursued by the Government instead of building more temporary homes, which many people would be pleased to take, and thus relieve the housing shortage?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up the matter with the Housing Trust and get a reply for the honourable member.

FORTY-FOUR HOURS CASE.

Mr. LAWN—Last session the Premier advised me that the Government was intervening in the employers' applications to the Commonwealth Arbitration Court for a 44-hour week and a reduction in the basic wage, and that the Government would oppose the applications, and its intention would be made known through Mr. Scarfe. I have read what Mr. Scarfe said, and he made it clear that the Government did not support or oppose the employers' applications. Can the Minister of Lands state the Government's intention should the Court grant either of the applications?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Obviously I have not got the information required by the honourable member. I will take up the matter with my colleague and get a report.

LOAN MONEY FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. LAWN—Can the Minister of Lands say exactly how much loan money was available to the Government last year? I think it was about £28,000,000. I believe that at the last Loan Council meeting the Acting Premier asked for £41,000,000 but later said he would accept £26,500,000 and that there would be no retrenchments. The public cannot reconcile that, seeing that there is a difference of £15,000,000 between the two amounts. Can the Minister make a statement explaining the attitude of the Acting Premier?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have no information about the exact amounts but because of his tenacity at the Loan Council meeting the Acting Premier and Treasurer was able to get about £3,000,000 more than we got last year.

QUESTIONS: CALLING ON MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER—Question time is important to members, and to facilitate matters I try to see a member on one side and then one on the other side. I endeavour to give every member who desires it the opportunity to ask one question before giving another member the opportunity to ask his second question, and every member an opportunity to ask his second question before another asks his third. Sometimes I alter that by giving the Leader of the Opposition some preference. I give this information for the guidance of members.

COURT OF DISPUTED RETURNS.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved—

That the House proceed to elect by ballot four persons to be members of the Court of Disputed Returns pursuant to sections 168 and 169 of the Electoral Act, 1929-50.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Messrs. Dunstan, Pattinson, Teusner, and Frank Walsh were duly elected.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

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

Library.—The Speaker, Messrs. Riches, Stephens, and Travers.

Printing.—Messrs. Brookman, John Clark, William Jenkins, Jennings, and Michael.

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of Sessional Committees.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS 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.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved that, pursuant to section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, the Speaker and Messrs. Geoffrey Clarke, Hutchens, and Frank Walsh be elected members of the Joint House Committee.

Motion carried.

Later the Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of a Joint House Committee.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved—

That the House request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present Parliament of a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, intimating that Messrs. John Clark, Heaslip, and Teusner will be the representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

Later the Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

DRAFT OF ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved—

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Heaslip, William Jenkins, Travers and White and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament and to report on Tuesday, July 21.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

On Friday, June 26, at 3.44 a.m., the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 21, at 2 p.m.