

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 11, 1955.

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

### QUESTIONS.

#### URANIUM DEPOSITS.

**Mr. O'HALLORAN**—Following on the visit to this State last week of Her Majesty's Minister of State for Commonwealth Relations, and his inspection of the uranium fields in South Australia, can the Premier give any information regarding their future development, particularly those at Crocker Well and Radium Hill?

The **Hon. T. PLAYFORD**—The Leader of the Opposition is conversant with the activity at Radium Hill, where the mine is fully developed and in production. It is producing the rate of tonnage planned in the initial stages. The plant is in going order and doing a good job indeed. No dislocations or major difficulties have unexpectedly arisen. Whether it will be possible to increase the tonnage at the mine, which would be beneficial to the undertaking generally, is a matter that only experience and further proving of the ore deposits can show. Questions immediately under consideration are these. Members know that the Government proposes to open up the Crocker Well area by inviting companies to apply to undertake the development. It would be more attractive if we could have guaranteed markets for the products, and investigations are taking place, firstly, to ascertain what guaranteed markets are available and, secondly, to see that in our efforts to get guaranteed markets we do not prejudice future requirements of uranium for local use. We want to get a balance that will enable us to sell the surplus and to have enough for future requirements in South Australia. The position is being examined. A Bill will be introduced in due course to enable the Government to go ahead with the scheme, the details of which have not yet been precisely worked out.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC LAWS.

**Mr. TEUSNER**—On September 29 last a judgment was given by the Full Court in a case arising out of an appeal under section 131 (1) of the Road Traffic Act, dealing with giving way to the vehicle on the right. In the *Advertiser* of September 30 last the Chief Justice is reported to have commented that there was something to be said for the sugges-

tion that our traffic code was far more complicated than it need be and that he would like to see a short code of rules in simple language; also that it should begin by stating that the over-riding duty of everyone who uses the road was to show due care and consideration for the safety and convenience of other people. Has the attention of the Premier been drawn to these remarks and will he consider the suggestion in the interests of motorists and the public generally?

The **Hon. T. PLAYFORD**—I saw the report, but the problem is how to define "due care." Ultimately it becomes a matter to be decided by the court. On our code of traffic laws the Government is continually being advised by a most competent committee, and I believe its recommendations have been beneficial to the Statute law dealing with road accidents. It is apparent that if every driver always insisted on his rights under the Road Traffic Act he would in many instances endanger other people, but it is nevertheless necessary to have a precise code that sets out the obligations of every person using the roads. That code cannot be expressed in general terms because everyone would have a different definition of its application. I know that the accident rate is still not satisfactory, but the State Traffic Committee has stated on a number of occasions, particularly in regard to the number of persons killed, that the accident rate in South Australia per 10,000 vehicles is lower than in any other country, except New Zealand. Therefore, our Road Traffic Act cannot be so bad, although we hope to continue to improve it.

#### STEELWORKS FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

**Mr. RICHES**—I wish to refer to two press statements made last week. A full-page statement in the last issue of the *Sunday Mail* stated that the firm of Krupps was prepared to consider establishing itself in South Australia. Has the Premier read that article and, if so, can he make a statement on this matter? Secondly, a leading article in one issue of the *Advertiser* stated that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company has made no secret of its readiness to help other companies which may wish to start a steel plant here. In what way has the company expressed itself as willing to assist another company? In particular, does that statement mean that the company is prepared to make available a quantity of ore for the purpose of establishing a steel industry in South Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In order to attract overseas interests to establish a steel industry in South Australia we must show that we have the necessary raw materials. I have emphasised that time and time again in the House. I did not see the article about Krupps, but I still hold the view that, provided we can show we have ample iron ore deposits to warrant the establishment of an industry, there are interests both in Great Britain and the United States that will be interested. I have not been approached in connection with Krupps, but I have always told any interested company that our explorations so far have not been conclusive. On a number of occasions I have discussed informally with the B.H.P. Co. whether it would be possible for it to encourage or assist a subsidiary industry to go to Whyalla, seeing that the company has its hands full with other developments at present. The company has expressed the general policy that it would not be opposed to the establishment of another steel company in Australia because there are disabilities in its being the only steel producer in Australia, for when there is a shortage of steel the criticism always falls on the one interest producing it. However, it has not gone so far as to suggest that it would be prepared to make iron ore available to another company.

#### ONKAPARINGA VALLEY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON—A letter from one of my constituents states:—

Could you tell me whether the Government will be pumping water down the Onkaparinga this coming summer? I want to plant two or three acres of potatoes and I haven't a bore on the river land as yet.

When the Public Works Committee took evidence from residents in the Onkaparinga Valley it clearly stated that River Murray water was not intended to be used for the purpose mentioned in the letter, but I think it would be wise to have an official statement to that effect so that no one in that area will think he can get water for irrigation purposes.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am glad the question has been framed in such a way as to enable me to give an emphatic reply. This scheme was never intended, nor will it ever be possible, as an irrigation scheme. It was developed entirely as a reticulation scheme for domestic and stock requirements. It would be impossible to use it as an irrigation scheme because the water would have to be lifted four or five times to a height of about 1,500 feet.

It is impossible to make a reticulation scheme into an irrigation scheme. We have often heard it said that it is far better to take people to the water than to take water to the people, but I stress that great cost would be involved in lifting water 1,500ft. for irrigation. It would certainly be uneconomic to supply this water for growing potatoes and it was never intended to do so.

#### LARGS NORTH-OSBORNE SEWERAGE.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Works any further information in reply to my recent question about the sewerage of Largs North and Osborne?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Following on the persistent, albeit courteous, inquiries of the honourable member, my most recent information is as follows:—Investigations into a comprehensive scheme for the sewerage of the Largs Bay North area have recently been completed. The levels in the area are such that a pumping station would be necessary. The estimated cost of the proposal, including the pumping station, is £127,000, and on the basis of the 368 houses that would be served this works out at £344 per house—more than three times the cost of sewerage homes in "average" areas. Viewed from another angle, expenditure of this sum would provide sewerage facilities for more than 1,000 residences in a better-drained area. The estimated revenue would fall far short of operating expenses, and when interest charges are taken into account, the scheme would show a loss of approximately £8,000, which the general taxpayer would be called upon to meet. In view of the capital cost, the project would have to be referred to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report, and having regard to the unfavourable economic aspects, and on the principle of the "greatest good for the greatest number," the Government would not be justified in submitting the proposal to the committee at the present juncture. The claims of the Largs North area will be kept under review and when the economics of the overall scheme improve sufficiently to justify it, the matter will be reconsidered in the light of the then existing circumstances.

#### SOLDIER SETTLEMENT: INFERIOR IRON.

Mr. FLETCHER—During the weekend, whilst at Mount Gambier, I had several complaints from soldier settlers concerning the deterioration of the material used in their milking sheds and in the tanks supplied for

windmills. Has the Minister of Repatriation received any such complaints and is anything being done in the matter?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Two factors appertain to the condition of the iron supplied to soldier settlers in the South-East and other districts. Firstly, because of the anxiety of settlers and the Returned Soldiers League to have men put on the land, the Government had purchased a large quantity of black iron to erect the milking and facility sheds. That iron has failed rather miserably and we are having iron supplied to replace sheds roofed mainly with that type of iron. Secondly, the new galvanized iron has, unfortunately, been found to be a poor quality and, as the honourable member suggests, much of it has deteriorated and rusted through in five or six years. I understand that the honourable member has one or two cases in mind, and if he will give me particulars I will have them investigated and let him know the result.

