

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, June 26, 1957.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

DESTRUCTION OF BURROWS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Recently I have had letters from a number of councils in my electorate desiring an amendment of the Vermin Act to make the destruction of burrows compulsory during the simultaneous destruction period provided for under the Act. Some correspondents suggested that the introduction of a Bill to amend the Act in this regard was being considered. Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Government intends to introduce such a Bill this session?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This matter has been brought to my notice by numerous councils in the last month or two and I intend, either next Monday or the following Monday, to take it to Cabinet for a decision.

NEW ERA PRISON FARM.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Will the Premier obtain a progress report on the work at the New Era Prison Farm?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

SALE OF MEAT.

Mr. TAPPING—Some months ago in an Adelaide court a company was fined £5 for having sold goat's meat as lamb. As this is a serious matter will the Treasurer ascertain from the Metropolitan County Board whether the fine specified in the Act is adequate for the offence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

BORING AT KOONIBBA MISSION.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Works any information concerning proposed boring operations at the Koonibba Mission Station and can he say whether boring already carried out has been successful?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM MCINTOSH—Not offhand. I will bring down a report tomorrow.

SECONDHAND CAR SALES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Considerable litigation has resulted from the failure of second-hand car buyers to ascertain whether the vehicle purchased was the subject of a hire-purchase agreement. Will the Treasurer consider the compulsory registration by the dealer of such a vehicle under the joint names of the finance company and the hirer

until it becomes freehold, when arrangements could be made for its registration under the owner's name? Such a provision would prevent much litigation on this matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a report from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

FAIRVIEW ESTATE.

Mr. HARDING—Part of the area known as Fairview Estate has been favourably reported on by the Land Settlement Committee. Can the Minister of Repatriation say what the Government intends to do with that part of the property and with the remainder? On the land adjacent to that property a pastoral company is now lambing down 3,000 ewes and running 20 head of cattle.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This is a large area that was purchased early in the land settlement scheme, but at the time of purchase it was known that it was a very wet area, consequently other drier areas with a better potential were developed first. For some time over recent years at least two approaches have been made to the Commonwealth Government concerning the possibility of using the land for soldier settlement, but each time it turned down the proposal. The State authorities are satisfied that it is a good proposition that could be developed to war service standard. Not long ago the Land Settlement Committee investigated the area again after we had excised part of it because of inundation and carried out experiments on another part. The committee recommended that the State Government develop it under the Crown lands scheme. Recently Cabinet approved the provision on the 1957-58 Estimates of a certain sum for Crown lands development and I have already approved a scheme for the development of a large part of the area. The initial development will be its clearing and majestic ploughing, after which the renewed offer of it to the Commonwealth Government for war service land settlement will be considered.

STATE WAR MEMORIAL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—There have been a number of reports recently of the desecration of the State War Memorial by thoughtless people. I am sure that if they realized the effect of their actions on the feelings of other people they would not so act. This was the subject of much public concern a few years ago, and the Returned Servicemen's League and ex-servicemen generally, as well as the public, are again becoming concerned. Most people regard

the memorial reverently, and with a view to preventing any further desecration I ask the Premier to take steps to have a policeman posted near the memorial between noon and 2 p.m.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member said this question arose several years ago. At that time it was discussed between the Government, the Returned Servicemen's League, and, if I remember rightly, the City Council. Some procedure was worked out to achieve the object the honourable member has in mind, and I should like to see where that has fallen down. I will advise the honourable member in due course.

SNOWY RIVER SCHEME.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yesterday's *Advertiser* referred to the controversy which has arisen over States' rights to River Murray waters as a result of the Snowy River Scheme. As this matter is of great importance to South Australia, is the Premier prepared to let the House know the Government's views, especially in relation to the River Murray Waters Agreement?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I was surprised to see the report in the *Advertiser*, for there were one or two peculiar features associated with it. In the first place, the report, on the face of it, was one from the constructing authority of the Snowy River undertaking, and not from a Government source. It surprised me that this authority should make a pronouncement of such importance on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. One would have thought the Commonwealth would make any pronouncement on this topic rather than leave it to a constructing authority. The second thing was the statement that this State had no rights to water arising out of the Snowy River diversion and that the Commonwealth law authorities had reported to that effect. That again seemed to me a peculiar statement to come from a constructing authority. One would not have expected a constructing authority to fly a kite on what the Commonwealth Law Office had pronounced, or be conversant with the Commonwealth Crown Law Officer's views, because the job of the constructing authority is to build the dam, not to worry about essential policy matters arising from it. My Government believes it has certain rights under the River Murray Waters Agreement, which has been ratified by the Commonwealth Parliament and by the State Parliaments of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, under which we have con-

tributed large sums for the development of all sorts of conservation schemes on the Murray.

We believe those rights are unassailable. We have been advised by no less an authority than Sir Edgar Bean that any waters flowing into the Murray from any source become River Murray waters and are subject to the agreement. I have asked the Commonwealth Government to show me a copy of the agreement before it is signed by the other States to see whether there is any objection on the part of this State to its signing. For some reason, this seems to be a hush-hush document which cannot be made available to me, but if necessary, before the agreement is signed, this State will take action in the High Court to force its production before it is signed. If it is detrimental to the interests of this State we will take action in the High Court to stop it from being signed.

SERVICE CHARGES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—There was a hint in the Governor's Speech of increased Government charges, and this has led to many rumours and considerable concern amongst the people. Can the Treasurer say whether consideration is being given to increasing tram, bus and suburban railway fares?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I cannot forecast decisions on this matter. The statement by His Excellency dealt with factors relating to this matter, but since the charges on various services were last fixed—and they were at that time only adequate to cover costs—expenditure has risen by £2,000,000 on account of increased basic wage payments. The affairs of each undertaking will have to be examined separately to see what the effect of the additional expenditure has been. I hope that it will be possible to avoid increased charges in some undertakings; in others it may be necessary to increase charges in certain sections only. These matters are being examined and as soon as possible I will make a statement, but at present the Government is not in a position to do so. I do not want to anticipate the Budget debate, but I assure members that, as far as possible, the additional costs will be absorbed in the undertakings themselves. Every economy possible will be effected, but rather than let the undertakings fall into disrepute through bad service to the public, it may be necessary to adjust some charges.

WATER RATES ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED SWAMPS.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yesterday the Premier told the House that the Minister of Lands had

approached him about water rates on Government-owned swamps on the Murray. Last year I was approached by occupiers of these swamps, who were greatly concerned about their rates. The Premier said yesterday that a decision on this matter had been made in Cabinet and that it would come before the House later. Can the Minister of Lands say whether that decision is now available to the House?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It is true, as the Premier said yesterday, that I referred this matter to Cabinet. A final decision has not been made, but I anticipate it will be within a few days and I will then advise the honourable member.

PASTURE GRUBS.

Mr. FLETCHER—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any research has been undertaken in connection with the infestation of pasture grubs in the South-East? The damage being done is serious.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The honourable member was good enough to advise that he proposed raising this matter, and I have received a lengthy report from the Director of Agriculture which I do not propose to read in full. It deals with investigations into three separate types of insects or grubs. They have long entomological names which I will not attempt to read. The *Oncopera* moth is apparently one of the worst infestations. It is a native of the South-East and one which it is proving difficult to eradicate or even combat. The report on this grub is as follows:—

Widespread and serious damage has been done to pastures in the Lower South-East by *Oncopera* several times in recent years. They are a native of the district and in South Australia their occurrence is limited to that part of the Lower South-East south of the Robe-Penola road. In the late 1940's serious damage was done to pastures by this grub, but the drier spring and summer weather in 1951-52 reduced numbers to small proportions.

They continue to eat pastures actively until about August and then go into pupation. From the pupae moths again emerge in the following October to mate and lay eggs to produce the next generation. Control methods are based on pasture management which reduces the amount of pasture growth in the spring and early summer so that the eggs and young caterpillars are exposed to sun and wind and so dry out and die. The sowing of perennial pasture plants, particularly phalaris, cocksfoot and lucerne, develops a pasture which is only temporarily checked by the eating of the herbage, and when the caterpillars become less active in August the pastures again grow away from them.

It is obvious from that report that this insect is difficult to control and the Director suggests pasture management as one means. I will make the entire report available to the honourable member if he cares to peruse it.

FOOT-ROT IN SHEEP.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I understand that the sheep disease foot-rot has been made a notifiable disease. Can the Minister of Agriculture outline the provisions of the regulations the department has introduced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The regulations regarding the control of foot-rot were gazetted last week, I think, and in the main they provide for control of the movement of infected stock. Foot-rot became extremely widespread during last year's wet winter and extended alarmingly to areas where it had till then been unknown. The department has been pressed for a long time to do something about it and has been making haste slowly because, although it did not desire to delay an attack on the disease, it desired to regulate with the minimum possible inconvenience to stock-owners. The regulations that have been gazetted were compiled in close collaboration with stock men and, in particular, with the Stockowners Association, which actually assisted in drafting them, and they have its full support.

In brief, they provide for control of the movement of stock to ensure, in particular, that they do not move indiscriminately along roads. Stock may be taken for slaughter to approved places and by approved means of transport, such as road and rail transport, and they must not be permitted to stray on roads. The department's intention is not to create a panic among sheep men. Sheep men have undertaken conscientious work in the last six or eight months, particularly during the dry summer, and this has materially assisted in reducing the incidence of the disease. It is hard to assess just how much of it will recur during the winter, but the department appreciates the work done and hopes that sheep men will continue to combat the disease on their own properties. Although the regulations are necessarily fairly stringent the department intends to interpret them sympathetically. It will endeavour to assist those people who are trying to help themselves and administer the regulations with a minimum of inconvenience to them in the management of their flocks.

