

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 31, 1954.

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

QUESTIONS.

SATELLITE TOWN NEAR SALISBURY.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Premier give the estimated cost of providing water services and sewerage for the satellite town it is proposed to build near Salisbury to house approximately 25,000 people?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have had a report from the Engineer-in-Chief on these matters. Both matters will have to be referred to the Public Works Committee. The area is extremely suitable for both water supply and sewerage as one of the largest pipelines from the South Para reservoir will run through the centre of it and also because the Commonwealth has already installed sewer facilities in the Long Range Weapons Establishment adjacent to it. Speaking from memory, the estimated cost of providing water to the area is about £740,000 and for sewerage an equivalent amount.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—A statement appeared in the press over the week-end—the announcement should first have been made in Parliament—that a satellite town is now to be established near Salisbury. Can the Premier state whether any provision has been made for motorists to park their vehicles whilst shopping to avoid such congestion as we have in the city of Adelaide and suburbs today?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the honourable member desires I will obtain a copy of a plan of the area, by which he can see that the area has been planned by the Housing Trust to provide the greatest possible facilities and convenience for the residents of the town. I think six shopping centres are proposed, and these will decentralize shopping activities and prevent the heavy congestion that occurs with one main shopping centre, which is a feature of many towns.

INTERSTATE DISPOSAL OF EGGS.

Mr. DUNKS—In 1941, when the Marketing of Eggs Act into existence, certain merchants were registered to establish egg floors to undertake the grading of eggs, and, I understand, were allocated the areas they held before the Act came into operation. One of these men is in difficulties because eggs from the Pinnaroo district are, in the main, going to Victoria. Can the Minister of Agriculture say if this is legal within the terms of the Act and can

he suggest why these eggs should be going over the border?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The trade with Victoria is not violating the Marketing of Eggs Act in any way. As in most of our marketing legislation, there is specific provision for interstate trade because of the operation of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Section 21 of the Marketing of Eggs Act exempts from control any eggs sold or delivered in the course of trade or commerce between the States, so eggs collected by Victorian buyers in South Australian districts are free to go over the border and be sold there.

EXAMINATION OF ACCUSED PERSONS.

Mr. TRAVERS—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the police insisting upon being present at a doctor's examination of an accused person in custody? Can he also inform me whether it was not the universal practice prior to the passing of the Police Offences Act last year that a prisoner could bespeak the presence of a doctor and be examined without a policeman being present? Is it not a fact that a number of medical practitioners rightly object to the presence of a police officer during their professional examination? Will steps be taken to alter the law to enable a prisoner to have a private examination conducted by his own medical man if he so desires?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I referred the question asked last week to the Attorney-General, whose reply is as follows:—

It is a well settled principle of law that, speaking generally, conversations between an arrested man and his legal adviser are privileged, and there is no intention of departing from this principle. It is an equally well settled principle of law that what passes between a patient and his medical adviser is not so privileged. Whether evidence of a communication between a medical man and patient will be tendered in any case will depend on whether it is considered necessary for the ascertainment of the truth. Whether such evidence is admitted will be in the hands of the presiding judge or magistrate who can be relied on to see that the law is properly observed.

The other questions raise new matters, which I shall be pleased to refer to the Attorney-General.

RAIL CONCESSION FARES FOR SCHOLARS.

Mr. TAPPING—Last Monday a class of 32 scholars from the LeFevre Boys Technical School left Adelaide for Tasmania, proceeding by rail to Melbourne and thence by ship

to Hobart; they will return by air. On inquiring from the airline and shipping companies I find that those companies grant concession fares to scholars, but I am informed by the Railways Department that no concession is offered to scholars travelling either intrastate or interstate by rail. Will the Minister of Education take up this matter with the Minister of Railways to see whether some concession can be extended to scholars from the various schools travelling in the charge of a teacher?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I think that before the war the practice of giving rail concessions to scholars did obtain, that it was discontinued during the war, and that it has not been renewed. I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Minister of Railways to find out the position and see whether any reciprocal arrangement is in force between the various State Railways Commissioners. When I have received a report I will consider what should be the practice in future.

GROWERS' BULK HANDLING PLAN.

Mr. HEASLIP—This morning's *Advertiser* contains the following report under the heading "Premier Sees new Wheat Plan.—Growers to pay Costs":—

A plan for the bulk handling of wheat in South Australia has been submitted to the Premier (Mr. Playford) by the bulk-handling committee of the S.A. Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association. . . . Mr. Stott said that the Public Works Committee's plan allowed for money being voted by Parliament for the project, but the association's plan did not require one penny of Government money.

I appreciate the fact that no sum over £30,000 may be voted for a project unless the Public Works Committee has inquired into it, but the committee has been inquiring into a bulk handling scheme for over seven years, whereas Mr. Stott is reported as having said that "the Association's plan did not require one penny of Government money." Can the Premier say whether the proposed growers' plan could overcome the difficulties with which, evidently, the Public Works Committee has been faced for over seven years and is still faced?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Last Friday I received a deputation on this matter from the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association, and I believe that either today or tomorrow their representatives will again call on me with some further details on it. The association has submitted some manuscript of the proposed formation of a company to be the exclusive authority to establish bulk handling centres. While the Australian Wheat Board continues

to function it is suggested that it should pay to the association certain sums each year for the use of the association's facilities and, in the event of the Wheat Board ceasing to function, the company to have the exclusive handling rights of wheat. Broadly, the proposals are on the lines that the company should have the right to use Government wharves and to establish facilities upon them; the right to use railway sidings and in, some instances, additional sidings would be necessary; that the company should be the sole handling authority for bulk wheat in this State and that it should be financed initially under charter by the Commonwealth Bank and by annual levies on the wheatgrowers on a bushel basis, these levies to be of a differential rate; that is, areas receiving the benefit to pay a higher rate than those which do not; after completion of installations the initial levies collected to be repaid and a new current debt substituted to be redeemed by levies on all wheat grown. By way of safeguard a ballot of growers would be held before the scheme could come into operation. Although the bulk handling installations are proposed to be established by the company I believe that the Railways Department might be involved in considerable expense, but until the proposals are in a more concise form it is impossible to express any views upon their merits or otherwise. No figures have been submitted as regards estimated costs, nor is it yet possible to assess whether the type of installation would be suitable. Dual control upon the wharves may be involved and the Harbors Board has not yet reported upon this aspect. In these circumstances my reply is that I have received some proposals but they are not yet advanced to the stage where it is possible for the Government to form an opinion upon their merits.

IMPROPER LITERATURE.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In July, 1952 (*Hansard*, page 140), I drew attention to the Children's Protection Act and a statement by the Premier at a Loan Council meeting about improper literature and asked whether steps could be taken to prevent its circulation. I was informed that because it was published in other States the Government had little or no authority over it. Mr. Travers received a somewhat similar answer the other day. Can the Premier say why the Queensland Government has been able to prohibit the distribution of certain literature, and is the law in South Australia sufficient to prohibit all types of improper literature?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The literature I had in mind when I answered the last question was, so I was informed by the publishing authority, approved literature in Queensland, but I hold it to be highly undesirable. To say that the literature concerned had been prohibited in Queensland is, according to information I have received, not correct. I am informed that the literature we are trying to prohibit has been approved by all other States. If the honourable member would like to examine it to see whether it is desirable, I will show him some of it.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Is the Premier of opinion that our laws are sufficient to prohibit the distribution of improper literature irrespective of where it is printed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I believe that the legislation passed last session with regard to the sale of improper literature from bookstalls is adequate and will enable reasonable supervision to be undertaken. However, the law is quite inadequate in relation to literature which is posted to this State because it does not come into the hands of the public. It is posted to a specific person. We are investigating whether action can be taken against a New South Wales firm which has been distributing in South Australia literature which we believe to be clearly within the prohibitions set out by this Parliament last year.

Mr. Lawn—Is that literature posted to or sold in South Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It was sold here, but for reasons I am not quite sure of, the Crown Law Office was not prepared to recommend a prosecution with regard to the sales. I am not clear what the technicality was. We do know that the stuff is being sent here through the post and if we can get sufficient evidence to take action against the New South Wales distributor we will hold a test case. We have been assured that if sufficient evidence is available a successful prosecution could be launched against the person distributing the material here. Postal matter, of course, is under the control of the Commonwealth Government. It is not possible for the postal authorities to police the type of matter contained in communications addressed through the post.