#### SOLDIER SETTLERS' LIABILITIES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Premier a further reply to my question of September 22 concerning the assessment of liabilities of soldier settlers in the irrigation areas? The Premier then said that he would take steps to resolve any stalemate that arose between the Commonwealth and the State, and as I understand a party of members may visit the Loxton soldier settlement area and be confronted with this question, it would be wise to know the Government's intention.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I informed the honourable member that our submissions had been sent to the Commonwealth department, and that if there was a stalemate I would personally intervene and discuss the matter with the Prime Minister at the first opportunity. I cannot say there has been a stalemate. Whether our submissions are acceptable we do not know; the Commonwealth department has not yet replied.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Can the Minister of Irrigation say how long it is since the State commenced negotiations with the Commonwealth Government? I gather from earlier statements by the Premier that the State has laid its cards on the table, but apparently there is some point on which the State and the Commonwealth authorities differ. Can the Minister indicate in what respect they differ? If he is not in a position to make a statement now will he bring down a report tomorrow?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I would not like to hazard a guess as to when we approached

the Commonwealth Government in regard to these negotiations, but it is some months. Apparently there is a stalemate, but not from this State's point of view. I heard unofficially that there was some difference of opinion between the Commonwealth and Victoria, and that when the Commonwealth had conferred with Victoria it would be prepared to again confer with the States concerning irrigation valuations.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Is it not a fact that Victoria is in an entirely different position from South Australia? From memory I think that New South Wales and Victoria are major States which carry their own responsibilities in this matter, and I cannot see—

The SPEAKER—The honourable member must not argue his question.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Can the Minister of Irrigation say why a minor State like South Australia, which comes under an entirely different scheme from the major State of Victoria, should be held up in the assessment of liabilities, especially as the Premier, as spokesman for South Australia, said in effect at the annual conference of the R.S.L. that he felt sure the settlers would be more satisfied and better settlers if they knew what their liabilities were?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It is true that we are an agent State and that the other States referred to are principal States. In the fixing of valuations it would be to the satisfaction of the three States concerned if there were some uniform system, and I think that is what the Commonwealth hopes to achieve.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Is the Minister of opinion that there is political significance behind the refusal to notify settlers of their liabilities? It is common knowledge that a Federal election is likely soon and it is a reasonable assumption that millions of pounds will be written off because of the losses on soldier settlements and that the Commonwealth Government has deliberately refrained from making an assessment of settlers' liabilities until after the election?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In accordance with Government policy, we have been desirous of clearing up the valuation question as settlement proceeds rather than have the settlement in operation for many years before the settlers know their position. It is much more advantageous for the settlers to know their liabilities and to be able to cut their cloth accordingly. Every member, including Mr. Macgillivray, agrees that that is desirable.

Mr. Macgillivray—You know I agree with you, but you do nothing about it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—We have repeatedly impressed on the Commonwealth our desire that this should be done, because losses after settlement, whatever they may be, are borne by the Commonwealth and not the State.

Mr. Macgillivray—Borne by the taxpayers.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, in the person of the Commonwealth, and not the State.

Mr. Macgillivray—Two fifths is borne by the State.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the honourable member wants an answer I suggest that he listen. Will he put the question on the Notice Paper?

Mr. Macgillivray—I will do that, too.

#### MURRAY RIVER FLOOD.

Mr. STOTT—Over the weekend I visited my district and found some responsible councillors there concerned about the river banks, particularly those adjacent to the Paringa Road and the channels running through Lyrup. These people are now more concerned than ever because reports from the top end of the river indicate that the flood levels will be higher than the 1952 level. Will the Minister of Works see whether the banks in those districts are high enough?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—At the earliest possible moment it was announced that the flood would be at least 3in. higher than the 1952 level provided wind and rain did not intervene to make it otherwise. The Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage (Mr. Ide) has been up and down the river seeking the co-operation, assistance and advice of all interests. It is not entirely the prerogative of the Government: people holding individual banks and local government authorities, all have their responsibilities. If the honourable member has any point at issue, however, I shall be glad to take it up with my departmental engineers to see whether anything more can be done to combat what seems to be a concurrent danger all along the river, because wind and weather may intervene to make the position worse than anticipated. Up to the present, however, as far as I can ascertain no constructive suggestions have been made toward improving conditions; but if the honourable member and local councillors have any I shall be pleased to discuss them with him.

#### IMPORT RESTRICTIONS AND GOVERNMENT WORKS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier yet been able to assess the impact, if any, on

South Australian Government departments and semi-governmental organizations, such as the Electricity Trust and the Tramways Trust, of the import restrictions which were recently imposed by the Federal Government and which may affect the importation from overseas of essential requirements for those departments?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The impact, if any, would not as yet have been felt by Government departments, because it is only when we start to import new additional plant that the restrictions are felt; in fact, I do not think they will be actually implemented until next month. I do not know of any problem that has yet arisen. Most of the things the Government would import would be items reserved for administrative direction and I think we could make out a complete case for anything the State desired to import because all its requirements are for community purposes and should have the highest priority. I doubt whether we shall have difficulties with State importations. In fact, the alterations taking place with regard to the importation of steel may be beneficial because some sections of steel were difficult to obtain in Europe and it is now possible to get import licences for steel from the United States of America.

#### HIGH OCTANE PETROL.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last Thursday concerning the possible use of high octane petrol in Government motor cars?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received a further report on this subject from the foreman of the Government Motor Garage in the absence of the Acting Manager. The honourable member will recall that last week I said tests were being conducted as to the economy of the new type of petrol compared with the old type. The report is as follows:—

On comparing the petrol mileages of the cars for the past two months during which high octane petrol has been used with a similar period using standard grade petrol, I find there is a slight average increase in the miles per gallon in these vehicles when using the higher grade fuel. I have questioned the garage chauffeurs available for consultation today on the performance of their cars and in general they claim a better and more efficient performance with the higher grade petrol. In the case of the American cars this opinion was unanimous. It is extremely difficult to compare running costs over such a short period, but I am of opinion that the decrease in running costs which will naturally follow the better performance obtained with high octane petrol will compensate for the additional cost of 3d. per gallon.

## COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Works indicate when the Karoonda water supply scheme is likely to be completed, particularly as it has been promised for some time and local residents are anxious about securing water for the summer months? Can he also indicate when the Swan Reach scheme is likely to be commenced?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have nothing specific to report but will take these matters up with the Engineer-in-Chief and bring down a reply as early as possible, possibly tomorrow, but not later than Thursday.

## FIBROUS PLASTERERS' AWARD.

Mr. FRED WALSH (on notice)—

1. Was any approach made by the Chamber of Manufactures to the Government to intervene in the common rule application in the case of the fibrous plasterers' award?

2. Did the Treasurer ascertain the actual increase, if any, of the cost in Government contracts, if the common rule application were granted?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. No.

2. No.

## SWIMMING CERTIFICATES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—How many scholars attending primary schools in this State received either beginners' certificates or junior certificates for swimming for the year ending June 30, 1955?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Eight hundred and forty-nine beginners' certificates and 51 junior certificates were awarded to scholars attending departmental primary schools for the year ending June 30, 1955. No statistics are available in respect of scholars attending non-departmental primary schools.

## SCHOOL TEACHERS' RESIDENCES.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice):—

1. What rents were paid for schoolhouses at Wepowie and Fullerville when they were formerly occupied by teachers?

2. Are the figures given on the old or new schedules of rents for departmental houses?

3. What rents are charged for each of these residences now they are let to private persons?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The replies are:—

1. Fifteen pound per annum in each case, with teachers paying council rates and excess water rates.

2. Under the old schedule of rents.

3. The tenant occupying the Wepowie residence pays 10s. per week and Fullerville 7s. 6d. per week. The Architect-in-Chief pays all rates except excess water rates.