Mr. JENKINS—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether there is provision in the regulations for an inspector to visit a farm

suspected of harbouring sheep suffering from foot-rot and take action to have the disease eliminated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Actually I did not say that the disease was notifiable, but there is an obligation on the part of the owner to notify the district inspector if there is foot-rot on his property. There is also a provision that stock may not be removed from the property, except by prescribed means, without permission. As to the treatment, we have specially trained several stock men in the department in the eradication measures that have been found to be sound, and these men have been placed in strategic areas throughout the State. One is at Mount Gambier, one at Naracoorte, one at Keith, and another at headquarters in Adelaide. They are specialists in the treatment of foot-rot and are available for consultation. In addition, a wide general knowledge is possessed by the stock inspectors who are stationed in various parts of the State.

PILDAPPA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Works received a report from the Engineering and Water Supply Department concerning an approach by farmers of Pildappa for a better water supply?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I have no details, but will bring them down tomorrow.

SUPERPHOSPHATE PRICE.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Premier arranged for the Prices Commissioner, or some other authority, to inquire into the announced proposed increase in the price of superphosphate by 9s. a ton? If so, can he say how far these inquiries have progressed? Will he lay on the table of the House a report of the agreement between the British Phosphate Commission and the companies operating in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The report of the increase in the price of phosphate rock by, I think, 13s. a ton led to the statement that the price of superphosphate would increase by 9s. a ton in this State. That was not an official statement or in accordance with any decision of the Prices Department, nor, as far as I know, has the Prices Department decided by what amount the price of super will be increased if the Phosphate Commission does impose an additional charge upon phosphate rock. This matter is extremely important to this State, which is dependent largely upon superphosphate not only for ordinary production but for extending production and developing

new areas. I have written to the Prime Minister asking whether the Australian representatives on the commission have submitted to the Commonwealth any information justifying an increase and, if so, whether that information has been examined by the Commonwealth Government, and whether I may have a report from the Commonwealth on the reasons for the increase. Until that information is available I hesitate to express any view whether an increase is justified. In recent years from time to time there have been very substantial increases in the price of phosphate rock, and the price of superphosphate has now become very high indeed. Ultimately it will seriously affect our overseas exports unless steps are taken to bring it more within reason. The Government has no copy of the agreement referred to by the honourable member. It would be possible for the Prices Commissioner to see the agreement, but under his Act he could not disclose its contents to an outside authority.

ENLARGEMENT OF ELIZABETH TOWNSHIP.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Has the Premier any further information following on the announcement in the press this morning of the purchase of additional land for the enlargement of Elizabeth?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have given a fairly extensive account of the reasons for the additional purchase. It has become obvious that there will be a large influx of factory and similar production around the town. Already the blocks held for industrial purposes have been largely taken up, which necessitates additional land being purchased whilst it is available. The honourable member will appreciate that Elizabeth has caught, to a large extent, the imagination of people coming to the State, and the project is going extremely well, and it would be a mistake not to secure at this stage the necessary land to enable any industry that desires it to establish there.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Government considered any other site in South Australia, either adjacent to an existing town or in any other locality, suitable for industrial expansion, and if so, has it acquired land in any area other than Elizabeth in order to capture the imagination of the people who may desire to establish industries here?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Apparently there is some slight misunderstanding; either I made an inaccurate

statement or the Leader did not hear quite accurately what was said. The Government did not purchase land adjacent to Elizabeth: it was purchased by the Housing Trust. The Leader's question, however, raises the important topic of the establishment of industries. There is no line on the Estimates or any other Government authority to purchase land to be held for the establishment of industries. However, we have known there has been a steady demand for land from time to time, and on some occasions we have suggested to the Housing Trust that land should be purchased in certain areas, if possible, so that it would be available for industries. For instance, a big industrial area was established in the district of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition near South Road because land was held there for industrial purposes on the Government's recommendation; but, apart from that, the Government always makes it clear to any industry contemplating coming to South Australia that if it will decide on the most suitable site the Government will do its utmost to see that land is available for it under the best possible conditions.

Sometimes we have had difficulties. On one occasion an industry was interested in a site at Murray Bridge and we had some difficulty in getting offers of land for it, but in the main there has been no difficulty in securing the necessary land. Recently an industry that would require a large area said it wanted land in a country district, and as soon as we get an official notification from the company that it wants us to go ahead we will see that the land is obtained for it at reasonable prices.

UNIFICATION OF RAILWAY GAUGES.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Premier received a communication from the Commonwealth Government regarding the proposal to alter the railway gauge between Broken Hill and Port Pirie, and if so, what stage have the negotiations reached? Will it be necessary to pass special legislation in this State or does the existing agreement between our Minister of Railways and the Commonwealth Government include that railway line? If so, when is it expected to make a start on the work?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know the Government has not received a communication from the Commonwealth Government on this matter since the legislation was passed a considerable time ago. It provided for the unification of all the Australian gauges, except the Eyre Peninsula gauges. I have noticed that a number of kites have been

flown in the press and that the matter has been referred to by two special committees appointed by the respective Parties at Canberra. These committees presented reports recommending certain action. The report of one committee was submitted to me by Mr. Wentworth, a member of the committee, for my comments. The Commonwealth Government, as such, has not formally approved of the Wentworth plan, nor asked for this Government's concurrence in the plan. There is already legislation providing for the unification of gauges in South Australia, and the matter has been ratified by the Commonwealth and State Governments. This Government has had no request for any alteration of the agreement, nor are negotiations proceeding now with the Commonwealth on the matter.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—A constituent of mine was taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for treatment during an epileptic fit. He was there for only a short time, a matter of minutes, before he recovered and indicated that he wanted to leave. This sort of thing had happened to him before and there was no need for him to stay at the hospital, but he was compulsorily kept there and afterwards, although he did not require any treatment, charged by the Hospitals Department. Will the Premier investigate cases of this kind and see that people who are involuntarily taken to the hospital and proved not to be in need of treatment are not charged for something they did not want?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I shall be pleased to do that and it will assist me if the honourable member will let me know the name of the patient so that I will have a specific case.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Recently a constituent—a friend of mine—spent 23 days in the Royal Adelaide Hospital, for which he received an account for £35. His wife made known to the Hospitals Department that they were contributing to a hospital benefits scheme. I understood that pensioners were to be treated free of charge at the hospital. I communicated with the Hospitals Department and was told that they were obliged, under instructions, to submit an account. If the man had not been fully covered under a hospital benefits scheme the Royal Adelaide Hospital would have accepted as payment the amount he was covered for. However, if his cover exceeded the charge, the department would have paid

the balance to the patient. Pensioners who do not contribute to a scheme are treated free of cost, but those who do insure themselves frequently do so at great sacrifice or with the assistance of their families. Will the Premier consider ensuring that the department treats pensioners more liberally?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—What the honourable member suggests, if accepted, would mean that a person going to hospital could make a profit. He would undoubtedly be kept by the hospital authorities and would then receive money from a hospitals scheme, part of which is provided by the Commonwealth. I could not agree to such a proposal.

PORT PIRIE TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIS—Early last year I discussed with Mr. Harvey, Chief Traffic Manager of the South Australian Railways, the possibility of running a Bluebird car service between Port Pirie and Adelaide and was told he hoped to put one on at the end of last year or the beginning of this year. I again approached him and he told me it would be a few months yet before the service was put on because no cars are available. I noticed in the press recently that the Railways Commissioner intends to give a car service to suburban lines and some country lines. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Railways say whether Port Pirie is covered by "country lines," and, if not, will he ask the Commissioner when the service will be available on the Port Pirie line?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will take up that question with my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

RENTS OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED HOUSES.

Mr. JENNINGS—When the House met last February the Premier was asked several questions concerning the rents of houses owned by the Government and occupied by Government employees, which matter Sir Kingsley Paine was investigating. The answers to those questions did not enlighten the House very much for the Premier did not seem to know at that stage what was happening. Can he now inform the House what has happened in the meantime and whether the Government has given effect to Sir Kingsley's recommendation? If not, what does the Government intend to do?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Sir Kingsley Paine reported to the Government on all cases in which the tenant had objected

to the proposed increase in rent. He visited every house concerned, except one at Leigh Creek, and after a thorough investigation made certain recommendations. None of these were for increases, some were for the same rent, some for a substantial reduction, but most were for a small reduction. Summarized, the judge recommended a slightly lower level of rents than that previously provided by the Public Service Board. After consideration Cabinet accepted Judge Paine's recommendations and recommended to the board, the authority that fixes the rents for Government buildings, that the report be implemented and the adjustments made retrospectively to the date the judge had been appointed. One or two supplementary matters arose: for example, whether a refund should be paid in a lump sum or over a period; but, by and large, Cabinet recommended that refunds be made over a period rather than in a lump sum. Later, some tenants who were leaving the houses were paid refunds in a lump sum. The board accepted the Government's recommendation, but Sir Kingsley made it clear that his recommendation was not to be considered permanent, and later, when rents in the community generally had been adjusted slightly upwards by Parliament, the board adjusted its rents upwards by about 5 per cent or 7 per cent. That decision applied to the rents of homes occupied by certain public servants but not to those occupied by teachers. The latter rents are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Education, who decided not to adjust them.