Mr. O'Halloran—Haven't they to be registered for transmission as newspapers?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Not necessarily; if full postage is paid they do not have to be registered. I believe that the best action is along the lines of Commonwealth-State co-operation, with each State examining very closely all printed matter originating in that

State and the Commonwealth taking far more care about the type of matter it allows to come into the country. Much printed matter coming here conveys, not the most desirable features of life abroad, but its most undesirable features. This is passed by the Commonwealth censorship authorities and is then free to be distributed from one State to another. I assure the honourable member that if the law requires tightening the Government will not hesitate to ask Parliament to review the matter.

MISTLETOE.

Mr. WHITE—I have noticed over an extended period as I have travelled around the country that many of our trees are infested with mistletoe. Some gum trees in the hills are almost covered with it and on a recent trip to Iron Knob I saw that even mulga trees had been affected. This plant is a parasite that lives on the sap supplied by the tree to which it is attached, thus reducing the tree's vitality. In cases where a number of mistletoe feed on the one tree it soon assumes a most bedraggled appearance. I have seen isolated cases where trees have been killed. It is my opinion that the pest is becoming more prevalent. If allowed to interfere with the growth of valuable timber and shade trees it could in time spoil the appearance of our countryside. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell me whether his department has done any research work into the destruction of the pest, or has it devised any means of preventing its spread?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I think everybody appreciates to the full the growing menace of mistletoe. As a matter of fact, the Forestry Department has undertaken a good deal of research work into it. The Forestry Department has conducted experiments since the latter part of 1951 and has met with a good deal of success by using hormone spray 2-4-D. A mixture is injected into the trunk of the tree according to its height and size of trunk. It is also being used as a spray, but the injection method is more applicable where the tree is too large and tall for the mistletoe to be reached by the spray. When using the weedicide very great care must be exercised because if it is used too liberally or not correctly in regard to dosages and the number of applications the host tree could be killed, but by the correct usage a great deal of success has been achieved. Before anyone attempts to use it he should obtain from the department the correct details as to its application. The height and size of the trunk of the tree need to be known in order to determine the

correct dosage. Apart from our own activities, the C.S.I.R.O. has also been conducting experiments at Canberra in the use of other materials, and I understand the New South Wales Forestry Department is also active in trying to discover methods to combat this very serious pest. I re-assure the honourable member that the Forestry Department here is watching the matter very closely with a view to obtaining complete success in the eradication of this pest.

PRICE OF TEA AND PETROL.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—An extraordinary percentage increase has taken place in the price of tea in Australia. Under the heading "Tea price war in Sydney" the following appeared in today's *Advertiser*:—

Many grocers engaged in a tea price cutting "war" today. Some large department stores sold tea at 4s. 5½d. a lb.—1s. 3½d. below the new price of 5s. 9d., which operated officially from today. Other stores sold at varying prices, most of them about 4s. 9d.

Can the Premier say who is responsible for this very large percentage increase and state the basis on which it was made? I ask the question because I have been very perturbed about the disclosures which have taken place in Australia particularly in respect of petrol and oil. We know that all through the war years and since the price of petrol has been controlled by the Prices Ministers, but despite that the companies have blatantly announced that they are investing millions of pounds in a search for petrol in Australia because of the support given to them by consumers within Australia. Crudely, that means . . .

The SPEAKER—I think the honourable member is asking two questions—one about tea and one about petrol. I should like him to ask one at a time.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I referred to petrol because I fear that what has taken place with petrol and oils will now take place with tea, inasmuch that under the protection and guise of price control the petrol and oil companies of Australia have exploited Australians, and I am afraid that the same will take place again. I would take a lot of convincing that the Sydney stores are making a loss with the reduced price of 1s. a lb. for tea. Will the Premier explain who set the price and what evidence they had in fixing it at 5s. 9d. lb., and whether as Prices Minister he had any say in the matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The position is that although Australians are paying for tea

a very much higher price than previously, it is still below world parity. The Commonwealth Government is still providing a subsidy on importations to meet some of the costs which have risen very steeply overseas. Towards the end of last year the subsidy that the Commonwealth Government was paying was increasing sharply because overseas prices had increased sharply, and the Commonwealth informed the Prices Ministers that it would be prepared to continue paying a subsidy but not increase it. This meant that the increased overseas costs automatically had to be passed on to the Australian consumer. The varying prices of tea in New South Wales is not a new feature. For a considerable time in that State there has been a price-cutting competition among various stores and from time to time various commodities have been used to advertise a particular shop or a particular line so as to attract customers. The average price of commodities in New South Wales is considerably higher than in South Australia, for the "C" series index figures normally disclose a cost of living in New South Wales about 10s. a week higher than in South Australia.

With regard to petrol, it is true that there have been large investments from overseas in additional facilities during the last few years, but I believe that the public has not been charged an unduly high price. This matter has been subject to continuous audit by the State's best officers. Overseas costs are being checked continuously; the lower platt, which is the international quote, is always accepted as the basis of fixing our price; freight rates are closely checked; the margins provided on capital invested have not been high; and no amount has been allowed for one-service petrol station expenditure. Moreover, we have obliged the industry to absorb a considerable amount of increased working expenses to offset the large increase in turnover as a result of the increased number of vehicles on the road. If the honourable member desires, I can give him more complete details in connection with these matters.

NEW TRAMWAY BUSES.

Mr. JENNINGS—It was recently announced that the first of the new diesel buses for the Tramways Trust will be operating within a month. Can the Premier ascertain from the trust whether any of these buses will be used to improve the two inadequate services now being run between Northfield and the city and Gilles Plains and the city, and whether it is

intended to provide a direct service to those two points to obviate the confusion that now exists as the result of passengers having to transfer from trams to buses?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will try to get that information for the honourable member and let him have it in due course.

GAWLER SEWERAGE.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Can the Premier say whether it would be possible to institute a sewerage scheme for Gawler in conjunction with the scheme for the satellite town?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The two places are somewhat distant from each other, but I will have the matter examined. It will be necessary this year for the Government to bring down legislation in connection with water and sewer matters, and I think that the House will then have to review the whole question of sewerage, particularly the necessity and best method of providing sewers in country areas. The Public Works Committee has been inquiring into some of these matters and has submitted interim reports, but since the legislation was enacted there has been such a substantial increase in the cost of sewerage that the fixed rate declared under the Act has no relation to present-day costs. I believe the Public Works Committee has experienced difficulty in that connection. I will, however, ascertain to what extent Gawler can be included in the proposals to be referred to the committee.

BOAT HAVENS.

Mr. McALEES—Some time ago the Harbors Board visited both Moonta Bay and Wallaroo. Can the Premier say whether a report has been received from the board with relation to the establishment of boat havens at these ports and whether it is proposed to proceed with their construction?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This matter has been under review for many years and I can remember a previous member for the district submitting such a proposal to me in relation to Wallaroo. I agree that it is a subject on which finality should be reached and I will try to get a report as to what the Harbors Board can do and when the work will be undertaken.

AMENDMENT OF JUSTICES ACT.

Mr. TRAVERS—A provision in the Justices Act requires that during the preliminary hearing of an indictable offence the evidence shall be taken down and signed by the witnesses and

the presiding magistrate. The net result is that quite frequently the court and counsel have to sit for long periods while the deposition clerk is reading back the depositions to the witnesses. This, apparently, is a survival from old days when the justice took down the evidence. These delays add considerably to the length of hearings and to the costs. The matter could be solved best by providing that the clerk who reads back the evidence shall be the person to sign it, as well as the witness. Will the Premier obtain a report from Crown Law officials on the matter and ascertain whether some amendment could be made to prevent this waste of time?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Legislation amending the Justices Act will be introduced this year and I will direct the Crown Law Department to consider the question raised by the honourable member to see whether suitable amendments might be included.

EXPLOSION IN HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Premier say whether a serious explosion occurred this morning in the basement of the building in which the headquarters of the Highways Department are situated, and whether any loss of life or serious injury to persons, or considerable damage resulted. Further, is the cause of the explosion known and are any steps necessary to prevent such occurrences in future?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is a fact that a serious explosion did occur in the basement of Richards Building this morning. The Minister of Local Government has reported that, as far as can be ascertained, the cause of the explosion was petrol seepage from disused tanks which had not been removed from an adjoining area. The explosion caused a considerable amount of damage, but I understand that there has been no loss of life. The Minister also assured me that arrangements were being immediately made for the housing of the department pending further investigations.

NEW KLEMZIG SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS—The site at Klemzig on which the Education Department proposes building a new school is liberally blessed with both natural and planted trees, including almond and fruit trees. Recently a sewer was laid through the site and some trees were destroyed. I do not allege any wanton destruction because possibly they were removed to enable the sewers to be laid. As the remaining trees will be a great acquisition to the school,

will the Minister of Education arrange for an inventory of remaining trees to be taken with a view to ensuring that no more trees are destroyed than is absolutely necessary?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I will be pleased to do so.