## SUPERPHOSPHATE SUPPLIES.

Mr. PEARSON (on notice):—

1. What amount of Government financial assistance has been given to the various interests involved in the Nairne pyrites and Birkenhead acid plant projects?

2. What is the potential output of acid from this plant?

3. What was the total superphosphate manufacturing capacity of all plants in South Australia at (a) June 30, 1950; (b) June 30, 1955?

4. Is the Government aware of the acute shortage of superphosphate in the districts served by the manufacturing plant at Port Lincoln?

5. Has the Government been consulted by this company on its proposal to enlarge its Port Lincoln works in respect of present and future requirements of that area?

6. If so, does the Government consider the proposals adequate?

7. If not, will the Government seek information on the proposals and urge the company to make adequate provision at the earliest possible date, so as to save users the cost of freighting superphosphate from mainland plants as is necessary now to meet their requirements?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. A guarantee has been given by the State pursuant to the Industries Development Act for £1,000,000 as security for a loan.

2. 100,000 tons per annum.

3. The figures are not available, but I will have them next week.

4. Overall production is sufficient to meet the State's requirements.

5. No.

6. See 5.

7. Information will be requested.

## ELECTION OF SENATOR.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of the joint sitting of the two Houses for the choosing of a Senator to hold the position rendered vacant by the death of Senator George McLeay, indicating that Mrs. Nancy Eileen Buttfeld had been appointed.

NOXIOUS INSECTS ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Noxious Insects Act, 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)—I move:—

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I regret having, without prior notice, to spring this on members, but the grasshoppers will not wait. In the administration of the Act as it stands I have discovered certain weaknesses that need rectifying, and the sooner we do it the sooner we can cope with the serious menace. It is understood that under the 1934 Act councils have certain powers to require owners or occupiers of land to take prescribed measures for the control and destruction of vermin, but the councils cannot go sufficiently far in the case of owners who do not comply with the notice. They cannot see that the required action is taken. Of course, they can prosecute the defaulting owner, but the machinery of prosecution is sometimes lengthy, and it means sometimes that a period elapses before finality is reached. In the meantime the grasshoppers are on the wing. In some cases prompt action is required, and it is therefore provided in the Bill that the council may, in the case of a landowner who refuses to comply with a notice, enter on his land and take the necessary measures for control and eradication.

That is on all fours with the powers contained in the noxious weeds and vermin control legislation. There, the council, or the Minister where the same power is vested in him, can take action to enter on the land of the defaulting owner and take the measures he was required to take. A further provision, and it is in the other legislation, is that when the work has been done by the council or the Minister, the costs can be recovered. The grasshopper plague is widespread throughout the State. There are some fortunate patches where they are not in evidence, but generally speaking the hatchings have taken place from the north down to Victor Harbour in the south, and from Ceduna in the west to Renmark in the east. Prompt action must be taken to control the grasshoppers. Fortunately, we have available to us much equipment and new types of insecticides and poisons for spraying or the laying of baits, and we can, to a large degree, control the pests once they are actually hatched. Indeed, ever since my department has taken control of this matter on this occasion, there

has been splendid co-operation from all district councils concerned and, generally speaking, from landholders. I think all concerned are very much alive to the seriousness of this plague. As I indicated some months ago, it could be the worst we have ever had, and that has been amply borne out by the hatchings that are taking place all over the State. If no effective action were taken we could be completely eaten out.

That is such a serious prospect that officers of my department and the Lands Department have visited country areas to ascertain the extent and the location of the hatchings. As a result of those investigations we have been able to alert the councils and have had ample supplies of materials made available to combat the pest. Manufacturers and wholesalers have co-operated very well and made available large stocks of insecticides and poisons at short notice. In many council areas hundreds of gallons have already been distributed. During my recent visit to the West Coast I consulted several councils on the mainland and on Eyre Peninsula and ascertained that some councils have distributed more than 300gall. of insecticides, and have supplied as many as 150 landholders. That shows that most councils and landholders are doing their utmost to combat the menace but, unfortunately, there are always a few people who will not co-operate.

As prompt action is necessary to combat the plague it is highly desirable that local authorities and my department should have the means to deal with those who will not co-operate. That is why I have brought down this measure, which will enable action to be taken by councils or the department in case of default, and it also gives us the opportunity to recover the cost involved. I have had conferences with several organizations, and I have been assured that even in the pastoral areas the landowners will be prepared to meet the Government in regard to the costs of any campaign that we undertake. We are also looking into the question of co-opting the support of various other organizations or authorities, if the need arises, in order that we shall have available, particularly in the outside country, all possible equipment and manpower. It think it will be appreciated that in the inside country the best means of handling the problem is through the landholder himself. We could not possibly marshal all the manpower required to undertake a State-wide campaign. If landholders combat the pest on their own holdings the costs will be infinitesimal compared with carrying out a campaign, as has been suggested by some

people, similar to that the Government instituted for the control of the fruit fly.

The obligation to combat the pest rests fundamentally on the landowner himself, for he has the necessary manpower under his own control and, in some cases, the necessary equipment, too. We have been issuing chemicals and poisons to councils for distribution free of cost to the landowners. Recently the Director of Agriculture estimated that so far £20,000 of material has been distributed, and eventually it will cost us much more than that, but by tackling the problem promptly we may avert a major calamity. The additional powers now sought are all designed to cope with the problem, particularly in those areas where population and manpower is scarce and where we may have to initiate measures for control and then charge the cost to the landholders concerned.

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

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No 2).

A message was received from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor recommending the House to make appropriation of the several sums set forth in the accompanying Estimates of Expenditure by the Government during the year ending June 30, 1956, for the purposes stated therein.

Referred to Committee of Supply.

#### THE BUDGET.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—In the Estimates for the year ending June 30, 1956, I am budgeting for a deficit of £748,000. Total payments for the year are estimated at £60,513,000, whilst receipts are expected to amount to £59,765,000. Since the introduction of the uniform tax system a substantial part of the total Budget of this State is dependent upon Commonwealth grants. This year we will have a tax reimbursement grant of about £13,870,000 and, as a special grant recommended by the Commonwealth Grants Commission £5,400,000, a total of £19,270,000, or 32 per cent of the Budget.

As honourable members are aware the income tax collection was the only readily adjustable field of taxation available to the States, and, now that this avenue is not open to us, whether the State has a deficit or a surplus very largely depends upon the adequacy of Commonwealth grants. Income tax has the added advantage that collections automatically expand in times of rising wages and prices.

Whilst it is true that slight modifications may be made through charges for services the amount of revenue which can be obtained by these means can never be sufficient to make up for insufficient tax reimbursement grants. This State is budgeting for a deficit of £748,000 because the Commonwealth grants this year are totally inadequate and represent a disproportionate return of the revenues available through income tax and other direct collections.

Notwithstanding the fact that this State now produces more wealth per head of population than any other State of the Commonwealth, and that we have exercised the greatest prudence in the administration of our public affairs and have kept expenditure under firm control, we are compelled to budget for a heavy deficit and, as our cash resources are relatively insignificant, the Government is placed in a most difficult position. At the last Premiers' conference I pointed out to the Prime Minister that the amount of additional tax reimbursement proposed for this year would not meet more than 33 per cent of the cost of wages and salaries arising out of Commonwealth Arbitration Court decisions.