KINGSTON WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Some time ago I learned from the Minister of Works that as a result of boring tests at Kingston it had been ascertained beyond doubt that the supply of suitable water there was unlimited. Later, in response to requests by the Kingston District Council and the Kingston Chamber of Commerce I wrote to the Minister to ascertain when a scheme would be established. As the people of Kingston are anxious to have this water supply, has the Minister of Works any report on the matter?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will ask the Engineer-in-Chief how far he has gone with his estimates of costs. After having established that water is available we must ascertain the cost of reticulation and the prospective revenue. I am afraid there will be nothing on this year's Estimates for the scheme because of the demands of great works already

in hand, but much preliminary work has been done and I will let the honourable member know what is contemplated.

BUSHFIRES RELIEF.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Has the Minister of Agriculture any information about the decision of the Bushfires Relief Committee on the applications of victims at Hamley Bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think the honourable member refers to several properties within the township of Hamley Bridge that were severely affected by fires which had their origin in broad acres outside the town. The owners of these properties suffered considerable losses, and the question was whether or not these cases came within the ambit of the committee for assistance from the fund. I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that the committee has accepted these as being *bona fide* applicants for assistance. Their cases have been assessed and included in the payments that will be made shortly.

DRAINAGE OF SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that portion of the drainage scheme for the south-western suburbs concerns districts outside my electorate, but I am greatly concerned at the continual flooding of many parts of my district after heavy rains. I understand, too, that the reconstruction of the Marion Road from the Glenelg tramline to a point near the Brighton train line crossing is dependent upon the drainage proposals being carried out before the roadworks. Would it be possible to permit the Marion Council to do some of its excavation work now, such as the digging of drains without their being lined, to connect up with the Sturt Creek instead of having to wait for the whole of the proposals to be considered by the Public Works Committee, or could the Government request the Public Works Committee to furnish an interim report on works to meet immediate emergencies?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government has had several requests from the honourable member's district and the Glenelg and Brighton districts about this flooding problem. The Government decided to appoint a committee to examine the matter and recommend what action should be taken. Before it was appointed the Government laid down, and it was accepted by the councils concerned, that only half the cost of the scheme should be met by the Government. The committee appears to have done a remarkably good job,

and its report was very convincing. The works recommended will cost about £3,200,000, and the committee recommended that certain works, costing £1,600,000, be carried out over the next eight years by an expenditure of about £200,000 a year. Although the report only came to hand last week, Cabinet has already considered it and referred it to me for the preparation of a Bill to refer the proposals to the Public Works Committee. That will be done because the apportionment of the costs that will not be borne by the Government has to be decided. I hope the Bill will be presented to Parliament early this session, and if passed the Public Works Committee will be authorized to examine the proposals and recommend the apportionment of the costs between the councils concerned.

RIVER MURRAY WATER STORAGEES.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Works received a report on the ability of the present water storages of the River Murray to maintain adequate supplies of water for South Australian irrigation needs, and can he inform me of the present salinity of the Murray waters at irrigation centres?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I have a report from the Engineer-in-Chief, dated June 21 which states:—

(1) River Murray Commission storages at present hold the following quantities:—Hume Reservoir, 610,000 acre feet, capacity 1,452,000 acre feet; Lake Victoria, 410,000 acre feet, capacity 551,700 acre feet; total 1,020,000 acre feet; total capacity 2,003,700 acre feet. With the extended dry period the situation was causing some concern and the discharge from Hume Reservoir has been reduced to a very small flow since the end of the irrigation season to conserve water.

During the last four days the outlook has improved as fair to good rains on the catchment area have resulted in freshets in the Upper Murray and its tributaries. With a definite break in the season it appears unlikely that there will be any shortage of water during the next irrigation season. The flow to South Australia during May was 243,000 acre feet compared with this State's entitlement of 94,000 acre feet for the month of May.

(2) Salinity: Present salinities are as follows, figures for the corresponding date last year being shown in parentheses:—

	Parts per million.	
Lake Victoria	250	(100)
Lock 9	230	(95)
Berri	320	(80)

With the much smaller flow it is only to be expected that salinities would be considerably higher than last year. However, as the flow of fresh water from the tributaries passes down the Murray, salinity should decrease. The salinity is not sufficiently high to cause concern.

PRINTING OF SCIENTIFIC BOOKS.

Mr. BYWATERS—On February 12 last I asked a question concerning the printing of scientific books by the Government Printer. The *Advertiser* had reported that certain books were out of circulation. Some constituents of mine have expressed a desire to obtain these books. The Premier promised to investigate the programme of the Government Printer and advise me of the position. I have not received a reply, although on several occasions I have made inquiries at the Treasury. I was informed that the Government Printer submitted a report the following day. Can the Premier now provide a reply, or will he do so tomorrow?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I regret that the honourable member has not received a reply. I will certainly check to see where my system has fallen down. The Government Printer did submit a report. The position is that few of these books are asked for: the demand is limited. The Government Printer has agreed to print a limited number which will be available for sale on ordinary trading conditions. I should think when he prints these copies he will have sufficient supplies to meet all demands for the next 20 years.

LIBRARIES SUBSIDIES ACT.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Can the Minister of Education say whether there has been any application by any local authority for assistance from the Government pursuant to the Libraries Subsidies Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I can recall one application which came from the district represented by the member for Stirling. The Libraries Board disallowed the application because the library was not sponsored by the council, but by an outside committee. More recently I have discussed this question with Mr. Skipper of the Libraries Board. I believe that interest will be stimulated and that there will be more action in future. The Government and the board are anxious to foster worth-while lending libraries outside the central system. Generally speaking, councils have not exhibited much keenness in this matter. If the honourable member desires, I will get more detailed information.

HOSPITALS BOARD RESIGNATION.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Premier supply any information as to the reasons behind the resignation of Mr. Ross Jacobs from the Hospitals Board?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Jacobs did not resign from the Hospitals Board. I do not know whether that makes any material difference to the question. If he desires, Mr. Jacobs is at liberty to disclose all the minor differences between himself and the Minister of Health. There was nothing detrimental to Mr. Jacobs or to the Minister. It was merely a difference of opinion.

ABORIGINALS AT ANDAMOOKA.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Will the Minister of Works make available the reports from the secretary of the Aborigines Protection Board, Mr. Bartlett, and officers of the Mines Department relating to their recent visit to Andamooka opal fields?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I have not had an opportunity of seeing the secretary since he returned today from Andamooka. I see no reason why the honourable member should not have full details of that visit, although the report will probably not be available before the House adjourns. There will be nothing confidential in it. Mr. Bartlett told my secretary this morning that he left Andamooka feeling greatly relieved about the conditions there: the tension was entirely removed and he thought the people were getting on quite well.

COTTAGE FLATS FOR PENSIONERS.

Mr. TAPPING—On two occasions I have asked the Premier whether the Housing Trust intended building more cottage flats for pensioners. The last report he supplied was most encouraging. In view of the huge demand for this type of home, will the trust build more of them in the near future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get a report.

INSPECTION OF SOUTH-EASTERN LAND.

Mr. HARDING—In a recent report of the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee on the north-western division of the South-East reference is made to the great potential of the eastern division when drained. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether it would be possible to arrange for an early inspection by the Land Settlement Committee of the 700,000 acres in the eastern division?

The Hon. C. S. HINOKS—I will investigate the matter and if I consider it worth while will arrange an inspection.

BULK HANDLING FACILITIES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I think it was generally understood when bulk handling was first

promulgated that the horizontal, or cheap, type of installation, similar to that being used in Western Australia, would be installed here. I understand that it has been decided to change to the more substantial vertical type of installation in use in Victoria and New South Wales. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate the unit cost per bushel of the two types and, secondly, what the handling or throughput charge per bushel would be for each type?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I agree with the Leader that it was generally accepted when bulk handling legislation was being considered by this House that the horizontal type of storage would, in the main, be employed because it was thought the vertical type would prove too costly and therefore make the scheme capitally top heavy. In the light of subsequent experience and inquiry the company received tenders for the erection of the vertical type at a cost per bushel very much more attractive than was at first envisaged. In view of this fact, and because of the distinct advantages accruing from the vertical as against the horizontal type, the company desired authority to accept the tenders, and it was given. The cost per bushel of the different types of storages varies materially according to the site. For instance, where the foundations are in subsoil that will permit of heavy loading per square foot the tall vertical type of storage can be erected, and the cost is reduced because of the additional height. Where the subsoil is not satisfactory for such a tall structure there must be alteration of design and larger foundations, so the cost goes up. I cannot give the maximum and minimum costs per bushel for the storages so far approved, but they vary considerably. It is true that the increased cost per bushel for storage accommodation is offset to a considerable extent by the reduced through-put charges. This has enabled approval to be given for the vertical type when otherwise it would not have been economical to use it. Each proposal is submitted to me for approval and the aspects are always considered. It is pleasing to know that we have built a number of the vertical type because in view of the possible segregation of wheat, and the possible utilization of the storages for the handling of barley, their value will become greater.

SNUGGERY SAW MILL.