DRAINAGE SCHEME FOR GLOSSOP.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—For a number of years residents of Glossop, supported by the Berri council, have approached the responsible department to see whether some scheme could be initiated to rid Glossop of surplus water on the sandy irrigation area. I discussed this matter with Mr. Ide, the engineer in charge, about a week ago, and he told me there was a scheme for draining the area. Has the department such a scheme and if so can the Minister outline it?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The drainage question in Glossop has been considered by the Irrigation Department and the engineers concerned. This morning I made inquiries as a result of correspondence from the honourable member's district, and I have been promised a report this week.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT.

Mr. TRAVERS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week on the Government's attitude towards amending section 54 of the Administration and Probate Act, which allows a first charge upon the estate of an intestate husband up to only £500 for the widow, to bring it into line with the Succession Duties Act which provides for an exemption of £2,800?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This matter has been examined and the Government has approved an amendment to be submitted to Parliament. The precise terms of the amendment are now being examined by the Crown Law Office.

EGG BOARD SURPLUS.

Mr. DUNKS—In the report of the Auditor-General for the financial year ended June 30, 1953, it is stated that the Egg Board had total funds and reserves of £200,782 made up of funds received from the Commonwealth Controller of Egg Supplies of £88,150, a surplus from the previous year of £85,562 and a surplus for the year 1952-53 of £27,070. Can the Minister of Agriculture state tomorrow what is the present surplus?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I will be glad to obtain this information for the honourable member.

TRAIN WHISTLE BLASTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 18 concerning the sounding of warning whistles by trains approaching level crossings?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Minister of Railways has furnished me with a report obtained from the Railways Commissioner; it reads as follows:—

With reference to the question asked by Mr. F. Walsh, M.P., *vide Hansard* of August 18, the honourable the Minister is advised that there is no section in the Coroner's Act, 1935-1952, making it obligatory on the part of the Railways Commissioner to ensure that trains shall whistle on approaching level crossings. However, in cases of fatal accidents at crossings, the coroner always ascertains if the warning whistle had been given. Accidents have occurred at crossings equipped with warning devices through inattention on the part of the road user, and to discontinue the supplementary warning by the engine whistle would eliminate one of the safety features. Engine-men are required by regulations to whistle, at the prescribed distance, on approaching all level crossings except those protection by gates or guarded by crossing keepers or station staff, as an added warning to persons who may be about to traverse such crossings. Any failure on the part of the staff could result in the Railways Commissioner being held liable in the event of an accident arising therefrom. I could not agree, therefore, to relax or modify the warning as now given.

MOUNT GAMBIER RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about the date on which trials are likely to be carried out on the running of rail cars between Mount Gambier and Adelaide?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received a report from the Railways Commissioner which reads as follows:—

The first of the new railcars for country passenger services is now undergoing trial. It is anticipated that the second railcar will be ready for testing the week after next. The first of the new trailer cars will not be ready until six weeks later. Consideration is being given to the replacement of the steam day train to Mount Gambier with a new railcar train, which would be made up on some days of two railcars and one trailer car. Consequently, it will not be possible to run trials on the Mount Gambier line with the new cars until at least two railcars and one trailer car are available, which it is anticipated will be about the end of October. However, a regular service of railcars on the Mount Gambier day train will not be possible until a sufficient number of cars and trailers are available to operate this and other country passenger services.

PORT PIRIE SEWERAGE SCHEME.

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 3 relating to the proposed sewerage scheme for Port Pirie?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will obtain a report on this matter and let the honourable member have it, probably tomorrow.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—In connection with harbour improvement schemes in Port Adelaide and Semaphore electorates, what are the costs to date to the Government of acquiring:—(a) hotels; (b) other properties exclusive of vacant allotments; and (c) vacant allotments?

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

- (a) £47,230.
- (b) £124,475.
- (c) £307,663.

PRICES LEGISLATION.

Mr. DUNKS (on notice)—What is the monthly cost of administering the prices legislation in South Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The expenditure on administration of the Prices Branch during the full financial year 1953-54 was £68,027.

JAMESTOWN-CALTOWIE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice).—

1. What is the estimated cost of completing the Jamestown-Caltowie water scheme, including the additional amount provided to increase the diameter of the main from Spalding to Jamestown to enable a supply for Peterborough and Terowie to be provided later?

2. When is it anticipated that this work will be completed?

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. An amount of £510,000 has been expended on the scheme up to the present, and a further expenditure of £75,000 will be necessary to complete the work.

2. The end of November, 1954.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

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

of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1952.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

Grand total, £27,295,000.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 24. Page 461.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—In introducing the Loan Estimates the Treasurer said:—

These Estimates provide for an expenditure of £27,295,000. The Commonwealth Government is also making available to the State, pursuant to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, £3,600,000. This makes a total of £30,895,000 available for expenditure on capital works during the year, as against a gross expenditure last year of £30,013,201.

I draw members' attention to the Premier's statement that £30,895,000 would be made available for expenditure. In the course of his speech the Treasurer indicated that the Commonwealth Government had not undertaken to provide anything from revenue towards the implementation of the State's loan programme for the current year and as I believe, speaking from memory, that last year the Commonwealth supplemented the amount raised by public loans by some £75,000,000 it will be seen that a good deal of optimism has been used in arriving at the estimate of a total expenditure of over £30,000,000 for this year. Consequently we must realize that there is no guarantee that the loan funds available will be sufficient for the programme set out in these estimates. Another point to which I draw attention is that, owing to the increase in interest rates, all loan works are becoming more costly to service and consequently less profitable to the State; probably profitable is not the correct word; perhaps I should say more unprofitable, added to which, of course, most of our public works are costing more than originally estimated.

The inclusion of a statement of expenditure of some items in the Treasurer's review last week was a welcome innovation, but we are entitled to more information as to how much has been spent on a given public work and how much work has been done. In other words, what value the State has received for the expenditure of the people's money. Another point worthy of notice was the Treasurer's reference to the availability of steel. In view

of the way this matter has been ventilated in our Parliament in recent years all members are cognizant of the fact that it should be no longer necessary to import steel in any great quantity, and that steel works should have been established in South Australia pursuant to the Broken Hill Proprietary Co's Indenture Act, relative to the construction of the Morgan-Whyalla water main. That was a long time ago and as has been pointed out on previous occasions, if that agreement had been honoured and the steel works established very major savings would have accrued to the State, particularly in recent years when not only our public works programme has been expanded enormously, but so much private building and manufacturing has necessitated the importation of increasingly large quantities of steel from overseas. It seems that the Premier has so many projects in hand that it is impossible to make satisfactory progress with any of them and the creation of this situation ought not to be used as an excuse for having to import steel at high prices. The Premier should concentrate on the agreement with the company and have cognizance of the resolution unanimously carried last session about the expediency of the construction of steel works at Whyalla.

The Treasurer referred to the shortage of labour as well as materials and pointed out the difficulties confronting the Hospitals Department, especially with reference to the completion of the Queen Elizabeth hospital. This, too, indicates that the Government is endeavouring to handle too many public projects at the same time. I am reminded of the fact that, with the continued growth of the metropolitan area and the resultant increase in population, the completion of the Queen Elizabeth hospital will not solve the problem. I visualize the necessity of another public hospital to provide for those areas south of the city which have been so extensively built on in recent years. Now, of course, we have the proposal for a tremendous expansion to the north of the city which will undoubtedly require hospital facilities in the not distant future. In view of the difficulties encountered in erecting the Queen Elizabeth hospital I suggest that a start should be made now to plan proper hospital facilities for the metropolitan area. My inquiries, both in Australia and overseas, convince me that very large public hospitals are not desirable; they are costly to erect and difficult to supervise and maintain. They result in patients having to travel long distances and, of course, impose some hardship

on those who desire to visit friends or relatives. Our plan should be to determine how many beds should be in a hospital, the number of hospitals required in the metropolitan area, and where they should be situated. The architectural plans should be begun in such a way that the building of the institutions will not be held up. The Premier said that the labour position in the State will be relieved only by means of migration, but he also complained that migration has increased the demand for public services. Surely that is something like the dog chasing its tail. Migrants are brought here to solve the labour problem, but their being here has caused a greater demand for services. I do not oppose migration, but I do not agree with the pronouncement made in another State by the Premier that he thought future migration schemes should be based on workers and not families. Bringing only single men here from other parts of the world is not the way to deal with the various grand schemes thought of by the Premier from time to time. He said:—

The Government desires, as speedily as possible, to extend many of these utilities to the country in order to give country people the same facilities as those enjoyed by people in the city and metropolitan areas. By making modern conveniences available to people in country areas, the Government can foster in the people a desire to live in the country and thus assist in stopping the drift of population to the city. I have said before in the House that we need more larger country towns. This is very evident when the cost of social services in this State is compared with that in some of the other larger States such as Victoria and New South Wales with their larger towns and greater density of population. We need more towns with a population of over 10,000, and we need many more with a population of 5,000 to 10,000 people. We cannot hope to achieve this unless we provide services to country towns and their surrounding districts so that the people can have a standard of living which is comparable with that enjoyed by city dwellers.