I have now been Treasurer of this State for approximately 17 years and I can say without any qualification that we have been forced into a more difficult financial position this year than at any other period in the whole of those 17 years; on the one hand our income is strictly limited and beyond our control while our expenditure is largely governed by Commonwealth policy. Nor have we received favourable consideration from the Grants Commission this year. Honourable members will remember that £620,000 was voted in the year 1952-53 for road purposes. As the money was voted in June for transfer to the Highways Fund, and was unexpended in that year, the Grants Commission has regarded it as an appropriation of a surplus and has therefore disallowed it as expenditure for grant purposes. This followed representations made on behalf of the Commonwealth Government that it should not be an allowable item in our Budget. The Grants Commission has accepted this view and this means that we must now repay the amount from our road fund to our State revenue account. I propose the Highways Fund should repay £580,000 this year, for an amount of £40,000 arising out of some previous expenditures of railway maintenance reserves may be adjusted in our favour by the commission. As the Highways Fund is not in a position to repay this amount out of current revenues without improperly curtailing essential

road works it will be necessary to make an advance to the fund from Loan. A Bill will be put before the House to authorize these matters.

When I mention to honourable members that comparing our expenditures with the expenditures of the non-claimant States the commission has acknowledged considerable economies in this State in other fields you can see that the disallowance of our road expenditure is very severe upon the State. In my opinion this matter should be reviewed. I hold the view that an excess in one field of expenditure should be offset against favourable adjustments made by the commission in another field. I personally hold the view that one of the most important functions of a State Government is to provide a reasonable road service and I am entirely at a loss to understand why road expenditure should have been treated in the particular manner I have outlined. I cannot understand the Commonwealth ever having raised objection to this expenditure. When the Commonwealth Government seized the income tax powers of the States they surely incurred a moral as well as legal obligation to return to the States a reasonable share of the revenues derived from this field. I regret to say that in the financial dealings arising out of the tax reimbursement grants this is not the case today. Honourable members will see from what I have said that we have arrived at the unhealthy position where the Commonwealth dominates the whole of the financial structure of the States and is therefore in the position to dominate State policy in almost every sphere. At June 30 next I expect that our consolidated revenue account will be in deficit to the extent of £828,209. This deficit has to be financed by the Government from its Loan Fund or from other funds in its hands, which means that the loan programme passed by this Parliament cannot be carried out as proposed. This also means that we could incur an interest and sinking fund liability on this large amount which should have been properly provided from revenue.

#### THE YEAR 1954-55.

In submitting my Budget for the year 1954-55, I estimated that receipts would yield £51,049,000 and that payments would require £52,982,000, the estimated deficit being £1,933,000. Actual receipts for the year amounted to £51,884,000 and thus exceeded the Budget estimate by £835,000. Actual payments, including monies paid out in pursuance of supplementary appropriation, amounted to £54,118,000 and this figure exceeded the Budget

estimate by £1,136,000. Transactions on revenue account for the year 1954-55 resulted therefore in a deficit of £2,234,000. This deficit was of such order as to completely extinguish surpluses, which over the preceding four years had built up to a figure of £2,154,000, and leave a small deficit of £80,000 to carry forward in consolidated revenue account.

#### PUBLIC DEBT.

The public debt of the State as at June 30, 1955, was £236,462,000 which represents a net increase of £21,740,000 for the year. This net increase is made up as follows:—

Loans raised—	£	£
New money . . . .	23,790,000	
Conversions . . . .	25,969,000	
		49,759,000
Less—		
Conversion or redemption of matured securities . . . .	25,969,000	
Redemptions by National Debt Commission . . . .	2,050,000	
		28,019,000

Net increase in public debt . . . . . £21,740,000

The new money borrowings for the year were obtained from the following sources:—

	£
1. Raised by the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the State pursuant to the Financial Agreement . . . . .	20,901,000
2. Monies invested by the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund . . . . .	12,000
3. Monies invested by the Silicosis Committee . . . . .	4,000
4. Proceeds of special loans raised by the State from the British Atomic Energy Commission and from the Export-Import Bank of Washington . . . . .	2,873,000

Since the beginning of the war the public debt of the State has increased by £127,000,000. Under the conditions of the Financial Agreement the State is required to pay interest and sinking fund on all moneys borrowed for public works and other purposes. For some years it has been the practice for the Commonwealth Government to finance its public works from revenue. Under this scheme the Commonwealth has financed works totalling probably a thousand million pounds with money free from interest and the obligation for repayment. Works such as the Snowy Mountains scheme, the West Beach airport, and extensions to buildings and technical equipment for the post offices throughout Australia, have been financed in this way. The Commonwealth has been able to do this as it has control of the whole of the

income tax field. While it is no doubt a good proposition as far as the Commonwealth is concerned to use this method of financing public works I feel a fair share of the interest free money should be made available to the States for public works which are at least equally or more important. It is true that the Commonwealth Government during the last four years has made available annually from its revenues large amounts to enable the States to carry out their works programmes.

Mr. Macgillivray—But you agree with that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have never agreed with it.

Mr. Macgillivray—Of course you do.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member is saying what he knows is incorrect. The Commonwealth, however, has made these amounts available to the States, not as interest free money from revenue, but as loans upon which the States are required to pay interest and sinking fund. Moreover, the States pay this interest and sinking fund to the Commonwealth which has obtained the funds free from any charges whatsoever. In other words, what is good for the Commonwealth would not be good for the States. This is a most iniquitous position, and it is more so when it is considered that the most flexible of revenues—income tax—is collected by the Commonwealth and only a proportion, which is fixed by the Commonwealth, is returned to the States as an annual grant. This year the increase in this grant, as I have already pointed out, was only sufficient to pay about one-third of the added cost to the Budget for the marginal increases in salaries and wages.

#### NATIONAL DEBT SINKING FUND.

Under the Financial Agreement both State and Commonwealth Governments are required to make contributions to the National Debt Sinking Fund for the redemption of State debts. During 1954-55 the National Debt Commission received £504,000 from the Commonwealth and £1,736,000 from South Australia as contributions in respect of the State's public debt. At the beginning of the financial year the commission held a balance of £234,000 for debt redemption purposes on behalf of this State. During the year, in addition to contributions from the respective Governments, interest amounting to £2,000 was also earned by the fund. From the total of £2,476,000 thus available, the commission, during 1954-55, purchased and redeemed securities on behalf of this State at a cost of £2,255,000. At June 30, 1955, a balance of £221,000 was in the

hands of the commission for further redemption of debt.

Mr. Quirke—Where does the redemption money go?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The method usually applied by the commission is that it purchases the stock upon the exchanges as it becomes available and that then is redeemed on behalf of the State. Under the Financial Agreement that does not mean that the State is relieved of the obligation of paying interest or sinking fund on that stock. Under the Financial Agreement, which provides for the extinguishing of a debt over a period of 53 years, the State is compelled to pay the interest, which goes towards buying other stock.

Mr. O'Halloran—Surely the State's debt is reduced *pro rata*?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, but the payments in respect of it are not reduced. We still have to pay interest to reduce the debt. I point out that we could never extinguish a debt in 53 years by merely paying a sinking fund of half per cent. The funds that are used to buy up securities are in respect of interest payments on previous securities that have been cancelled.

Mr. Macgillivray—Was not the general idea of the Financial Agreement in 1937 that the State would be free of debt in 53 years?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That was never the plan. The Financial Agreement provided for the liquidation of a debt over a period of 53 years, but if the States continue to develop and build more houses, pipelines, irrigation works, drainage works and such things, they incur additional debts, and it stands to reason that the sinking funds that have been paid in respect of past debts will not pay off future debts.