Mr. CORCORAN—About 12 months ago the Premier told me that an area of land at Snuggery had been purchased as a site for a new sawmill, but said there was no prospect of its being erected before the completion of the new

Government sawmill at Mount Gambier. As I understand that mill is now nearing completion, can he say whether the Government intends to proceed with the work at Snuggery shortly? Immediately electric power from Mount Gambier is installed at the Cellulose works a number of employees there will be dismissed and unless there are prospects of work elsewhere their position will be difficult, but the construction of the Snuggery sawmill would help.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No work will be done in connection with a sawmill at Snuggery under this year's Loan Estimates. Whether it will come under next year's Loan Estimates depends on the progress made in completing the large project at Mount Gambier, where a considerable amount of work has still to be done. The company proposing to establish at Snuggery will make an early move, so labour conditions at the town should be buoyant in the future.

REHABILITATION OF FLOOD AFFECTED SETTLERS.

Mr. KING—Yesterday I pointed out that before some of the river settlers could be helped in connection with rehabilitation arrangements would have to be made with various classes of creditors, but I cannot see how that can be done unless there is legislation covering the matter. Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider introducing some sort of moratorium to provide protection for these settlers whilst they are rehabilitating their properties, and at the same time afford some protection to the various classes of creditors?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government does not propose to bring down such legislation. It has had experience of this type of legislation and nothing destroys the confidence of an investor in an undertaking more than the existence of a moratorium. I cannot give the honourable member an assurance that the Government will accept his suggestion.

TEMPORARY HOMES AT MYPOLONGA.

Mr. BYWATERS—Some time ago I asked that temporary homes be made available at Mypolonga. I understand they are now nearing completion and I wonder when they will be occupied. Can the Minister of Lands say whether any move has been made regarding the allocation of town blocks, as suggested by the Mopolong District Council? I also requested that strong fences should be built around the open channels at Mypolonga to avoid danger to young children likely to be

living in the area. Has the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Materials, with the exception of a few posts, have been made available for fences, and when they are to hand the work will commence. Seventeen allotments for the building of homes have been surveyed and a domestic water service installed. Four allotments have been made available to the Housing Trust and so far three emergency homes have been erected. It is understood that a decision will be made in a few days regarding the occupation of the buildings.

MANNUM-ADELAIDE OVERALL WATER SCHEME.

Mr. STOTT—The Governor's Speech refers to an overall water scheme in connection with the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline to serve the Onkaparinga Valley and certain other areas. However, that is a matter for the future. I am more concerned now with the possible rating along the proposed pipeline. Can the Minister of Works say whether the people concerned will be asked to approve the scheme and to state whether they agree to being rated in accordance with the department's assessment?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—People along the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline are not rated but charged for a service; only those along branch lines are rated. It is not intended to force water on to people who do not want it, but usually they are anxious to get it and are prepared to be rated.

BEACH SANDS.

Mr. JENKINS—Paragraph 18 of the Governor's Speech says:—

Next year a thorough investigation of South Australian beach sands will be commenced to assess their thorium content and to determine whether they contain other minerals of commercial value, particularly rutile and zircon. Can the Premier say whether any preliminary investigations have been made and is there any indication of our beach sands containing these minerals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Some preliminary investigations have been made by, I believe, a private company. It is not thought that we have extensive deposits like Queensland and New South Wales, but it may be possible to work out a proposition, and that matter is being examined.

RAIN-MAKING EXPERIMENTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I have noticed in the press and heard over the air that the

Department of Agriculture and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization are working conjointly in rain-making experiments. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether present results warrant a continuation of them?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The arrangement is that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization carries out the experiments and the Department of Agriculture acts as the liaison office for publicity purposes. To an extent the department has control because if there is a possibility of anything untoward occurring it has the right to call off the experiments. So far there are no tabulated results. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization made it plain when it began experiments that they would take at least six months and then the results would be tabulated and examined to see the extent to which the experiments had been successful. Two areas have been selected and each is dealt with periodically. It is decided by lot, or some other means, so the selection is free from bias. The resultant rainfall is measured in a number of the gauges now used by the Meteorological Department, but extra gauges have been put in to assist in the calculations. Not until October at the earliest will the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization be able to collate and examine the results in order to indicate the degree of success that has rewarded its efforts.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY CHARGES.

Mr. BYWATERS—A report in the *Mail* of April 13 states:—

Leigh Creek coalfield expansion may bring lower electricity charges in South Australia. The Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, holds this belief. He confidently predicted today that field expansion would reduce coal costs, probably allowing for lower electricity charges. If charges are reduced, can the Treasurer say whether preference will be given to country consumers who are now paying a surcharge?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That statement is based on the long-term development of Leigh Creek coalfield, which at present produces about 500,000 tons of coal a year but which, when the Port Augusta B station operates, will produce 1,250,000 tons at no greater cost. This will reduce the annual cost, but that does not reflect the immediate position as at present the trust must purchase much New South Wales coal and oil.

DEFENCE PLANS.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Premier received a communication from or consulted with the Prime Minister or his department concerning the possible use by the United States Government of the Woomera or Maralinga range for the testing of atomic and other bombs? If so, does this involve the South Australian Government in the provision of amenities, such as housing and road and rail transport, for the increased personnel that may be expected, and does the Premier know whether the Commonwealth health authorities have made an exhaustive inquiry into radio fall-out from such tests and the dangerous effects, especially on infants?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TOWN PLANNING APPEALS.

The Legislative Council transmitted the following message:—

The Legislative Council, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly in the appointment of a Joint Committee, with power to adjourn from place to place, to inquire and report what action should be taken in respect of any report of the Town Planning Committee laid before both Houses of Parliament pursuant to Section 13a of the Town Planning Act, 1929-1956.

In the event of the Joint Committee being appointed, the Legislative Council will be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

The said three Council members will be the Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill and the Attorney-General (the Hon. C. D. Rowe).

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That the Legislative Council's request be agreed to; that the members of the House of Assembly to be members of such committee be Messrs. Coumbe, Stephens and Fred Walsh, of whom two shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council informing that House accordingly.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That during the present session, unless otherwise ordered, the House meet on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in each week at 2 o'clock.

Motion carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved—

That during the present session, on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after the 6 o'clock adjournment on Wednesdays, Government business take precedence over other business, except questions.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD brought up the following report of the Committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech:—

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

CELLULOSE AUSTRALIA LIMITED (GOVERNMENT SHARES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 25. Page 30.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I do not intend to speak at great length on this Bill for I agree with the principle it embodies. All members on this side believe that, in the absence of true co-operation by which all the people have a say in the management of industry, the substantial improvement on undiluted private enterprise effected by this Bill is desirable. The Government is to own shares in an industry and have some say in its management, therefore it is somewhat incongruous to read in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Federal Liberal and Country Party Government is to sell its shares in the Commonwealth Engineering Company. The press report goes on to say that this sale represents the disposal of the last interest held by the Commonwealth in ventures of this kind and completes the desocialization of industry that has been planned by the present Federal Government. In South Australia, on the other hand, we have the paradox of the present Liberal Government on the same day submitting a Bill to enable the Treasurer to take out a further considerable shareholding in the cellulose industry.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Which one do you agree with?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—With the Bill before the House. Its presentation and preceding history indicate the soundness of the policy embodied in it. Cellulose Australia Limited

was originally established as a result of a Government guarantee to underwrite the issue of shares up to £100,000. That guarantee was not fully called on at the time, but subsequently the industry got into considerable financial difficulty and the question of whether it should be assisted under the Industries Assistance Act was referred to the Industries Development Committee. I was then a member of that committee and recall that it was the first reference the committee received after its appointment. The committee found that the industry, which at that time was an infant industry branching out on a new type of work, was in dire financial straits.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The bank was in occupation.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Virtually; the receiver of the bank was there and was so dissatisfied with the financial position of the company that he gave notice that after about three weeks no further cheques drawn by the company would be honoured. This meant that the company had only a little over a fortnight's pay roll in sight. The industry would have closed down and been sold at junk value. There was a large organization in Australia at that time which we believed was interested in Cellulose Australia Limited closing down, for Cellulose Australia Limited had a concession from the Woods and Forests Department regarding the use of certain thinnings from our forests which were in great demand for the purpose of making board. However, in the limited time at its disposal the committee was able to recommend a re-organization of the company and presented a report to the Government that resulted in the State Bank, with the Government's guarantee, taking over the financial affairs of the company and keeping it in production. As a result, the industry continued to prosper, as it has until this day.

The pound shares in the company, which were at that time virtually valueless, are now quoted at over £2 on the Stock Exchange. If it had not been for Government support in the first place, and Government intervention in the second place, this extremely valuable industry would not have continued in South Australia. It is valuable because it is a source of employment for many people in the South-East and also because it furnishes a supply of board and other products for which there is a growing demand in this State. Furthermore, the company gives preference to South Australian materials in making its products and preference in employment to

South Australians. Additional funds are now required by the company for the establishment of a second mill at Snuggery. This will cost about £1,500,000, one-third of which will be provided by Australian Paper Manufacturers Limited, one-third by Cellulose Australia Limited, and the other third on guarantee by the State Bank after an inquiry by the Industries Development Committee. The future of the industry is bright. Adequate safeguards are provided in the original Act, and in view of the many advantages to be gained by passing this Bill I support the second reading.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I cannot support the Bill because I believe it is wrong in principle. As a Liberal and Country League member, I do not believe that loan money should be used for investment in shares for the sake of getting dividends, and that is what the Bill provides for.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not mention dividends, but progress.