That was one of the most remarkable statements ever made by the Premier. He has had many years in which to encourage people to live in the country.

Mr. John Clark—He has been talking about it for years.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, and doing nothing about it. When we have suggested that something should be done to decentralize population he has said it is not the Government's policy to force people to live anywhere, but that same Government has consistently refused to give industrial conditions to country people similar to those enjoyed by employees in the

metropolitan area. I have in mind rural employees particularly. Progress in mechanization of farms has also been the means of reducing the number of country employees. There has been not much drift by the landowners except, as has been suggested from time to time, by way of retirement of those who have sold their properties and come to the metropolitan area. It is not so much a matter of the drift of population from the country to the city as the enormous increase in the city population. If positive steps had been taken to establish industries in the country that drift would be much less marked. The population of the extra-metropolitan area has remained constant for many years, but the population in the area itself has increased alarmingly. Amenities, such as the provision of water, electricity, etc., will not attract an appreciable number of people back to the country. It goes without saying that landowners will remain there in any case, but workers need to be assured of employment in the country before they will go there. I ask members to peruse the Loan Estimates line by line and they will see, with the possible exception of two or three districts, that nothing is being done to increase the capacity of our vast country areas and result in the permanent employment of many additional persons. It ought to be stressed also that most landowners have their own amenities. The Premier will find that many will not be anxious to have their properties connected with electricity when it is available from an outside main. Towns are not built up artificially merely by the provision of amenities, but if industries were established population would be attracted, and then amenities would naturally follow.

Some sort of plan for the decentralization of industry must precede the creation of towns with the population of 5,000 or 10,000 that the Premier spoke about. This was stressed some time ago in my motion for an inquiry into decentralization of industry and population. The terms of that motion must be well known to most members and I do not intend to elaborate upon them except to say that in these Loan Estimates there is not even a glimmer of an attempt to give effect to the sound principles that were expressed in the motion, which was defeated by the votes of country members sitting on the Government side. They were the votes of men who were sent here by their constituents to espouse the welfare of country people. I suppose they will take the same view of these Loan Estimates as they took of the motion and support them in their entirety irres-

pective of the consequences to the country as a whole, and particularly in the years to come when we have to foot some of the bills that will accrue from the expenditure of this Loan money. In any case Government policy has been such that it will be extremely difficult to make any thorough-going attack on this problem of decentralization. The Treasurer has been more interested in having huge projects undertaken without due consideration of the real problems of development. If he is interested in the development of country towns he should contemplate the many ghost towns in the State and the reaggregation of rural holdings which is taking place.

This brings me to a point which is of vital importance at present. It was raised by the member for Goodwood today when he referred to the establishment of a satellite suburb for Adelaide. That is what it will become, even in my lifetime. If the Government wanted to build satellite towns and do something effective about decentralization of population and industry, there are other places where the money could have been better spent. The announcement of a beginning of the construction of the new satellite town came as a bolt from the blue in the week-end press. Some of the money to be used on this project must be included somewhere in these Estimates, which were presented to us a week ago today. Why could not the Treasurer have told us then that it was proposed to begin the development of this suburb and that apparently most of the money voted for the Housing Trust for homes, and probably a great proportion of the £3,000,000 to be provided by the Commonwealth for housing, will be required to build houses in this area? Also, why did not he tell the House what proportion of the £1,500,000 required this year for sewerage and water schemes would be for this area? No authoritative statement has been made on the subject to Parliament, which is responsible for voting the money, but is the last body to be consulted on the matter. We secure our information from the week-end press. I have spoken on this before, and will speak on it in future until the responsibility of the Treasurer and the Government to Parliament is recognized and we are consulted on such expenditure before it is glibly and finally entered into.

Mr. John Clark—Do you think that time will come?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, because such actions will bring about a change of Government, and if I sit where the Treasurer now sits I can assure members that such things will not

happen in my time. We are told in the week-end press that the total cost of the undertaking at North Salisbury will be £20,000,000 and that some 6,000 houses will be constructed to accommodate 25,000 people. Four thousand of these homes are to be erected by the Housing Trust. We are also told that many of the houses will be of double-unit construction. Let us see how this figure of £20,000,000 squares up with a reasonably intelligent guess as to the possible total expenditure. To begin with, allowing for the houses to be built for the very low cost of £3,000 each—and I say they cannot be built for such a low figure for many years—that will entail an expenditure of £18,000,000 of the total of £20,000,000. In addition there is the cost of the land, and expenditure on the provision of sewerage and water supplies, the construction of roads, schools, extra railway facilities and other amenities required to complete this satellite suburb. Therefore, it seems to me that the £20,000,000 is just a nice, round, grand total that someone thought of, but we are committed to this expenditure irrevocably. What the consequences will be I do not know, but I know that one consequence will be that the decentralization of industry and population will be made extremely difficult for many years. Let us look at the money to be spent from this year's Estimates. One of the most important items mentioned by the Treasurer in the list of amenities is the provision of sewerage for country towns, including £60,000 for Salisbury. As honourable members realize, the time is not far distant when Salisbury can no longer be regarded as a country town, but will simply become a northern suburb. It is proposed to spend £40,000 at Port Lincoln on similar projects, making a total of £100,000, whereas great industrial areas like Port Pirie and Port Augusta and other towns that should be developed, but are not being developed because of the Government's policy, will not have a penny spent on sewerage as a result of these Loan Estimates.

Mr. Pearson—I thought you said that Port Pirie and Port Augusta were not developed?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am not objecting to £40,000 being spent at Port Lincoln, which is a delectable township and very well represented by the honourable member. Despite that, however, I will do my best to change the representation at the next election and provide an even better representative, and no doubt I will succeed in both respects. Port Lincoln, which has opportunities for expansion, is the unofficial capital of Eyre Peninsula and must develop in size and importance as the years roll by. The provision of a sewerage scheme will undoubtedly assist in that development. If the Treasurer and the Government had been sincere in their efforts to extend more amenities to country areas we should have had many towns with populations of 5,000, 10,000 or more. Just visualize what could have been done with this £20,000,000 spread over a period of years! Supposing £1,000,000 had been allocated to each of 20 towns—and there are more than 20 towns in this State with great potentialities for development—what would have been the result? We should have had a great decentralization of population and industry, and a tremendous increase in the safety of our citizens, for if we ever become involved in another major war decentralization would be a tremendous advantage.

It seems that much pride is being taken in establishing at Salisbury industries associated with the Woomera defence project, but I do not think they should have been established there. The natural place for these industries is Port Augusta, where we have recently established a large power station and where there is an almost unlimited area of cheap land. Port Augusta has many suitable sites between the gulf and the beautiful Flinders Range which would lend themselves to a satellite town. Further, it is so much nearer to the point where weapons will be required and it is situated strategically much safer. I have prepared a table showing the principal items of Loan works, the total Loan expenditure to June, 1954, proposed expenditure for this financial year, and the grand total as at June 1955. It is as follows:—

Item.	To June, 1954.	1954-55 (net).	To June, 1955:
	£	£	£
State Bank	6,480,000	1,624,000	8,104,000
Railways	26,188,000	2,066,000	28,254,000
Harbours	10,846,000	775,000	11,621,000
Engineering and Water Supply	42,013,000	5,375,000	47,388,000
Housing Trust	19,957,000	4,600,000	24,557,000
Leigh Creek	3,588,000	400,000	3,988,000
Electricity Trust	26,322,000	5,000,000	31,322,000
M.T.T.	6,332,000	500,000	6,832,000
Uranium	4,215,000	3,000,000	7,215,000

In order to show the impact on our annual finances of this increase in Loan expenditure I have prepared a table showing the interest on the public debt, including trust funds, exchange on interest payable overseas, and sinking fund payments for the period 1946-47 to 1952-53. It is as follows:—

Year.	Amount. £
1946-47	5,113,000
1947-48	5,165,000
1948-49	5,344,000
1949-50	5,596,000
1950-51	5,851,000
1951-52	6,493,000
1952-53	7,051,000

During that period the sinking fund increased from £901,000 to £1,467,000. The public debt at June, 1947, was £114,000,000, but at June, 1954, it was £218,000,000, an increase of £104,000,000 in seven years. They are big figures, but that huge expenditure has not achieved a corresponding increase in productive capacity which would in normal times enable the State to meet the increased interest and sinking fund commitments.