#### ESTIMATES FOR 1955-56.

The principal items of estimated receipts and payments for 1955-56, compared with actual receipts and actual payments on similar items for the last two years, as shown in Appendix 7 to this Financial Statement, and I now give some brief comments on the principal variations disclosed by this statement.

#### RECEIPTS.

Estimated total receipts on Consolidated Revenue Account amount to £59,765,000 which is £7,881,000 in excess of actual receipts for 1954-55. State Taxation is expected to yield £8,006,000 which represents an increase of £460,000 over actual collections last year, and this estimate is made in the expectation of

increased receipts from stamp duties, succession duties, and motor vehicles taxation. Earnings of public undertakings are expected to increase by £1,529,000. Railway revenue is estimated at £17,115,000, an increase of £808,000. This increase is almost entirely due to an increase in the Treasury subsidy towards railway working expenses. Receipts from water supply and sewerage charges, which are shown in the statement at £2,935,000 are expected to exceed last year's receipts by £526,000. This increase will be derived in the main from the metropolitan area where assessments have been increased. These increases together with new connections will yield an estimated additional £277,000 from water rates and £193,000 from sewerage charges. The increase in rates for country lands, made in 1954, will have effect for a full year in 1955-56.

Recoveries in respect of State resources are expected to reach £803,000, or £574,000 more than last year. This increase is due entirely to the repayment to Revenue of £580,000 from the Highways Fund to which I have already made reference. Recoveries of interest and sinking fund are shown at £5,063,000 and are estimated to exceed last year's receipts by £1,314,000. Increased recoveries of interest and sinking fund follow the increased capital indebtedness of semi-governmental bodies such as the Electricity Trust, the Tramways Trust, the Housing Trust, and others. Moreover, in this year and in succeeding years, the Government will recover from the Radium Hill project the full interest and sinking fund involved in servicing special loans raised from the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Commission and from the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The amounts which will be paid to these authorities and recovered from the Radium Hill project during 1955-56 are £155,000 for interest and £510,000 for sinking fund. By far the largest increase in anticipated receipts for 1955-56 occurs in connection with Commonwealth Grants. The grant to be made to this State in pursuance of the recommendation of the Commonwealth Grants Commission will this year be £5,400,000, which is £3,150,000 greater than last year when we received only £2,250,000 and were required to use up our accumulated surpluses and more to finance our operating expenditures. The grant to be made this year is considerably less than the amount I sought and is one of the factors which forces me to budget for a deficit this year. I anticipate that our share of the income tax pool under the tax reimbursement arrangements will be £13,870,000, or some £709,000 more than the amount actually received last year.

I think members may be conversant with the procedure which applies so far as the tax reimbursement amount is concerned. The formula applying has been in operation seven or eight years. When uniform taxation was introduced it was adverse to the State, but each year we have been getting a slightly better share of the pool that has been distributed. The other amount that features in this £709,000 refers to the increased population of the State. Members will realise that an increased population automatically incurs the State in greatly increased expenditure on education and other social services and that was taken into account in the formulation of the formula in the first place. The £709,000 for this year does not really represent a more generous distribution. The same method of distribution has been applied to a larger population, and with the 10-year adjustment taking place it will gradually bring us into a more equitable position with the other States. Originally the formula was most adverse to Victoria and fairly adverse to South Australia, but each year over the 10-year period we gradually get into a relatively better position as compared with the grants the other States receive.

#### PAYMENTS.

Estimated payments to be made this financial year are summarized in the second part of Appendix 7 under headings which have regard to the nature of the payments to be made, and are compared with similar actual payments made during the past two years.

In all departments the Government will incur increased costs for wages and salaries in meeting, for a full year, the costs of awards made by various wage-fixing bodies last year. It is estimated that last year such awards, and in particular those determinations which had regard to margins, cost the Government over £700,000 for part only of the year. Those determinations will be in effect for the full year in 1955-56 and are responsible for a large part of the increases shown in the various departments in the Estimates.

*Social Services.*—Payments in respect of the various social service activities for which the State is responsible are estimated at £15,886,000. This group includes payments in respect of:—

*Education, Science, Art and Research,* £7,666,000.—This amount is £939,000 more than actual payments made last year and includes increased provision for the Education Department, and increased grants to the University, the School of Mines, and the Kindergarten Union.

*Law, Order and Public Safety, £2,134,000.*—An increase of £297,000 over actual payments last year. This increased provision is required to meet the expenses of the police service, gaols and prisons, and the courts.

*Medical, Health and Recreation, £5,399,000.*—An increase of £727,000. It is estimated that payments in respect of the Hospitals Department will exceed last year's actual payments by £230,000, whilst grants and subsidies to hospitals, and for other health purposes, will require £1,422,000, which exceeds last year's payments by £396,000. Included in this year's provision are further amounts totalling £73,000 to assist in the provision of additional accommodation at private non-profit hospitals. Last year grants totalling £76,000 were made for this purpose. Amongst other grants the Government is providing £80,000 for additional accommodation at the Children's Hospital, £83,000 for an additional building at the Home for Incurables, £75,000 for additions to Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, and £35,000 towards a new building at Minda Home.

*Public Undertakings, £19,106,000.*—The estimated payments for public undertakings amount to £19,106,000, which represents an increase of £432,000 over payments of a similar nature during last financial year. All of these undertakings are affected by the impact of marginal wage and salary determinations but some relief is obtained through the fact that, with all reservoirs full, it will not be necessary to finance pumping from the Mannum-Adelaide Pipeline and from bores for long periods as was the case last year.

*Interest, £9,347,000; and Sinking Fund, £2,511,000.*—These amounts are required to meet the State's debt service obligations on borrowings made in accordance with the Financial Agreement, including the special borrowings made from the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Commission and from the Export-Import Bank of Washington. The amounts shown are respectively £1,367,000 and £707,000 in excess of last year's actual payments, and include £155,000 for interest and £510,000 for principal repayments in connection with these overseas uranium loans.

*Pensions, £936,000.*—The amount provided under this heading covers the Government's contribution to public service, police, parliamentary, and judges' retiring schemes, and is £189,000 in excess of last year's figure. The increase reflects the Government's increased liability as a result of amendments made to public service and police pension legislation.

*State Resources, £5,122,000.*—This group, which includes payments made in respect of such departments as Highways, Lands, Agriculture and Mines, and includes payments made to the Highways Fund from the proceeds of motor taxation, is expected to require £631,000 more than last year. A special contribution to the Highways Fund for country roads development and maintenance will absorb £250,000 of this increase, whilst the amount to be transferred to the Highways Fund from the proceeds of motor taxation is expected to exceed last year's transfer by £148,000.

*Financial Transfers.*—To Railways—towards working expenses—£3,250,000. This is £850,000 in excess of last year's subsidy. To Municipal Tramways Trust—towards working expenses—£570,000. This is £30,000 less than the amount paid to the Tramways Trust last year and £130,000 less than the subsidy of the preceding year. This reduction is most heartening and is an indication of gradual progress in tramway finance.