Mr. HEASLIP—The honourable member said that by investing money in this company a second mill could be established. Not one pound of Government money is needed to make that possible. Any amount of money could be obtained from outside Government sources for this purpose. The Bill proposes the investment of loan money for what is not a Government function.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why the necessity for the Government to underwrite £500,000 capital?

Mr. HEASLIP—I was not in Parliament when the Government made it possible for the company to continue operating, but it then did something that any Government should do.

Mr. Lawn—It is all right to assist private industry!

Mr. HEASLIP—Exactly. The Government may assist an industry to get on its feet, just as it has helped Nairne Pyrites Limited and other industries. The Industries Development Committee has been appointed for that purpose, but that is entirely different from investing loan money in ordinary shares of a company and leaving it invested for the sake of dividends. In his second reading speech the Treasurer said that clause 3 gives him the power to sell shares whenever he deems it appropriate, but he was not satisfied to leave it at that. He went on to say:—

I assure members that the Government does not intend to exercise that power to sell shares: it is merely an enabling power that could be used in exceptional circumstances.

That finished the Bill as far as I was concerned. It means that the Government will become an ordinary investor. I have often approached the Government for better hospitals, schools, roads, waterworks and railway services in my district, but I am usually told "We are sorry that we cannot carry out these works this year because we have not enough money." We shall have much less money for these necessary works if we invest in company shares.

Mr. John Clark—We shall be making money out of this.

Mr. HEASLIP—We are not here to make money, but to serve the people. Loan money was not made available for us to invest, but to be used in the interests of the community.

Mr. John Clark—Don't we invest money in the railways?

Mr. HEASLIP—No, but we must maintain the railways for the good of the people. We certainly do not make money out of the railways or the tramways, but it is the function of any Government to maintain those facilities.

Mr. Fred Walsh—To enable cheaper freights for farmers?

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not like that attitude. The railways are costing people in the country much money and the railways lose far more in the metropolitan area than in the country. I, as a country member, have supported the grants made each year for carrying on the tramways services for the sake of industries and people in the metropolitan area because I believe the Government should do that.

Mr. John Clark—That is an investment.

Mr. HEASLIP—No, making money available for the tramways or the railways is not an investment, but something that is done for the good of the people. My attitude might have been different if the Bill had been introduced only for the purpose of enabling the Treasurer to take up his rights and dispose of his shares in this undertaking. After the new issue the Treasurer will hold 69,342 shares, and if he sold them he would get £138,684. That money could be made available for carrying out various necessary works. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I am pleased to support the second reading. At one time Cellulose Australia Limited was in grave financial difficulties, but the Industries Development Committee investigated the possibility of retaining this industry in the South-East with a view to assisting decentralization and providing employment for people there. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) seemed pleased that the Government came to the company's rescue previously, but because

it is now flourishing as a result of Government assistance he says that the Treasurer should not invest further money in it because he would collect dividends. I cannot follow his reasoning. I doubt whether the member for Rocky River said anything further to which I should reply beyond indicating that I regard this as a most important undertaking that would not be in existence today were it not for the assistance given it by the Government in years gone by. It is important, however, from the point of view of the Government's investments in afforestation in the South-East, and I believe that these two undertakings are completely integrated. From that angle alone this Bill should receive the support of the Chamber, as I believe it will.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—This measure shows what happens when Governments go into private business. It started with the idea of getting this industry established, and it has been continued in order to allow it to become a prosperous concern. Now that it has reached that stage it seems to me it is a good time for the Government to get out and not go on investing in what is simply a private business transaction. That is not the purpose of Government. I agree that the Government may be well advised to run public utilities, and if it can make them pay so much the better, but that is quite a different thing from ordinary trading activities. The money proposed to be invested will have to come out of the loan market, and even though it is clearly a good investment it does not seem to me that is the right way in which to use loan money. By its holding of shares the Government also has rights to further shares and these rights have a market value. What is to prevent the Government from saying, "We have helped this industry to get going. We do not want to use our hard-earned loan money on matters that have nothing to do with the ordinary functions of Government. What is the prospect of getting out all that we have put into it and leaving it to other people who are willing to subscribe for these shares," and I take it there will be quite a willing market for them.

The argument has been advanced that this undertaking will help the Woods and Forests Department, but if the general public are willing to help afforestation by investment in this undertaking I do not see why they should not be allowed to do it. The Government has rendered a useful public service and by taking out its money at this stage it will lessen the drain on loan money. Furthermore, the return

from loan investment is comparatively low whereas generally the return from private investment is much higher, so why should people subscribe money for Government loans knowing that some of it is simply to be turned into private investment?

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent)—I give my wholehearted support to this Bill for many reasons. In the first place, it is a good, sound investment, and it is gratifying to know that the Government at this stage can reap some benefit from the financial aid it rendered to this undertaking when it was almost bankrupt. Had it not been for this financial assistance at one period it would not be functioning today. The benefits accruing from this industry are felt throughout the Millicent and Tantanoola district; indeed, throughout the whole of the South East, as it provides one of the chief sources of employment besides utilizing a quantity of thinnings from our pine plantations that could not otherwise be disposed of. With the proposed additions to the mill there will be a greater absorption of these thinnings. It is due to good management that the industry survived its teething difficulties and has reached the stage of being able to act independently. I have no doubt that this House will support the Bill, and if it does so it will do something to further this important industry with advantage to the State.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I do not agree with my colleagues, Messrs. Heaslip and Brookman, for I look upon this as a purely business matter for the Government. No businessman in the position of the Government, owning shares in a successful undertaking making a new issue of rights, would contemplate selling out. It must be remembered that the Government's holding is very considerable—I believe it is the largest shareholder. Obviously, the knowledge that the biggest shareholder in a concern proposed to get out would have some bearing on the market; that must be obvious to anyone who knows anything of the buying and selling of shares. Therefore, from that point of view the Government is wise in taking up these rights. If at a later stage it decides to sell some of its holding that can be done by the judicious disposal of the surplus, or all of them, without disturbing the market. To follow the advice of Mr. Heaslip and Mr. Brookman, I suggest, would not be good business whereas, by orderly marketing these shares could be absorbed by the market in such a manner as not to depress their value.

Again, I am not entirely in agreement with the other angle taken up by my colleagues, namely, that this will be a drain upon our loan expenditure. As I understand this matter the Commonwealth Grants Commission takes into account all the affairs in which the Government is interested, and if the Government did not spend this sum in taking up these rights the Commission would probably reduce the amount to which this State would be entitled, and therefore we would not get the money anyway. On the other hand, if the Government takes up the shares and at some future time decides to quit some or all of them the Commission will not be nearly so interested. I believe that this industry is very important from our own forestry point of view as it consumes what would otherwise be waste material. I recall the time when A.P.M. made an offer to buy the whole of the thinnings and offcuts or, rather, almost to take them from us for nothing provided they cleared the forest for us. We did not fall for that suggestion, but established our own mills in the South-East. This industry struggled in its early days, but now is a valuable adjunct to our forestry operations. I do not mind being called socialistic in this matter. The Government will not be the owner of the industry because it is supported privately. There are a number of industries in South Australia which the Government has financially assisted. In my own electorate a small brick factory was struggling, but the Industries Development Committee came to its aid and after a few years the proprietor was able to sell his holdings for £50,000. I agree that the Government does not have to take up these rights, but I believe it should, purely as a business project. I commend the Bill because it is based on sound business principles.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—I support the Bill because I believe it is in the best interests of the State. I feel that is what has prompted the Government to make this move. I regret that it is not taking a majority of the shares because that would enable it to control the company's destiny. I believe the Government is anxious to protect its interest in the afforestation project in the South-East, otherwise it would not be introducing this legislation. Similar objections to those expressed today were advanced by some Government members when the Government proposed taking over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. The Government's aim then, as today, was to preserve the interests of the State. It foresaw the possibilities of

industrial development in South Australia and desired to provide cheap power. Mr. Heaslip ran true to form in his objections, but he did not dissent when the Government decided to become associated with South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, no doubt because farming interests were going to benefit. He did not point out the dangers to the Government through being associated with that company because he could see benefits to himself. He was not concerned with any possible risk to Government money. He should be consistent and have regard for the best interests of the State. Most Governments put huge sums into their railways to provide efficient and cheaper services for the community. I shall not, at this stage, reflect on our railways in view of the limited funds they receive. So far as our country services are concerned, country people benefit although the bulk of the money comes from the metropolitan area. Finance expended on the tramways is designed to keep fares down and to prevent increases in living costs. That, I believe, is the Government's motive in assisting that semi-Governmental institution. The Opposition is wholeheartedly behind the Government's interesting itself in this company.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I support the Bill, but for an entirely different reason from those already mentioned. I believe the Government must take up the rights or else lose money. This company is different from any other company it has assisted in that it owns shares in the cellulose company. The Government guaranteed an overdraft for bulk handling. The Government has supported many industries by way of guarantee, but they cannot be compared with this proposition. This is a straight out investment, and fortunately it is a good one, possibly because we have a good Treasurer. However, this could establish a dangerous precedent because if we ever get a Treasurer from the Opposition he may attempt to buy shares in any company the Opposition thought it could dominate. Buying shares is no bonanza and I hope this legislation will not establish a precedent because Government funds should not be used to buy shares. The Bill does not suggest that we buy shares merely for the sake of buying them; in this case we will secure holdings at approximately half their current market value.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I support the Bill. This provides a different type of support to industry from that which is generally guaran-

teed through the Industries Development Committee. However, I believe this is a good medium and one from which the Government stands to benefit. In all other undertakings the Government guarantees direct assistance and does not benefit financially at all. The Government stands behind many industries in Adelaide and throughout the country and guarantees losses if they occur. It assists to maintain these industries and keep them producing and this has assisted the State as a whole. I doubt whether I would be in order in enumerating the industries or the types of industries that have sought and received Government assistance. Many would not be in business today but for the guarantees provided by the Government. This is the first instance in which the Government stands to receive some return for the assistance it has given. The cellulose industry was supported through the Industries Development Committee, and it is doubtful whether it would be operating today but for that help in the early stages. Now that it is on its feet and in a position to pay dividends, why should not the Government share the profits?