Mr. Macgillivray—How many taxpayers in this State have to carry this increasing burden?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It would be difficult to get that figure, for the bulk of our revenue is derived from reimbursement of income tax by the Commonwealth and from disabilities grants. I have noticed that our disabilities grant is diminishing, and in view of the Treasurer's statements that South Australia is the most prosperous State, it is obvious that there will not be much justification for maintaining our disabilities grant for long.

Mr. Macgillivray—He did not say how many of our motor cars, refrigerators, and other commodities have been bought on time payment.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I do not want to anticipate the debate on my excellent hire purchase legislation, but I hope that I will have the full and competent support of the honourable member on that measure. Most of the huge expenditure to which the Treasurer is committed is non-productive. Of course, some is non-productive only for the time being, such as expenditure on uranium development. According to the Premier's speech, a considerable proportion of the £3,000,000 to be voted this year will apparently be used to meet ordinary working expenses. We can only hope that this undertaking will be successful because if it is not we will be faced with a difficult position. In the more restricted sense, most of our public works are non-productive in that they are

costing much more to provide than they will return. In other words, the State is losing on them. This applies particularly to railways, although that utility is not costing as much as it did a year or two ago. It applies especially to the Municipal Tramways Trust, to which I shall refer later in this debate.

A matter of vital concern to my district is that there is no provision in this year's Estimates for a water supply for Peterborough and Terowie. I realize that in previous years provision was made to sufficiently enlarge the main from Spalding to Jamestown to enable the extensions to Peterborough and Terowie to be carried out later. That extension becomes more urgent each year it is delayed. The matter was investigated by the Public Works Committee in 1947 and it found that it was practicable to provide a water supply from the Morgan-Whyalla trunk main at a point near Spalding to the towns of Jamestown and Caltowie, and to intervening country lands. It also found that it was practicable to make that scheme of sufficient size to enable extensions to be laid to the towns of Yongala, Terowie and Peterborough, should no other sources of good water be found to be adequate. Extensive investigations have been made since then to find a source of good water to supply the towns of Yongala, Peterborough and Terowie, but they have been completely unsuccessful.

The estimated costs of the schemes then were totally different from what they are now. The Jamestown-Caltowie scheme was then estimated to cost £172,000, but today it would cost over £400,000. The continuation to Peterborough, which was then estimated to cost about £200,000, would now cost about £500,000. Costs do not seem to have any effect on considerations of supplies to satellite suburbs and other older-established districts which have had the benefit of water supplies for many years. An amount of £1,010,650 is to be expended on the Beetaloo, Bundaleer and Baroota water district. I realize that this expenditure is necessary and that it is required primarily to increase the size of the mains to enable sufficient water to be provided to the large farms which have grown up in that area as a result of re-aggregation in the past few years and which are being conducted as sheep farms rather than as wheat farms. We are prepared to spend £1,000,000 on that but we are not prepared to spend £500,000 on providing water for Yongala, Terowie and Peterborough, the latter two towns being important railway centres where the work of the railways is hampered year after year by the provision of water which is not really

suitable for locomotives. In addition, there is the tremendous annual cost of carting water to both places. I have the figures for the last six years; they are as follows:—

Cost of Cartage of Water by Railways for Peterborough and Terowie.

Year.	Peter- borough.	Terowie.	Total.
	£	£	£
1948-49	262	5,300	5,562
1949-50	—	2,372	2,372
1950-51	9,400	7,826	17,226
1951-52	391	11,773	12,164
1952-53	425	17,042	17,467
1953-54	500	23,608	24,108

Total for 6 yrs. 10,978 67,921 78,899

Those figures do not include the cost of the water at the points from which it was procured. I do not object to that, because if the water is piped to Peterborough the Railways Department will still have to pay the Engineering and Water Supply Department for it, but the cost of cartage could be saved. The cost of locomotive maintenance has increased enormously at both depots because the department has been forced to use water which is not suitable for locomotive steaming purposes. It is idle to talk to the people in those towns about the provision of amenities. There was a swimming pool at Peterborough but it had to be abandoned because the local water supply was not sufficient to keep it full. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has warned the local council that it may not grant permission for the installation of any more septic tank systems in the town because the water supply is not sufficient to enable the tanks to be flushed. I am getting a bit sick and tired of that area being left out in the cold when a small portion of the expenditure we are asked to approve annually in the Loan Estimates would be sufficient to meet requirements. Let us consider some of the replies to my questions recently. At one stage it seemed that provision would be made in this year's Estimates. On July 27 I asked the Minister of Works a question on this matter and was told that the Government has already spent an additional £130,000 on the pipeline. He said that when the extension was reported on by the Public Works Committee in 1947 the cost was estimated at £206,000 but on present day prices for materials and labour the estimated cost is about £541,000 in addition to the £130,000 already spent. The Minister went on to say:—

Since the Public Works Committee's report was furnished a marked change has occurred in the economics of steam locomotives against diesel locomotives. The savings effected with

the limited number of diesel trains already in operation are such that the Government has decided to use diesel locomotives wherever possible as soon as the units can be procured. These of course would not need the large quantities of water required by the locomotives now in use and this would result in a considerable reduction in the volume of water used at Peterborough, especially for railway purposes.

He also said that the Government is constructing £16,000,000 worth of water and sewer works, but these are mainly in the metropolitan area. A suggestion has been made that the Peterborough division will be equipped with diesel locomotives but I cannot find any mention of this in the Estimates and I do not think the Government has ever thought of this except as an excuse to put off the water scheme for a further year. Only 12 months ago the railways imported 10 new Garratt locomotives at fairly high cost and anyone familiar with the subject knows that this type of engine is probably the most efficient water sucker of the steam types, although they are excellent engines and haul tremendous loads. This applies also to the T class engines, but I venture to say that the department will continue to use them on the Peterborough line for many years and will be committed to an average annual expenditure of over £11,000 to carry water for railway purposes only. That would provide most of the interest and sinking fund on the cost of the water scheme even at the additional cost that has taken place since the Public Works Committee's investigation.

Mr. Lawn—Do the supporters of the Government know that?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No, and they have admitted it on more than one occasion.

A Member—Nor does the Opposition.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No, but at least it makes an effort to find out whereas the supporters of the Government just sit and blandly take what is handed out to them. A few years ago assessments for water rates in the metropolitan area were increased by an average of about one-third and the little bird that sits on the crossarm just down the street and whispers in a sweet tone to passers-by has whispered in my ear that there will be a 50 per cent increase this year although apparently there is no suggestion of altering the method of assessing broad acres in the country. That method is totally unrealistic in relation to present day land values and if the metropolitan assessments are to be increased again and no re-adjustments of assessments is to be made in the country it will be a crime against the

voteless people in the metropolitan area whose votes are concentrated in such a way that they cannot be used effectively; as a result this policy goes on year after year almost *ad infinitum*. The people in the metropolitan area have had water restrictions imposed on them for many years and probably will have them again. Bore water has been pumped into the mains all the time but I admit that it is very good bore water and if we had it in Peterborough we would not be worrying about the Morgan-Whyalla water. Metropolitan bore water carries about 50 grains of salt to the gallon whereas the water at Peterborough has about 112 grains to a gallon.