#### GENERAL FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC MATTERS.

After a period of stability the Australian economy has latterly been showing signs that it is getting out of balance again. To the man in the street the official warnings of possible trouble ahead must seem rather out of place for there is wide choice of employment with increased margins, high activity, and good profits in business, very few shortages, and a general air of prosperity. In South Australia in particular there is every prospect of an excellent rural season. Yet despite all this the outlook is less encouraging than for some years. Increased wage margins, which were necessary for the proper encouragement of skill and to restore the proper relativity between the unskilled wage and the remuneration of the more highly trained and responsible staffs, have placed a heavy additional cost on the community. This has not been balanced by any comparable increase in productive efficiency in industry generally, whilst there has at the same time been some further fall in prices of rural products, particularly wool. Thus a threat of inflation is again arising accompanied by a rise in prices, a fall in savings, and a wave of free spending upon consumer goods. Whereas the overseas outlook for prices of our rural products gives no encouragement for any spectacular increases, there is a real risk that the Australian economy will continue living beyond its means unless positive remedial measures are taken. The Commonwealth Government has lately announced measures designed

to correct the adverse trade balance, and others directed at internal economic affairs. The former measures can be made effective by direct restrictive controls, but the latter depend far more upon the co-operation and understanding of the various sections of the community. Though there is a tendency for the Australian community at present to live somewhat beyond its means, and this must be corrected, there need be no fears about our ultimate standard of living after those corrections are made. It is necessary to recognize that recurrent threats of inflation in Australia are an almost inevitable accompaniment of a high and sustained rate of development. Australia has latterly been developing, both in population and in productive capacity, at a rate seldom reached and never before sustained in any community. We desire to continue this development and there is no reason why we should not, so long as it is recognized that the price is continuous vigilance against the threats of inflation and adverse overseas balances.

In a time like the present it is not usual for public finance to be in any serious difficulties for income taxes, sales taxes, and the like, are buoyant. However, the whole six Australian States are in difficulties although the Commonwealth, which has the monopoly of such taxes, is in an affluent position. As a result of an inadequate distribution of tax reimbursement funds, to which I have referred earlier, the Commonwealth has left every State in Australia with insufficient revenue funds to meet its normal obligations. Every State with the exception of Queensland will, I believe, face large budget deficits this year, and Queensland will avoid being in a similar position only by calling on funds previously set aside to the extent of several million pounds. I believe that the monopoly of income tax in the hands of the Commonwealth, which has given the Commonwealth such tremendous power over the finances and affairs of the States, is not only contrary to the best interests of the States, but to the Australian people generally. This monopoly will, I believe, greatly contribute to irresponsibility in Australian public finance in the States because they are not responsible for raising monies they spend, and in the Commonwealth because it has income it does not really need.

The seasonal outlook for 1955-56 is the best for many years. The whole of the State without exception has received winter and early spring rains sufficient to give promise of an

excellent agricultural and pastoral season. Of great importance to country and town people alike is the fact that every reservoir in the State has filled. During the past 20 years there has been tremendous expansion in South Australia's secondary industries, but the part played in the State's economy by the rural industries has not diminished. Although only about 5½ per cent of the State's population is permanently engaged in rural industry, as compared with 11 per cent in secondary industry, the recorded value of primary production in 1953-54 (the last year for which complete figures are available) was £112,500,000 as compared with £100,200,000 for factory production. Taking all production into account South Australian income per head continued in 1953-54, as in several previous years, to be actually the highest in Australia.

The rate of expansion in the South Australian population since the 1947 census has been next to highest in Australia, being exceeded only in Western Australia. Over the eight years to June 30 last the population increased from 646,000 to 820,000, an increase of almost 27 per cent. Of this proportion about 12½ per cent was due to natural increase and over 14 per cent to migration. Over the same eight years the number of children of schoolgoing age (say 5 to 15 years inclusive) increased from 98,000 to 161,000, an increase of 64 per cent. This compares with 43 per cent for Australia as a whole and 48 per cent in the next highest State, and it gives some indication of why this State has been so hard pressed to keep abreast of requirements for education facilities and staff. As a matter of interest the population of the metropolitan area of this State is estimated to have reached the half million mark within the last few months. Eight years ago it was approximately 382,500.

This year will be a difficult one for the State finances, but that will, I trust, be a passing phase. The community at large must, in the interests of progress and development, adjust itself in certain ways, particularly so as to avoid overspending both externally and internally. It must face the fact that the prices for our exported produce are unlikely in the near future to recover towards the previous peak levels. However, with a very good season ahead, all reservoirs filled and a valuable stand-by in the Mannum pipeline, full employment, profitable manufacturing industries and flourishing commerce, there is no real threat to our standard of living. Our problems, such as

they are, are those associated with a high degree of prosperity and a rapidly developing country. The relatively small measure of self-discipline, tolerance, and readjustment required is a price which I am sure will be readily paid by South Australians to retain and improve upon this State's extraordinary record of economic progress during recent years.

I pay a personal tribute to the officers of the Treasury for the high standard of work they have again performed this year in managing State financial affairs. The South Australian Treasury has a very fine record and its efficiency is appreciated in Australian and overseas financial circles. It is with pride that I submit figures to the Loan Council because they are always respected. Frequently they have proved to be correct when figures submitted by other authorities have not been so accurate. I was pleased recently when an overseas Government, desiring advice on accountancy, was advised by an Australian authority to put into effect substantially the South Australian accounting system. Messrs. Drew, Seaman and Carey and the other members of the staff are officers of the highest order, and do a remarkably good job. I publicly acknowledge my indebtedness for the great assistance and skilful advice they have given me on the intricate financial problems that arise from day to day. I move the adoption of the first line of the Estimates.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again..

#### **Y.W.C.A. OF PORT PIRIE INC. (PORT PIRIE PARKLANDS) BILL.**

(Continued from September 27. Page 882.)

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Title.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The Select Committee has recommended that the title of the Bill be amended slightly; accordingly, I move:—

To strike out "vest" and insert "provide for vesting."

Amendment carried; title as amended passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

#### **GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

(Continued from September 27. Page 894.)

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

#### **TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 622.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—Speaking on August 24 I said I thought there was some merit in this Bill, but that there were strong arguments against it. I have given it further consideration and am still somewhat dubious about supporting it. The part that disturbs me is clause 3, which states that the Town Planner shall be the chairman of the Town Planning Committee and that the other four members may be councillors or officers of councils. I do not think such a committee would always act in accordance with the views of the people. For some years I served on a council, and I found that sometimes councillors are appointed to important posts by a popular vote. Therefore, we must be sure that the person appointed chairman of the committee has all the necessary credentials, and the same applies to the other four members, who may come from councils. I think it would be wise to have two members from councils and two others, with a sound knowledge of town planning, from other walks of life. I do not disparage councillors, but they may find it difficult to arrive at a decision because the council concerned must decide on a proposed subdivision and if the matter comes before the Town Planning Committee the question must be decided by Parliament, through the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, if no agreement is reached. That means that Parliament will make the decision if there is a deadlock between the committee and the council concerned.

Although some members of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation may be fully cognizant of the merits and demerits of a case, others may not, so this House, or another place, may have to make the decision, and those members without an intimate knowledge of the case may find a decision difficult. In saying that, I am not reflecting on anyone. The Bill states that the committee's developmental plan for the metropolitan area may be

referred back to it for reconsideration, but the whole purpose of town planning could be defeated if there were too many delays.