Mr. Heaslip—Do you advocate putting loan money into the Adelaide Cement Company, for instance?

Mr. RICHES—The Government supported the Adelaide Cement Company by way of guarantee. That meant a tremendous saving to the State. It enabled cement to be produced locally at a cost much less than was being paid for imported cement. I think the saving was about £750,000 a year.

I cannot see why it should be argued that the Government should interest itself in an industry only when there is a chance of losing money and not when there is an opportunity to get a return. That sort of thing is in accordance with the platform of the Party in office in the Commonwealth. I read in today's paper that the Commonwealth Government is selling its shares in the Commonwealth Engineering Co. The progress of that firm is the finest example of co-operation between Government and private enterprise that we have seen. It was an industry no larger than an ordinary blacksmith's shop but has now grown into one of the major industrial concerns in New South Wales, producing rolling stock for all the Australian railway systems. It was responsible for the building of the magnificent Sunland express in Queensland. This has all resulted through financial assistance being given at the right time by a sympathetic Commonwealth Government. The establishment of the industry has

returned good dividends to that Government, and it was all due to the matter being covered by a plank of its political platform. The holdings of the Commonwealth Government are now being sold, and that sort of action is the only argument that can be advanced against this Bill. I would like to see more co-operation between Government and industry for the benefit of the people. I commend the Government for introducing the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Disposal of shares."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—My views are much the same as those held by Mr. Heaslip. I was disappointed with the explanation of the clause given by the Premier. He was emphatic that the Government would not even consider selling its shares in the company. I do not like the Government's holding shares in a purely commercial undertaking. Of course, there are exceptions to everything. At one time there was a proper exception to the rule in connection with this cellulose undertaking and it was probably a good move for the Government to step in during a time of difficulty. However, the Government was released from its guarantee in 1951, so for the last five or six years the company has been on its own feet. The exceptional circumstances that existed at one time have now passed.

What would happen if for some reason shares in Cellulose Australia Ltd. were to decrease in value? Would the Government have a duty to the company because once it assisted it in time of difficulty, or would it have a duty to the taxpayers? Would the Government be bound to keep the shares whatever the risk or would it be obliged to sell them and get out of the difficulty in the best way possible? I do not say it will happen, but it could happen, and that is the real objection I have to this socialistic venture by the Government. It is ironical that on the very day that the Commonwealth Government said it would sell its interests in the Commonwealth Engineering Co. our Premier made his statement. I protest against the statement that the Government has no intention to sell the shares. It would be foolish not to take them up but it should be in the mind of the Government to sell them in due course. The Government should not enter the affairs of a live commercial undertaking distinct from public utilities such as railway and tramway under-

takings. The time has come for the Government to consider getting out of this field and I hope it will take the action in due course.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The last speaker and one or two other members have overlooked an important factor. The welfare of the company is bound up closely with that of the forest industry of this State, and the welfare of that industry is bound up closely with the success or otherwise of the cellulose industry. I agree with Mr. Millhouse's remarks about an ordinary company activity. From time to time under legislation the Government has assisted industries, but only to the extent of providing a guarantee to help them to get on their feet. No permanent interest is taken in them. The Government is happy when they are successful. In this case there is no commercial interest. It all has relation to the welfare of our forests. On numerous occasions there have been suggestions that the Government should enter secondary industry in relation to our forests by using our thinnings and enabling the forests to prosper. Some members will recall very vividly that we had no effective method of thinning an enormous area of forests in the South-East, and as a result our forests were running to seed.

Mr. O'Halloran—That was the real purpose of supporting Cellulose Limited.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. An outside company came in and said they would thin our forests for us if we gave them the thinnings without charge, but we did not accept that proposition. The position today is that when a forestry area is planned we purchase the land, plant the forest and look after it for 15 years. At the end of that period the price of the thinnings almost completely covers the cost of the establishment of the forest up to that point. In other words, we start off again with the land and 15 years old forests practically free of debt. That is what has arisen out of the development of this industry. I cannot agree with the member for Mitcham that the Government has no direct interest in this matter, because we have a very great direct interest. If the cellulose industry had not been established by private enterprise, with the support of the Government, we would today have sawmills completely owned and run by the Government. This is very much less of a Government enterprise, and therefore I thought that it would have had support from honourable members.

The welfare of our forests is ultimately wrapped up with the utilization of our thinnings and our timber, and for that reason it is essential that the Government sponsors and takes an active interest in the industry. We do not propose to do more than that. We have not had a controlling interest, nor have we even had an official director on the board, because the directors previously appointed by the Government have been retained. I thank honourable members for their consideration of the Bill. This issue was debated very fully in Parliament when Sir Richard Butler first introduced the legislation. The debate lasted for a very long time and there were certain members who had grave doubts on the wisdom of underwriting the complete shareholding of a company. Those of us who have seen what has happened since will agree, whether we voted for it originally or not, that the action taken by the Government at that time was sound and in the best interests of the forestry undertaking. It was undoubtedly in the best interests of the districts concerned, where enormous industries have developed employing large numbers of men, and in the interests of a community providing large essential requirements which otherwise would have had to be purchased overseas. I assure members that it is not the intention of the Government to become involved in a large commercial enterprise, but in a case like this I believe there is every reason for the Government to be interested and to support the undertaking.

Clause and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

(Continued from June 25. Page 29.)

On the motion to go into Committee of Supply,

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—There are two matters which I wish to bring before the House on this motion, and I do so now because there will be no opportunity for discussion in Committee. The first is where are we going with regard to public expenditure on caravan parks. I hope the Government will consider this question before the Tourist Bureau estimates come down. We have had many plans submitted by municipal bodies and by the West Beach recreation authority

for the provision of caravan parking facilities in the Adelaide area. It sounds very good at first until one comes to analyse precisely what facilities we have, and the effect on them by the provision of further facilities at the public expense. Within the Adelaide area are 19 operating caravan parks—Kingston Park at Marino, Argosy at Seacliff, a private park at West Beach, the Grange Oval, Fort Glanville, Boord Street, Glanville, Semaphore, Largs North, Hackney, Levi Park at Walkerville, Windsor Gardens, Brownhill Creek, Gorge Road Picnic Ground, Hawthorndene Oval, National Park, Silver Lake, and two at Marden. Now one is to be erected at Eagle's Nest as well.

None of these caravan parks are operating at anything like full capacity. Indeed, a survey during the May holidays showed that in three parks with a capacity of over 150 each, only 125 berths were in use, which is about a 25 per cent occupancy in what should normally be one of the busiest periods of the year. What is happening is that while we are providing facilities for caravans—and there are already adequate facilities in the area—we are spending Government money on facilities already available to the public at no great cost. By spending public money on this we are destroying adequate small businesses giving a good service in the metropolitan area. Private individuals running the parks have to pay overhead expenses, interest on capital and taxation, yet we are proposing to spend money on additional parks when adequate facilities are already provided. I hope that when the time comes for the Estimates to be presented we will see no further money provided for the Tourist Bureau for the provision of additional caravan park facilities, for any survey of the position at the moment shows that they are already adequate, and we have far too many other necessary things to spend money on.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is something that is becoming of urgent importance throughout Australia. I refer to the activity of the oil combine in Australia and to what it is doing to private owners of service stations, not only in this State, but elsewhere. I presented to this House two years ago a Bill to control motor spirit distribution. It was a measure that aimed at preventing the oil cartel from getting control of the retail trade in petrol in South Australia, and from being in a position to drive petrol resellers from business, but it was defeated on a party vote in this

House. All members opposite voted against it, and have thereby allowed the oil companies to continue driving the small private man out of business.

Let me now give two examples that have come to my notice recently of what the oil companies have done. A reseller who had a small station in the district represented by the member for Enfield had signed an agreement with a petrol company. To operate in the metropolitan area a reseller must have a one-brand petrol station agreement, because we have one-brand petrol stations. This man was not given a copy of the agreement, although he asked for it. After he had sunk his savings and had been operating for some time, and had built up an adequate business, the company advised that it was going to take his pumps away because in its view he was not selling enough petrol. He protested that petrol was essential to his business of car repairing, but the company said it was going to take the pumps away. He said he would buy them, but the company refused to allow that. When he protested that the company could not take them away under the agreement, he was told that it could because he had broken the agreement by selling another company's oil. He pointed out that he did not know there was a clause to this effect in the agreement, and said that in any case he had only sold a few bottles of the product. He was not given a copy of the agreement until his solicitors wrote to the company. The company subsequently took away the petrol pumps, his station is in danger, and the company is opening another in that area. In other words, it is driving that man out of business and opening up a company-owned station, which will have a manager who will control reselling in that area.