Mr. Fletcher—It is almost solid water.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, evaporation in the warm weather almost turns it into salt. I do not agree with the manner in which the financing of the Woods and Forests Department is carried out, the whole of the expenditure being provided from loan funds and all receipts from the department's activities being repaid to that fund. The Loan Estimates reveal that the department expended £1,075,361 last year and that £1,300,000 will be provided this year; of this amount administration will cost £155,000, maintenance of forests £112,000, working expenses of mills £379,000 and felling of timber £126,000, leaving £528,000 for other purposes. In the early days when this undertaking was being established it was perfectly sound to finance it entirely from loan; it had to be a long range undertaking and at least 12 to 15 years had to elapse before there could be even a moderate return from plantings. However, we have long since reached the stage when a change in the method of accounting is necessary and the department should have been put on an annual income and expenditure basis in the same way as the railways, Engineering and Water Supply Department and other departments mentioned in the Estimates. It is beyond my comprehension why the administrative expenses, maintenance expenses, and the wage costs of running the sawmills and felling the timber should be charged to Loan Account. These departmental accounts should be put on a business-like basis before the presentation of next year's Loan Estimates. Their present form does nothing to encourage real efficiency and contentment in the department. Why should the salaries of all officers employed in the department be paraded in these Estimates for all the world to see? This practice does not obtain with regard to the salaries of officers of the Engineering and

Water Supply, Railways or any other department whose capital costs are financed by means of these Estimates. I hope the Treasurer will consider changing the method of charging the expenditure of the Woods and Forests Department.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—Mr. O'Halloran's speech today was, as usual, so clear and thoughtful and such a powerful and complete analysis of the Loan Estimates that, as I listened, I longed for the day when I should have the honour of sitting on the Government benches behind him as our Premier. I was pleased to hear the Treasurer give more details in his speech on the Loan Estimates this year than previously, but still more details are necessary. Particularly in the early part of his speech he made one or two rather amazing statements, and, although Mr. O'Halloran commented on South Australia's steel supplies, I draw members' attention to the following statement by the Treasurer:—

Materials have been in more plentiful supply during the year, more so than for many years past, except in the case of steel, where it has been necessary to resort again to importation of certain types and sizes of steel which are unobtainable, with any degree of certainty, from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. That is, obviously, an admission of a shortage of steel, yet the Treasurer, in reply to questions last week by the member for Stuart, showed that he could not see eye to eye with the Director of Mines when that officer, from his long experience and expert knowledge, advocated what he considered an essential step towards effectively easing our steel shortage. Nor does the Premier seem particularly anxious to implement the resolution passed last session with regard to the setting up of a steel works at Whyalla. We are short of certain types of steel, yet we are not allowed to take steps to remedy that shortage. I use the words "not allowed" advisedly, because, in his speech on the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer continued:—

The company has agreed with the Commonwealth Government that it will not object to importation of structural and other types of steel from overseas.

How magnanimous of the B.H.P. not to object to the importation of steel from overseas! Last week the Premier answered a question on this subject by the member for Stuart in an evasive way, using the words "would not object." South Australians and Australians generally are entitled to ask, "Who really rules Australia?" The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Housing Trust project which is known as the "satellite town," but

which he aptly termed the "satellite suburb," and I must speak on this subject, because Gawler, the largest town in my electorate, has been the victim of this absurd proposal. In referring to the extension of the various essential utilities to country areas, the Treasurer said:—

The Government desires, as speedily as possible, to extend many of these utilities to the country in order to give country people the same facilities as those enjoyed by people in the city and metropolitan areas.

If that statement were not serious, it could be taken as an enormous joke, but many people, both inside and outside this House, wonder whether such a statement is genuine, and it is impossible to blame them for their doubts. In 1920 the metropolitan population was 51.64 per cent of that of the State; in 1953 it was 61.27 per cent. Do those figures make it appear that the much talked of decentralization policy of the Playford Government has meant anything, or do they create doubts whether that policy has achieved anything? Actions speak louder than words, so let us examine the Treasurer's actions in this matter.

Mr. Hutchens—Has there been any action?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Some, but whether it is in a reverse or forward direction I am at a loss to understand. Under the line headed "South Australian Housing Trust" the trust will have made available to it under the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement £3,600,000 from funds allocated by the Loan Council. How much of this is to be spent on the "satellite suburb" scheme? We can be quite sure that the Housing Trust's activities which, in the main, will be diverted to building this huge suburb, will absorb a considerable part of it and we should be told how much is to be spent on this wild-cat scheme. For months, in fact for years, I have been trying to get from the Treasurer, by way of question and other means, some details about it; just when it would start and what the plans were and so forth. I managed to get a little and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition also has managed, with great difficulty, to get a few scant crumbs dropped to him, but suddenly over the week-end the press was put in the fortunate position of being able to get the lot—and I do not blame them for publishing it. If we have a Premier of the type who prefers to release information to the press instead of to Parliament, good luck to them, and they are fully entitled to publish it, but I say again in support of what the Leader of the Opposition has said, and what we have all on this side said

on occasions too numerous to be counted, that schemes of such magnitude involving expenditure of such very large amounts of public money should be released in Parliament first, and I do not think anyone can deny that. Of course the Premier was simply running true to form as this is his normal procedure. Most members can recall—it was long before I had the honour of being sent here—when this scheme was first mooted. The Government planned, entirely without reference to Parliament, to create a satellite town in the paddocks north of Salisbury while there were already established towns, such as Gawler, crying out for development. I qualify that by saying that the proposal would never have been discussed within these walls but for an unsuccessful motion condemning it which came from this side of the House, moved by the member for Stanley, Mr. Quirke. History and *Hansard* record that the scheme was supported by Government members in their entirety, including country members who surely stood to lose most by it, and was opposed just as unanimously by members on this side.

Mr. Macgillivray—But you must be fair to them. Government supporters have not much option.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is probably so. I am reminded of the old gramophone records which had that picture of the dear little doggie on the label listening to His Master's Voice—and how that doggie listened. I repeat that that proposal, which was given to the press in all its details before it came to Parliament, was begun in the same way, and although it was discussed in this place it was only because of a motion moved by a private member without any hope of success. I say quite plainly that this scheme gives the lie direct to Premier's much vaunted talk of decentralization. That is why we, who really believe in decentralization, opposed it then and have done ever since. It represents yet another step in the Government's policy of centralization—probably for gerrymander purposes—which has proved so detrimental to the interests of South Australia. It appears certain that a town of considerable size so close to Adelaide will eventually mean the withdrawal of all the intervening land from production. I submit that that is not only possible, but very nearly a certainty, and the population in the metropolitan area, already swollen to proportions much too large to be economical, will be even more swollen. It appears that the word "decentralization" has different meanings,

according to whether one sits on the Government side or on the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. Hutchens—Perhaps it has no meaning.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I think it has a meaning, but it is a peculiar one and does not seem to be adequately understood by at least some members sitting behind the Government. I can visualize that Adelaide in the very near future will sprawl to Gawler, for I have no faith in the Bill now before us to prevent it. I recall the words uttered by Mr. W. R. Lawrie, past president of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, when this scheme was mooted some years ago. He said, when the bombshell was first dropped:—

Satellite towns should be located far enough from the metropolis to enable them to develop their own individuality, and it is better to develop existing towns than to spend millions of pounds on building new places in paddocks. He went on to say, in substance, that the minimum distance of a satellite town from a capital city should be about 25 miles. If it were closer it became merely a dormitory for people who worked in the city. I admit that in this scheme a small attempt is being made to prevent the use of the new town as a dormitory, but I am afraid it will not be successful. Mr. Lawrie particularly instanced Gawler as an ideal example of a potential satellite town—and so it is. To the people in Gawler and district this scheme has always been—and will be more so now since the fatal news was blazoned across the pages of the press on Saturday and Sunday—a smack in the face, a punch on the nose, a kick in the shins, or whatever you like to call it. It can only be regarded as a direct and unsympathetic insult to them by the Premier who has never shown any signs of being interested in the town.

The new suburb will be sewered. Like my predecessor in this House, I have been trying for some time to get sewerage for Gawler. In 1949 the local newspaper came out with the news that a sewerage scheme had been submitted to the Public Works Committee, and the residents were jubilant. At the time I was a member of the town council and several rate-payers wondered whether it would be all right for them to put in some type of sewerage so that it could be connected up easily when the Government scheme was installed in a short time. In my ignorance I agreed because I thought the scheme would operate in a short time. As far as I can see, the scheme is still well over the horizon although today the Premier gave me a small ray of hope. The

new suburb will get sewerage at the expense of country towns which have been waiting for it for years. This afternoon the Premier said that the tentative cost of providing sewerage in the new satellite town is £700,000. If this is so, what about the country towns for which schemes have been submitted to the Public Works Committee? What right has this new town to get preferential treatment? I do not think anyone can answer that question. It is supposed to be a country town, but obviously it will be within the metropolitan area. As far as the railways are concerned, Gawler is in the metropolitan area, and when it comes to a matter of additional Parliamentary allowances the member for the district is said to be a metropolitan member.