When I spoke on August 24 I said that the Port Adelaide City Council had not contacted me on this matter, and I assumed that it was not interested. I have since been informed by the council that it is not very interested in town planning because that municipality is almost developed. The recent subdivision that took place in the Semaphore district was the result of the Harbors Board's acquiring a large area there for reclamation and for subsequent vesting in the Housing Trust for development as a garden suburb. That is a very commendable scheme which may take some years to carry out, but it will be greatly appreciated by the people who have the honour to reside in that locality now and by those who will be allotted trust homes when they are built. The Woodville City Council has displayed interest in this measure because it has 700 acres in Seaton Park needing subdividing. Its difficulty, however, is that, although under the Building Act it has powers to zone areas, they only operate after a building has been constructed on an allotment and do not apply to vacant allotments. This may also apply in other districts, and if so, noisy trades may operate and be a nuisance, but the council has no power to act because they are being operated on vacant allotments, whereas if buildings were constructed thereon the council could exercise its powers in the matter. This Bill provides that zoning may be carried out by the Town Planning Committee. I take it that that power might be exercised in respect of vacant as well as occupied allotments, and I therefore support that provision.

I also support the provision that the Town Planning Committee shall at all times give consideration to the reservation of land for playing grounds and recreation reserves. We cannot be too careful in this matter. The metropolitan area has developed considerably and at times the authorities have forgotten to set aside sufficient land for reserves. The provision in this Bill has a dual meaning: reserves apply to football, tennis grounds, etc., for people desiring to take part in sport for the benefit of their health; children's play-grounds play an important part in allowing children a recreational outlet for their energies and in ensuring that they can play in safety. The Bill is good in part, and I support the second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I congratulate the Government on its attitude to town planning. I believe strongly that it is time that the development of the metropolitan area was put on a proper footing. Indeed, I regret that this was not done some time ago; it could well have been done soon after the war and before the great upsurge of building in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It could have been done after the first war.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes, but better late than never; therefore I congratulate the Government on introducing a Town Planning Bill again this session. If its provisions had previously been law a number of problems would not have arisen in my electorate. For example, had the provision in clause 6 concerning sewerage facilities been law, the difficult problems that have arisen in the hills area of the Mitcham electorate would probably have been averted. Town planning is an undertaking that is probably easier to appraise after it has been carried out than at the time of its implementation. Indeed, in many ways the town planner has a thankless task and it is left to future generations to thank him. It is one thing, however, to congratulate the Government on introducing this Bill, but it is another to give wholehearted support to the whole of its content, and I am afraid I cannot do that.

I shall not traverse again the ground so admirably covered by the member for Torrens (Mr. Travers). I could not, with his lucidity, expound the points he made; nor would I attempt to do so, because it would simply be going over the ground again, but I sincerely refer members to his remarks because I agree entirely with most of his criticism. The points he mentioned in his excellent speech are real shortcomings in the Bill, and unless we attend to them now we shall be sorry. I understand the Bill differs in a number of respects from that introduced last year. That is a good thing, but I regret that greater changes have not been made.

I wish to mention specifically only three points. The first relates to the limits within which this Bill shall apply. I join issue with the member for Torrens (Mr. Travers) when he says, in effect, that any part of the State could be brought within its terms, for I do not think that is the position as clause 2 (b) defines the metropolitan area as:—

(a) the area comprised within the municipalities of Adelaide, Brighton, Burnside, Campbelltown, Enfield, Glenelg, Henley and Grange, Hindmarsh, Kensington and Norwood, Marion, Mitcham, Payneham, Port Adelaide,

Prospect, St. Peters, Thebarton, Unley, Walkerville, West Torrens and Woodville and the area comprised within the Garden Suburb:

(b) such other parts of the State as the Governor by proclamation from time to time declares to be within the metropolitan area.

The districts referred to in paragraph (a) comprise merely the present metropolitan area, and paragraph (b) is simply the product of the Parliamentary Draftsman's tidy mind. It gives no power by itself to extend the metropolitan area, but merely takes care of the possible extension of the metropolitan area by some other provision. In other words, the Parliamentary Draftsman has said, "Here we have the metropolitan area as it is to be declared at present." Then he thinks, "Well, I know there will be a provision to extend the metropolitan area under this Bill, and I will allow for such extension by inserting paragraph (b)." To ascertain what power there is to extend the metropolitan area we must look at the last part of proposed new section 2 (2), which states:—

The Governor may, from time to time by proclamation declare that any part of the State which is contiguous to any part of the metropolitan area . . . shall be included in the metropolitan area.

In other words, the metropolitan area can only be extended to some part at present contiguous to it. Therefore, the Act could not be extended to Port Lincoln, Port Augusta or any other country town unless all the area between the present metropolitan area and that town was brought under the Act.

Mr. Shannon—There would have to be a neck leading from one to the other.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes; therefore I do not think Mr. Travers was correct when he said that the metropolitan area could be extended to any part of the State. Perhaps the whole of the State might be proclaimed, but not isolated pockets. On whether that is a good thing I shall not venture an opinion now; I simply point it out. Secondly, I desire to refer briefly to compensation of property owners whose land may be affected. It has been seriously suggested that there is no need for any provision for compensation. That may be so, but on the other hand there may arise cases of hardship, and surely it would not be asking too much that some provision be inserted in the Bill so that, if that eventuality arises, people will be protected. If there are no cases of hardship, well and good: the provisions will never be used. If, however, cases of hardship arise, there should be a provision to cover them. That seems to me only elementary justice, and not only must justice be done, but

justice must appear to be done. That is an old and well tried maxim, and it is absolutely applicable here. Town planning is a community programme and it is not right that a few members of a community should be made to suffer. It is only fair that the community as a whole should bear the expense of town planning; therefore, I suggest most earnestly that members consider providing for compensation if it be required, otherwise I believe this Bill could be completely unjust.

Thirdly, I question the method by which the developmental plan for the metropolitan area of Adelaide will become law. It seems that the whole idea under the proposed scheme is to make any change in the committee's plan as difficult and unlikely as possible. In other words, the object seems to be to ensure that the plan, which is to be drawn up by unknown people with unspecified qualifications entirely in their own time, shall be confirmed with the least possible trouble and public fuss. We do not know how long it will take the committee, once appointed, to draw up the plan. When it is drawn up the onus is switched to us to say we do not like it. In other words, we do not consider it in the normal way and decide whether or not it is a good plan: it is up to us to take some further step if we disapprove of the plan. I think the analogy of the onus of proof is applicable here—that a person is adjudged innocent until proved guilty. There is always an outcry when the onus is switched and there is presumption of guilt. Here, we have the same thing. Instead of our having actively to consider the plan and to pass judgment on its merits, it is up to us to take the step of disapproving of it should we so desire. I think that is a bad thing.

However, although I have made these few comments—two of them critical of the Bill's provisions—I do not oppose the second reading because there has been far too much delay already on town planning. It is better to pass the second reading and hope for improvement in Committee.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I have always believed in town planning, and with strong reservations I support this Bill. I was interested to hear the member for Mitcham congratulate the Government on it. Although I agree with most of what he said I cannot congratulate the Government on producing this Bill because, after all, it is only a second edition of the measure introduced last year which somehow or other subsided into the silence. As a result, I have some grave doubts

about this measure. To put it frankly, I am not sure it is genuine, although I hope it is. I agree with Mr. Millhouse that it is better for a Bill of this nature to be introduced late than never, but I am not sure that this one is the answer to the problem of town planning. Mr. Millhouse said that there had been far too much delay already. I entirely agree but ask why there has been so much delay. Many members of the Opposition, and of the Government, have been wondering why we have had to wait so long for it. It seems to be another half measure, and that is one reason why I support the second reading with strong reservations. It appears to be another instance of the Government's practice of filching items from Labor's policy and, unfortunately, only adopting them in a hybrid form. As usual we find that the Government only goes a short distance along the road of progress, but because it has to a slight extent adopted our ideas I will support the measure.