Another case is that of a very well-established business in the district represented by the member for Burnside. The proprietor signed an agreement with another oil company in which it was provided that the company would facilitate the transfer of the business should he desire to sell, and if he found a satisfactory buyer. He found two buyers in succession, and each time the company made a considerable number of difficulties which resulted in the sale falling through on both occasions, although each offer was satisfactory to the proprietor. The agreement was particularly vague, so it is difficult for him to go to law, but the company was extremely slow, although it had agreed to facilitate a sale. It is obvious that it is trying to prevent the sale of this very valuable

petrol station so that it will offer an unsatisfactory price to the owner, who will accept it in desperation, because he has to get out of the State for personal reasons. When he said that he would take his business elsewhere, he was told that once he accepted petrol from one wholesaler he could not get petrol from another; that if he ended his agreement with one member of the cartel he would not be able to get petrol from any other member.

By these means the oil companies are getting a monopolistic control over the whole of this industry and the small man is being turfed out just as we said two years ago that he would be. This is going on bit by bit, and it is no wonder under these circumstances that we see this process continuing in every suburb of every city in Australia and have unnecessary service stations being erected, with the private man being driven from the industry. I am amazed that honourable members opposite, who speak so much about the necessity to maintain private enterprise, should allow this to continue and that they show so little interest in the small men who are in regular and satisfactory competition between themselves.

Mr. O'Halloran—You are not suggesting that they were ever interested in the small man, are you?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Originally, I was naive enough to take honourable members opposite at their word, but I am learning from the lessons they are teaching me. As has been said before, the philosophy of honourable members opposite upon things like this is apparently "Each for himself and God for us all," as the elephant said when dancing among the chickens. Obviously, members opposite are unashamedly on the side of the elephant. All true Liberals should be on this side, and I being a true Liberal believe in the necessity for maintaining fair competition where it can be maintained. The Premier and his followers have had such cases as I have mentioned cited to them time and again by the Automotive Chamber of Commerce. They know all about it, but will do nothing. I am raising my small voice on this occasion in a plea not to allow us to get to the stage where the gun will be held at the heads of the people of this State by the oil cartel so that we have to surrender to their highwayman techniques. It is time the Government did something to protect the people of this State and to see that the reselling of these products is not placed in the hands of the oil cartel which is not in the interests of

the people, but is interested only in predatory profits which go to other countries to people already better off than we are.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

Grand total, £436,000.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—These Supplementary Estimates differ from the Supplementary Estimates we have become accustomed to expect at this time of the year. On numerous occasions the Premier has taken the opportunity to scatter largess from surplus revenue so that next year's Commonwealth grant would not be prejudiced, although he miscalculated to the tune of £620,000 on one occasion when he appropriated that amount to road maintenance. Members will remember that incident when it was not possible for the Government to spend the £620,000 appropriated for road maintenance in the very few days of the financial year remaining. The result was that the Commonwealth Grants Commission, very properly, looked at it from its standpoint, but most unfortunately from our standpoint, held that it should have been included in the Budget surplus rather than be disposed of in this way.

On this occasion it is noteworthy that the additional appropriations have been necessitated largely by misfortune. We have had dry conditions when we should have had wet and wet conditions when we should have had dry; and it must have been very annoying to the Treasurer to realize that he cannot always govern those conditions to his own liking. It sometimes happens, of course, that when the annual Estimates are introduced, shrewd budgeting, such as we have had from the Treasurer, results in large discrepancies between estimated and actual revenue and expenditure, and the Supplementary Estimates are intended to make good any errors, deliberate or unintentional, that may have been made originally. But we cannot charge the Treasurer with any juggling on this occasion. How was he to know that certain trunk mains—which have probably not been properly maintained for many years—should select this particular financial year to burst and thus impose upon the Government additional expenditure in relaying and servicing these mains?

Again, the weather has been so contrary that much more than was originally appropriated has had to be spent on pumping water from the Murray to the metropolitan area. We have been repeatedly told that the Mannum-Adelaide

pipeline, which the Government again hopes to complete in the near future, has been a very good investment.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—Anyhow, it is functioning.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, it has been for two years, and it is a good job, but whilst it has been functioning and rendering a good service in maintaining the metropolitan water supply, the mounting capital cost of the undertaking has also been functioning until today it has reached astronomical heights, compared with the original estimate. Operating costs have risen correspondingly with the capital cost, and they promise to become heavier and heavier. While not denying that a better water service is necessary for the metropolitan area, I think that better planning of the development of that area and the encouragement of decentralization of population and industries would have rendered the task of providing a better service less difficult and much less expensive. In this respect we heard a discussion recently, and we had further reference to it in this House today, about the ultimate cost of providing an adequate system of drainage in the Marion area. This case was substantially represented by my very efficient deputy, Mr. Frank Walsh. I remember being associated with an investigation by the Railways Standing Committee into metropolitan floodwater problems as far back as 1924. At that time all this area, which has subsequently been built on, was covered by orchards and vineyards and there was a floodwater problem in the Marion area then. It was suggested to the committee that it should investigate the best means of overcoming the difficulty, and the committee recommended the widening of the Sturt River, but since then the Housing Trust has been encouraged, as a result of Government policy, to purchase and build on these orchards, vineyards and other sites which previously had a great absorptive capacity, with the result that the precipitation that formerly was absorbed now runs off roofs, streets, and footpaths and creates a tremendous flood problem in the lower levels of the area.

Now we are told it will cost about £3,000,000 to satisfactorily solve this problem, whereas I suggest that if that £3,000,000—and the many other millions of pounds that have been spent on providing services and amenities to the metropolitan area within the last 12 years—had been spent on amenities and opportunities for the establishment of industries and services for the people in country areas, we would be better off today.

Now we learn that the Housing Trust is acquiring land adjacent to Elizabeth and it is said that the new town is capturing the imagination of people; but I maintain that it is not a new town: it is simply a northern suburb of the city, for the intervening areas are being built on as rapidly as possible. Is there no other area in South Australia that would lend itself to the purchase of land by the trust and the encouragement of industries?

We hear much about power stations, particularly Port Augusta "A" (which is almost completed) and Port Augusta "B" (which will be completed within the next two or three years). Why does the Government not purchase land for industrial purposes near those power houses? After all, the Government would not have to spend millions of pounds to drain the good cheap land available there. Why does the Government not purchase land along the main Adelaide-Melbourne railway line, on the other side of the Mount Lofty Ranges, so as to avoid the cost of pumping water over the ranges to supply the metropolitan area, a cost that forms a major part of the amount provided in the Supplementary Estimates? The policy of this Government, which is backed by men from the country who should believe in decentralization, is to shun decentralization like the plague. They do not want industrial areas created in their pocket boroughs because that would result in their seats being no longer safe for Liberalism.

The provision for additional expenditure on what the Government is pleased to call its fruit fly eradication campaign is a subject for critical comment. We have had a Fruit Fly Act every year since 1947—except 1951—so that we may assume there has been a reported "infestation" practically every year for the last 10 years. Some districts have been involved in the scheme almost every year during that period, so that we can hardly say that the Government has been successful in its "campaign."

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—It rarely occurs in the same place twice.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Some districts have been involved almost every year for the past 10 years despite the Minister's statement that, like lightning, the infestation rarely strikes the same place twice. Unfortunately, the old theory about lightning has been disproved and unfortunate citizens have lost their lives because of their belief in the immunity that is said to accrue from a lightning strike in a certain place.

The same principle applies to the fruit fly: a landholder may be in the middle of an infested area one year; the next year, he is on the fringe of another infested area to the east; in the third year he is on the fringe of an infestation to the west. Thus he is involved almost continuously.

The cost of the Government's fruit fly measures to June, 1956, has been £1,094,671, made up of £831,926 for stripping, spraying and other activities and £262,745 for compensation. Actually, the cost to June, 1956, was greater than that because many claims in respect of compensation lodged before that date were then still outstanding. This is a feature of the fruit fly campaign—we never know at any given time what it has cost us. We can say, however, that the cost already has been tremendous and probably out of all proportion to the benefits derived. The Government has insisted that its approach to this problem is the correct one. I think that the burden of its theme is that if a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing well. There is scope for difference of opinion as to the correctness of the Government's policy, but, apart from matters of principle, there is plenty of evidence of slipshod methods, negligence and inefficiency in carrying out that policy. And if, as seems likely, we are to have a fruit fly campaign every year in future, it might be better if the Government put the implementation of its policy on a sounder basis.

Although many persons better qualified than I on this matter claim that the measures taken in this State are too severe in view of the climatic conditions, I do not say that the principle adopted by the Government is not sound; but the weight of evidence produced to members from time to time seems to prove that the methods of handling this problem are extremely slipshod. That is understandable because in these days when the labour force is fully employed in industry we must, in order to fight a campaign of this nature, fall back on a pool of labour that has certain disabilities. Expenditure on stripping and spraying in certain parts of the metropolitan area has been an annual commitment, with one exception, for the past 10 years, so we should organize the fruit fly campaign properly and put it on a permanent basis in order to minimize complaints from householders.