The new town has been promised industries. That means that in the next 10 years or so whilst it is gradually coming into existence industries, which could have been diverted to country towns, will be established there. All the industries that can be coaxed to this State will go to the satellite town. In the meantime, established country towns will get no industries. Men from those towns now have to travel long distances to their places of employment. The new town will get thousands of houses. All members know how difficult it has been in the last few years to get houses for those needing them. Apparently most of the resources of the Housing Trust, which has been doing a splendid job, are to be used in the new town. What about the people in Gawler and other nearby towns who want trust houses? Are these people to be diverted to the new town? In some way 25,000 people have to be found for the new town. They must come from somewhere and I suggest that most of them will come from country towns, because of the amenities which are available there, and which are not available in their own towns, despite the bold way the Premier has spoken about them. These country towns will not get the houses to which they are entitled. The new town will get sewerage, industries and houses, at the expense of country towns. Millions of pounds are to be spent on the new venture. What will be the feelings of the residents of country towns whose claims have been scandalously ignored? Are they to stand meekly by and take it? I do not think there is much else they can do under the present set-up. No amount of talking by me in this place, as the elected representative of the Gawler people, will do any good, but it behoves me to do what I can for them, and to get

into the pages of *Hansard* some statement as to the iniquity of the scheme. I am afraid it will have no effect because it must be remembered that the Government is elected under a system that is like a variation of the fixed gambling wheel. No matter which way the wheel is spun the right numbers always come up. Under our system the right numbers are always there for the Government, and such schemes as this can be put into practice. They are schemes which no ordinary democratic set-up would impose. No Government would be plucky enough to undertake such a thing in the face of obvious opposition throughout the State. When speaking in regard to decentralization the Premier said:—

We cannot hope to achieve this unless we provide services to country towns and their surrounding districts so that the people can have a standard of living which is comparable with that enjoyed by city dwellers.

Mr. Hutchens—The Premier said that with his tongue in his cheek.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That may be so. That quotation shows that the Treasurer, although advocating decentralization, proposes this satellite town scheme. Suggestions have been many as to what name should be given to it, a suitable one being submitted by Mr. Lawn. Perhaps as the member who will represent a small proportion of this area it would be nice if I were given the opportunity to say what I considered should be a suitable name. I understand that the greater proportion will be in the district at present represented by Mr. Goldney, and I suggest it should be named Jerry. Possibly he will wonder why, but it will be remembered that in the Old Testament Jeremiah was the gloomy prophet. The proposed big influx of working class people into this district is certainly gloomy news, from his point of view. Apparently the Premier, quite unjustly, considers that the honourable member is expendable, and for that reason I would call his section Jerry and the remainder Mander. Putting the two together we could give the whole area the name Jerrymander. This town, which should never be built, should be called Jerrymander as a memorial to the dead hopes of the older country towns, such as Gawler. It will stand as a memorial in perpetuity to the death of their hopes.

In reply to a question last session I was told by the Premier that the price paid for the land at Salisbury averaged £61 8s. 3d. an acre for 4,180 acres, but I notice that the press has now given the total as 4,285 acres, so apparently an additional area has been acquired. Plenty of land could have been obtained in the

vicinity of Gawler and the people there would have been anxious to sell it for an extension of the town at £61 8s. 3d. an acre. Then, the excellent civic facilities and all the other amenities at Gawler could have been provided and thus Gawler could have become the nucleus of a great city. That would have been decentralization. People in country towns have been deliberately let down by the Government. Gawler is an ideal distance from the capital and has a tradition which only the oldest towns in the State can have. Hundreds of skilled tradesmen live here and the greater part of their time is spent in travelling to and from their places of employment in the metropolitan area to industries which could have been in Gawler. Many new industries are now to be established at the new city of Jerrymander. Those people at Gawler with their claims denied will watch the burial of their hopes while the Premier's brain child grows and flourishes, and all this because he has said the word that the new town of Jerrymander must be built. I have tried to explain my conception and the conception of those on this side of the House of the true meaning of Playfordian decentralization.

Mr. Jennings—It is a farce.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I agree. The Government has no conception of what "decentralization" really means.

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—I shall refer to the bitter criticism of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Gawler concerning the proposed satellite town. We have been told that the greater proportion of the town will be in the district of Gouger and that my days as a member of Parliament are numbered. I have never taken that view. Three or four years after I entered Parliament some years ago there was a great agitation for the building of more houses in the Salisbury area. I was told by some friends that I was very foolish to advocate that because I would jeopardize my prospects of holding that seat for any length of time. I did not take that view, because I believed that more houses were necessary and I used what influence I had toward getting them. Members know how that area north of Salisbury has grown in the last few years and this has made a great difference in the population and from the political point of view, but I am not worried about that. If something is in the interests of the people, we should support it and not look at it from our own private point of view and interests. The view has been expressed today that the area between Adelaide and the proposed town will gradually become

built upon. I do not know what the policy of my friends opposite would be in this respect. We have the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs about six miles from Adelaide and the stock farms have land there.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed,

Mr. GOLDNEY—Most members would admit that this satellite town is favourably situated, though I realize that some people have said it occupies what was once valuable agricultural land. That cannot be helped, but the site is near a main road and railway, and electricity supplies are available, it is close to catchment areas in the Para hills, and it will be easy to sewer in conjunction with sewers serving the Long Range Weapons Establishment at Salisbury. The town will help to overcome the housing shortage. There will be a waiting list for the houses built, so they will soon be occupied after construction.

Mr. Frank Walsh—So you agree with what the member for Gawler said?

Mr. GOLDNEY—I agree with some of his remarks, but not with all. The Leader of the Opposition said that the foothills near Port Augusta would be ideal for a satellite town, but how many people would care to live there?

Mr. Frank Walsh—Didn't they go to Whyalla?

Mr. GOLDNEY—Some did.

Mr. Frank Walsh—And others went to Leigh Creek?

Mr. GOLDNEY—Yes, and some went to Woomera, but many people are so used to the amenities of the metropolitan area that they would find it hard to change their way of life and go to the country. Water supplies have to be provided for new towns.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Water was taken to Whyalla.

Mr. GOLDNEY—Big water supplies would be needed to establish a town near Port Augusta with a population of 25,000. I do not see any need for violent criticism of the satellite town. The Leader of the Opposition criticized the long delay in providing an adequate water supply for Peterborough. I agree that this town needs a good supply for railway purposes and that water cartage there has been most expensive. For a town of this size an improved supply should have been ensured years ago. I hope the Government will do something about this before long. A large sum has been placed on the Estimates

for the Yorke Peninsula water scheme. It will not pay its way, because water schemes generally are not paying, but this supply will greatly develop the central part of Yorke Peninsula and increase production there. I commend the Government for taking water to districts where it is urgently needed. I support the first line.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—When explaining the Loan Estimates the Treasurer said:—

Materials have been in more plentiful supply during the year, more so than for many years past except in the case of steel, where it has been necessary to resort again to importation of certain types and sizes of steel which are unobtainable with any degree of certainty from the B.H.P. Company. The company has agreed with the Commonwealth Government that it will not object to importation.

Those remarks have frequently been referred to in this debate; they fortify the views of members of the Opposition that the Government has not sufficiently considered the necessity to establish steel works in South Australia. The advocacy of such a responsible officer as Mr. Dickinson, Director of Mines, for the establishment of steel works is gaining support. The member for Stuart has raised this question again this session. I am wondering whether the B.H.P. Co. is governing Australia, or whether the Commonwealth Government is governing the B.H.P. Co.? Why isn't the South Australian Government prepared to take any notice of the recommendations of its responsible officers? I do not think any member of the Government would be prepared to denounce the Director of Mines. Has he anything to gain from his persistent advocacy of the need of establishing a steel works in this country? The Government sits idly by while this responsible officer repeatedly indicates the necessity of such a project. Why should we be so dependent upon the Broken Hill Pty. Co. when we have the resources? Does the Government suggest that it has not the wherewithal to establish a plant? The position is ridiculous. The Treasurer indicated that the Electricity Trust has placed orders overseas for steel. Could the Government inform members of the additional cost involved in the construction of the powerhouse at Port Augusta through having to obtain steel from overseas? I wonder how much steel will have to be imported to complete the works at Osborne. The Broken Hill Pty. Co. apparently is not in a position to supply our steel requirements. The Government should take notice of its responsible officers.

The Treasurer indicated that the Municipal Tramways Trust would require an additional amount of £500,000. The trust is building 70 diesel fuel buses, but it is doubtful whether they will be completed by June, 1955. The board has already intimated that it will require additional money to establish a new workshop and depot for these buses. Members have raised many queries relating to the activities of the trust but as yet have received no satisfactory replies. The provision of £500,000 in the Loan Estimates is no answer to the queries raised by the Opposition.