These Supplementary Estimates differ from those we have been used to considering at this time of the year. They have become necessary this year mainly as the result of misfortune. Although some items, such as the cost of pumping water over the hills whereas we should have

taken the people to the water, could have been avoided by proper organization, and the cost of the fruit fly campaign might have been minimized, in the main the expenditure proposed does not represent a distribution of largesse, which used to characterize the Supplementary Estimates in days gone by. These Estimates do not contain items that could be emblazoned in banner headlines in the press with the statement that the Premier had budgeted so wisely and administered so efficiently that he was able to make handouts here, there and everywhere. I support the first line.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I am particularly concerned at the grant of £60,000 for the Adelaide University. We should do everything possible to help the University, but the Treasurer should have given some explanation of this line. It is time I voiced some protest about the amenities at a certain school in my district. I have already taken up with the Minister the question of toilet facilities at the Forbes primary school, which has 1,600 children at present. The girls have to queue up at the toilet at recess time, and there is still a queue after the bell has rung. Should we provide additional sums for the University when we deny normal facilities to school children?

A thorough investigation into the administration of the Education Department should be made. When the department was very short of school accommodation it organized its own building force, which provided suitable portable school buildings, but apparently the Government is not now prepared to ascertain whether the department is being efficiently administered. Why should the Minister have to consult one of his colleagues when he requires works to be carried out? Another 70 children will be enrolled at the Forbes primary school shortly, yet toilet accommodation there is even now insufficient. With whom should we be more concerned—children at the Forbes primary school who may reach university standard later or those now attending the University? We should not have to pander to the University. The Government's administration generally has become muddled, and this was proved yesterday, when I had an admission from the Leader of the Government that there was no need for the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department to be housed in Foy and Gibson's building some months ago. Today I am giving another example of the Government's muddled administration.

With the support of the Opposition I was given the honour of becoming a member of the University Council. On one occasion, whilst a member of the University Council, I went with the council on a visit of inspection in the company of the University's architect. During this inspection I asked why so many creepers were growing over University buildings, and the reply was that they were getting so much like brick buildings or stone buildings they had to use something to hide the fact that there was so much of one type of building. I suggested then that if they wanted to grow creepers over buildings, which involved continual maintenance, it would be better to erect buildings of wattle and daub and grow creepers over them. There are some very admirable buildings in the University grounds; the workmanship in them is excellent and there is no need to hide them with creepers. Whether any of this £60,000 is to go towards the maintenance of those buildings I can only guess. How soon can we expect the Government to realize that the Education Department has a very big building programme and that the Minister cannot carry it on without the wherewithal to do it. As things stand he has to go to the Architect-in-Chief's Department to do certain work and that department also lacks the wherewithal to do a job.

What has taken place at Foy and Gibson's building is a standing disgrace to any department. Perhaps the Minister will be able to tell me before these lines are passed that tenders will be called very shortly for the things I have mentioned at the Forbes School, but I say that no Minister can carry on a job of this magnitude unless he has full control over it, and the sooner the Government wakes up and realizes that this very big department is being hamstrung by another department the sooner will we get somewhere. Some of the young children now attending the Forbes School may reach the University, so it is all the more important to give them proper amenities now. Is it any wonder that we have bodgies and widges growing up while this type of maladministration is going on—while there is this lack of necessary facilities? Is that the type of people we are to send on to the University that wants this £60,000? Perhaps the Government has the answer. I hope it has.

The prevention of fruit fly has always agitated my mind and I subscribe to the remarks of our Leader, for I believe that the declared areas have been very drastic.

I do not know what success has attended the efforts of the Victorian authorities, but the declared areas of Mildura are much smaller in radius. What control has the Minister of Agriculture over air freight into this State? How does he know that fruit from other States is not being brought in by air? How many passengers have brought in fruit from Queensland, New South Wales, or Victoria in the express daily? I have already asked questions relating to drainage that I shall not repeat at this stage, but it appears to me that the Public Works Standing Committee will become a very much more important committee in the near future.

Mr. Lawn—Why in the near future?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—From what I gathered this afternoon as to the number of references to be made to that committee, it will become a body that will determine public policy and tell the Treasurer how much he can spend. That is how I see it. Under the heading "Chief Secretary and Minister of Health" there is much more that I shall have to say on a more appropriate occasion, but there is one thing that surprises and disappoints me and that is the announcement in tonight's *News* about the resignation of Superintendent Walsh because he is reaching the age of 60 years. It astonishes me that after all these years of administrative responsibility he could not have been appointed to the position of Deputy Commissioner or even Commissioner. I do not know much about police activities, but I am prepared to accept the statement that he is a very efficient officer. I regret the Government has been unable to find him the position to which he is entitled. He has been a great friend to the public and holds a very high reputation. The submission of Supplementary Estimates each year shows the time has come for the appointment of a Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—Yesterday I referred to the dilapidated state of the Port Pirie Harbor and the possibility of that city losing the Broken Hill ore trade.

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there is no line dealing with these matters.

The CHAIRMAN—We are dealing with the first line of the Supplementary Estimates and the usual practice is to allow members to bring forward any matter.

Mr. DAVIS—Better harbor facilities should be provided at Port Pirie. There is also the possibility of losing the wheat trade. When

it was decided to put silos at Wallaroo it meant that all wheat grown in the lower northern areas had to go there, which meant added expense to some wheatgrowers. In his reply yesterday the Premier dealt with matters raised by all members except those put forward by me. If the Government is not concerned about the welfare of the State I am. If the ore traffic and the wheat trade is lost it will mean that men at Port Pirie will be thrown out of work. If I do not get an answer from the Premier this afternoon I will raise the matter in question time tomorrow.

First line—Chief Secretary and Minister of Health—Miscellaneous, £10,000—passed.

Treasurer—Miscellaneous, £40,000—passed.

Minister of Works—Engineering and Water Supply Department, £196,000.

Mr. LAWN—The Waterworks Act says that the Commissioner may from time to time make, alter and repeal by-laws and also that every such by-law shall, after it has been approved by the Governor and published in the *Government Gazette*, have the force of law and be binding on and be observed by all persons, and shall be sufficient to justify all persons acting under the same. Also, it prescribes the matters in connection with which by-laws may be made. Recently some constituents told me they had received a notice from district inspectors about work that should be done and asked whether the inspectors had the power to issue such notices. I made inquiries and found that on August 15, 1935, the then Commissioner of Public Works issued 63 by-laws and published them in the *Government Gazette*. Since then there has been no mention of the repeal or issue of by-laws by advertisement in the *Government Gazette*. On August 24, 1935, the then Commissioner of Public Works had a document printed. It remains in the office of the Minister at Victoria Square and is not available to the public. There is no copy of it in the Parliamentary Library and a copy cannot be purchased at the Government Printing Office. I learned that there are a number of directions and two I saw are numbered 133 and 147. The then Commissioner of Public Works issued other directions, and I know they number at least 147.

I have learned that if a builder or any person is interested in the by-laws issued by the Minister he is informed by the Government Printer that he must go to Victoria Square to see those documents, and I believe there is only one such document at Victoria Square because each time I rang the person

I spoke to had to get in touch with a particular officer. The Commissioner of Public Works should not have attempted to bluff the public by the issue of directions other than those by-laws which he could legally issue in accordance with the Act. The public should not have to go to the office at Victoria Square and be shown some document which purports to be by-laws issued by the Minister. That is not the way to run a department. I think I have made it clear that this did not originate with the present Minister of Works. I do not condemn the action of the Minister or the Government, but merely draw the attention of the Government to this matter. I would like to know whether the Government intends to press those people who have been supplied with notices to rectify certain matters or do certain things which are prescribed in by-laws other than the 63 which were gazetted. What is the intention of the Minister in this regard?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Another matter was raised a few moments ago in connection with Port Pirie, and I would like to reply to that matter first. Members know that the bulk handling authority was created by Act of Parliament and is an authority outside the jurisdiction of the Government. That authority has stated where it is giving priority in the building of these silos and the Government has to service them by the necessary port installations. I assure the member that Port Pirie has not been overlooked, and in fact very important references have been made to the Public Works Committee in that regard. The future of Port Pirie is being fostered by the Government in every possible way.

In reply to the honourable member for Adelaide, it is true that by-laws, particularly relating to the Sewers Department, date back to 1935. The Minister has been examining these by-laws for some time for the purpose of bringing them up to date, and has given instructions to the department that every consideration should be given to people with regard to any alterations in the meantime. I hope

that in due course a complete set of the department's by-laws will be freely available through the Government Printer. In fact, that matter is now in hand.

Mr. LAWN—In the meantime, I would like to know what the position is with regard to those people who have already been served with notices to do things which are not covered by the 63 gazetted by-laws.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have already informed the honourable member that the Minister has instructed his department to treat those persons with every consideration. I cannot give him the assurance that under no circumstances will the instruction be insisted upon. In one instance a health matter is involved, and the instruction in the notice will have to be complied with, but I assure the member that those people will get every consideration.

Line passed.

Minister of Education—Miscellaneous, £60,000—passed.

Minister of Agriculture—Agriculture Department, £105,000; Miscellaneous, £25,000—passed.

Grand total, £436,000—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

The Supplementary Estimates having been adopted by the House, an Appropriation Bill for £436,000 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, and taken through its remaining stages.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Public Works Standing Committee, together with minutes of evidence, on Port Augusta sewerage system (final) and Wandilo-Glencoe railway.

Ordered that reports be printed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 6.06 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 27, at 2 p.m.