An amount of £100,000 is to be provided as loans to councils to enable them to purchase road-making equipment and it has been suggested that that will be beneficial to them. I disagree entirely with the proposal. I realize that councils would benefit from the purchase of light road-making equipment but there is a limit to the time the councils would require such equipment. It was reported in the press that one council desired to borrow money with which to purchase some secondhand equipment from the Highways Department for the purpose of road-making. I understand it proposed to have a series of similar equipment in at least two, if not three, wards in its area. I do not know why it requires this equipment. Instead of the Government providing money to enable councils to purchase equipment, would it not be better if the Highways Department hired out its modern, heavy and efficient road-making equipment to them? If councils purchase their own equipment, the time will come when, although there is still life in it, it will no longer be required.

Another matter which has caused some concern is the proposal that the Highways Department will widen certain roads in established areas. The next occasion on which we will have an opportunity of discussing this matter will be during the Budget debate when the Government will probably be in a position to provide a little more information about the widening of certain metropolitan highways. The Treasurer intimated that £2,176,000 would be provided for the railways. Last year £1,500,000 was provided for capital work and in addition it was proposed to duplicate the Goodwood-Marino line. This has not been done and people in the district are still waiting for an improved service. We have been told that the Government will not erect a bridge over the railway or a subway under it and that through the Highways Department it will acquire certain land on the approaches of this important crossing; the

railways would then have to install equipment to give a warning of the approach of trains. However, this matter has gone on for so long that I am doubtful whether the Highways Department really intends to acquire the necessary land. We have manpower, materials and everything to permit the work to be carried out. Since the duplication of the line over the South Road-Cross Road crossing further bottlenecks of traffic have occurred. A little time ago I sent a petition to the General Traffic Manager of the Railways Department containing the signatures of about 80 people working at Islington who desired a connecting train to meet their train at 4.50 p.m. These men have to wait until 5.18 to catch a train from Adelaide. The Department stated that as the duplication had not been completed the necessary service could not be provided. The Government, by endeavouring to do too much work, has commenced something without having a fully planned programme and it has been necessary to remove labour from one place to another, not because of shortage of finance, but because of lack of a comprehensive plan, and it should consult its advisers and formulate such a plan.

I would be pleased to know whether any trial has been made of the 14 diesel railcars mentioned in the Estimates, and if so, whether they have been successful. Perhaps if I put the matter on notice tomorrow the Minister will be able to furnish a report. From the remarks made by the member for Gouger I take it that he is in favour of the location of the proposed satellite town. I asked the Premier some weeks ago when this project was to be commenced and I was told to put it on notice. On August 17 I was informed that the matter was still being considered. Last week I was still seeking information from him, and still received no satisfactory reply, yet it seems that after a meeting held at Parliament House after question time last Thursday between the General Manager of the Housing Trust and the Premier, a decision was arrived at, and probably the press was then advised, but told to keep it for week-end editions. That is typical of the way in which members are treated. Why does not the Treasurer give information to members when they ask for it? Are not they entitled to know what action the Government intends to take in certain matters? Must members derive all their information on the satellite town from the Sunday newspapers, or will the Premier place before Parliament the plans of the project? Surely members are entitled to such a courtesy. In reply to a

question on a certain matter, which I asked this afternoon, the Premier was unable to give me any information, but I am sure that, had he had that information at his disposal, he would have given it to me. For years many shopkeepers have not delivered goods to purchasers' homes, and adequate parking facilities should be provided near shopping centres for shoppers using their own transport. I understand from the press that such facilities are to be provided in the satellite town. In introducing these Estimates the Treasurer referred to the allocation of £3,600,000 to the Housing Trust pursuant to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. How much of that is to be spent on the new satellite town? I always understood that money advanced under the Housing Agreement was to be used by way of subsidy to assist people in the lower wage groups.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! I can hear voices, and I am sure the member for Goodwood must hear them too. I ask members not to converse aloud.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The Treasurer said that the programme of the trust for the current year is for the completion of 3,500 houses, of which 1,000 will be built for rental or sale in the country. Will the balance of 2,500 homes comprise the first part of the satellite town project? I understand from press reports that Orlit Company and Richardson Bros, are soon to commence building operations at the satellite town. What is to happen to the operations of those builders regularly employed by the trust? As the town is to be situated partly in the Gouger and partly in the Gawler electorate, is it to be considered a country rather than a city project, and, if so, are the 1,000 houses that the Treasurer says are to be built in the country to come within this year's programme for the satellite town? The Treasurer may be able to get the information for the Committee and if he cannot perhaps one of his colleagues will be able to do so; it would be most interesting. Another amount mentioned is £760,000 for second mortgages—the figure is creeping up and up. When I raised the matter some years ago I was left out a limb—and I will never forget it. I could not get from the Housing Trust a copy of the contract used, although we have ways and means of getting information at times.

Now the Government has achieved its purpose of quashing the activities of the State Bank in the group home building scheme which

it had carried on effectively. I do not know whether the Government really is responsible, but I assume that it is by reason of the appointments to the State Bank Board made from time to time. When we see persons appointed to the State Bank Board who are closely associated with the Treasury one wonders whether there are any discussions in Government offices which lead to telling the State Bank Board what it has to do—whether the board's policy is framed before it holds its meetings. On the other hand, it may be because of the Treasurer's continual refusal to increase the amount that may be borrowed under the Advances for Homes Act, for that has been the Premier's continual reply to me when I have asked questions pertaining to second mortgages and the Homes Act. I have put on record here—and it has never been challenged—that the State Bank under its groups building scheme was building better houses at lower costs than any other institution, but apparently the Government has accomplished its objective by forcing the group building scheme out of existence. Let us take the Treasurer's own figure of £760,000 for second mortgages and let us assume an average cost of £3,000 for a home. On that basis what deposit will be demanded and how many homes will this sum finance? Let us assume an advance of £1,750 by the State Bank to the South Australian Housing Trust under the Advances for Homes Act. The applicant will probably have to find £300 or £400 according to the circumstances, so we could take an average of £600 as a second mortgage loan. Would it not have been more honourable for the Government to amend the Act to make it a larger amount available to home purchaser and use the State Bank as the lending institution and not increase the rate of interest beyond $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Instead the Government practically made the State Bank a trading bank in competition with private banks for which there was no necessity because it is a State owned instrumentality. If the Government desires to help people acquire their own homes there was a golden opportunity to show how sincere it was. I assure the Treasurer that I will want further information on this when we discuss the lines seriatim.

About £750,000 is set down for hospital buildings, but no reference is made to the purchase price of Ruthven Mansions in Pulteney Street for nurses. In this transaction what consideration did the Government give to nursing sisters who have been living in flats where they had some degree of privacy and comfort,

but may now have to share accommodation in nurses' quarters. Will the Government consider making available portion of Ruthven Mansions to sisters who require flat accommodation? If that freedom in accommodation is needed it should be extended to the sisters. If we do not mention it here nothing will be done. In the Address in Reply debate I said that the ex-Director of Medical Services (Dr. Jeffries) agreed with Dr. Cowan that there should be a tuberculosis clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There should be something better than the chest clinic which is there today in the wilderness of the grounds. Dr. Cowan can give very reliable information on the matter. He went abroad and presented a valuable report. Another medical man was appointed to succeed him and he went abroad to get information. There is no mention in these Estimates about the establishment of a proper tuberculosis clinic at the hospital. I hope the Government will have the decency to include it in the next Loan programme. If the Government fails to live up to its promise in this matter further investigation will be necessary.

The Loan Estimates include £9,400 for alterations and additions to various buildings at and the purchase of equipment for Bedford Park, as well as expenditure at Morris Hospital amounting to £34,340. I have more than once

asked the Government if it possesses a master plan for Bedford Park Hospital, but I have not been able to get any assurance that there is such a plan. There has been a good response by the people in the matter of compulsory X-ray examination. Soon we will not be able to give the necessary treatment to those who may be found to be suffering from tuberculosis. Instead of spending money haphazardly in altering and adding to institutions, we should look at the position differently. It is not desirable to continue with the expenditure of money at the Morris Hospital. It could be better spent by the Government in constructing a decent hospital at Bedford Park, where buildings were taken over after the 1914-1918 war, since when temporary additions have been made to them. The Government should have a master plan for a new hospital at Bedford Park. Such an institution would be in the interests of the people. As I have said, there should be a complete tuberculosis clinic at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Authoritative evidence in support of it could be obtained from Dr. Cowan.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 1, at 2 p.m.