I have been told frequently in the last few months—and I think this is generally believed in South Australia—that this Government is totally impervious to new ideas. I disagree with that. I believe this Government is slowly accepting new ideas that best support its own interests, but it takes a long time. The Labor Party has for years urged the adoption of town planning principles as a part of its long-range policy for the good of the State. In 1924 a Labor Government introduced such a measure to this House and made it plain then that the Greater Adelaide scheme must eventuate sooner or later. By "Greater Adelaide scheme" I mean complete co-ordination of local government and its services throughout the metropolitan area. That certainly does not come within the scope of this Bill, which is a half measure and only too symbolic of the Government's attitude of refusing to come to grips with most public questions in a realistic manner. Unfortunately, through bitter experience, with the cards stacked against us, we have learned that we must take what we can get and strive for more and consequently, together with others members of my Party, I support the Bill.

I believe the Government's own inaction has made this measure even more necessary. Consider the method of locating housing schemes in South Australia. No-one seems certain how they are allocated—whether drawn out of a hat or whether a penny is tossed. Whatever method has been adopted it has been haphazard and the results—particularly when we examine some of the roads in our new Housing Trust

areas—reveal that there has been no thought for future planning and future servicing. Indeed, that is one reason why I am happy about this Bill: it shows some evidence that in future new housing estates will have these problems considered before the houses are erected. I have always believed that it would have been better to provide such amenities as roads in new areas before the houses were built, and if tenants had been asked to pay a few shillings more for rent they would at least have had the benefit of good roads and footpaths. We realize well enough that there has been lack of control over private subdivisions which has greatly increased our difficulties. I would not like it to be thought that I am casting a stone at the Housing Trust because I appreciate how much we have benefited from its activities, but private subdividers have been equally culpable in regard to amenities, in rendering it difficult for people and tradesmen to get into houses.

Town planning is much more than merely controlling the subdivision of land for residential and other purposes. It is only a part of a large undertaking: co-ordinating all building and planning for development not only of the metropolitan area but of country towns and country districts. The real problem in South Australia is lack of co-ordination. The Labor Party has always advocated co-ordination. Such things as gas, sewerage, roads, public transport—and here I particularly refer to the Tramways Trust—are all an integral part of the problem and to a large extent are all in a state of confusion or worse because there is no broad general policy. Worse still, they suffer from a multiplicity of authorities, many of them overlapping. Apparently that has been Government policy for years. If there is praise or blame to be taken for it—and here I suggest it is blame—it should go to the right quarter. Of course, we realise that like most Governments, it is usually more eager to seek praise than the reverse.

This then is a belated and, as shown last year, half-hearted attempt by the Government to right its own wrongs. Last year, when debating a similar Bill, the Leader of the Opposition spoke about closing the stable door after the horse had gone. I would go further and say that the horse had been gone so long it had almost died of old age after doing a lot of damage. There are many problems attached to the principle of town planning. There is some good in this measure and it must be supported with hope for the future. Probably we have more hope for the

future this time than is usual because next year we shall have an opportunity, as a Government, to do what is being done in Queensland—make an attempt to co-ordinate town planning. I am rather pleased, in mentioning Queensland, that for once I did not hear caustic remarks from members opposite. We frequently hear such comments, particularly about Queensland's natural resources, and what it is doing and is not doing, but it savours of the old fable of the fox and the grapes. In Brisbane they are busy co-ordinating the various services in the metropolitan area. They have one Greater Brisbane authority. If we compare our many and often contradictory authorities we may see that benefits must arise from a co-ordinated system for a State capital. They are undertaking a master plan for the Brisbane metropolitan area that has been determined by the Government on the advice of a really expert committee. The Brisbane City Council has complete power of land acquisition, with recompense, for reserves, parks, roads and so on, and to take all necessary action for the co-ordination of that city. That scheme is already proving such a success that it affords ample proof of what is really desirable in Adelaide. Opposition members make no secret of the fact that the co-ordination of the city of Adelaide into a Greater Adelaide will be the policy of the Party when in office. I am disappointed that the Bill does not set out the personnel of the proposed committee. Of course, the Town Planner is to be the chairman, but the Government has had 12 months to make up its mind on the matter, and the delay raises doubts as to whether the Government is any more sincere with this Bill than it was with the measure last session. Of course, I do not think it is insincere, but this is an example of the Government's unfortunate slipshod method of tackling a problem.

The proposed committee will have two main functions, and I am not happy about either of them. Firstly, it will have the power to approve or disapprove subdivision proposals, which must be submitted to it. The Bill says how the proposals shall be dealt with but under existing legislation councils have the right either to approve or disapprove subdivisions. There are provisions for an appeal to be made to the committee against the decision of a council, and for an appeal to be made to Parliament against a committee decision. This seems rather complicated and not a workable system. It will bog down the committee in a mess of trouble. It is a pity the Brisbane scheme was not followed, and a complete co-ordinating authority established. The second function of

the committee, and Mr. Millhouse is not happy about it also, is that the committee will make a long range comprehensive plan of development for the metropolitan area. "Long range" is a wide term and I would like to know how long a period is to be covered. If the time is too long it will provide scope for speculation, which must be unfair to the landholders. I prefer a maximum time for the production of a plan, but there is no mention of it in the Bill. The debate on the measure has been rather protracted, and during its course members on both sides have pointed out anomalies, so there is no need for me to labour the matter. I must support the Bill because it is a short step in the right direction. That is a change, but it is about as far as we can expect the present Government to go in the matter. It would be better if we tackled it as a complete problem. There is some difference of opinion about the ambit of the Bill. Mr. Travers contends that it can be extended to country areas, but I cannot believe that to be the position. With these reservations I support the second reading.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the Bill, which is a step in the right direction. It is something that members have been advocating for many years. Paragraph (b) of clause 2 means that the Bill applies to the metropolitan area by stipulation, but paragraph (d) says:—

The Governor may from time to time by proclamation declare that any part of the State which is contiguous to any part of the metropolitan area (whether defined by subsection (1) of this section or by a proclamation made under this subsection) shall be included in the metropolitan area. The Governor may, by proclamation, vary or revoke any proclamation as aforesaid.

Therefore it applies to the country by proclamation only. Mr. Travers said that the Bill applies to all areas within the boundaries of the State, but I question that. "Contiguous" is defined by the dictionary as a place nearby or adjoining. Consequently, if it were desired to have the Bill apply to Port Pirie the area between the metropolitan area and Port Pirie would have to be proclaimed as an area contiguous to the metropolitan area. I cannot see how the Bill will apply to any part of the State. Paragraph (c) of section 3 (1) of the Building Act says:—

Every municipality and every district within which the Governor, after receipt of a petition from the council of such municipality or district declares, by proclamation, that this Act shall apply.

Such a provision in this Bill would make the position much clearer. Paragraph (i) of subsection (1) of new section 12a says—

... if the land is situated within a municipality that the council of that municipality has notified the committee that the roadway of every proposed street or road has to a width of at least 24ft. been adequately formed and paved

The present method of dealing with the matter is something like this. A vendor, wishing to cut up land for building purposes, may apply to the Town Planner and the municipal authority involved, and they may agree that it be subdivided provided the vendor builds roads, but he may refuse to do so. The board, the place of which will be taken by the committee set out in the Bill, may say the vendor need not build the roads as there is no law to require it. The Bill provides for a roadway 24ft. wide and built to certain specifications, and that is a good provision. Let me set out what has happened in two instances recently in my municipality. One vendor cut up valuable rural property for building purposes. He built no roads, but he reserved a small area as a park. It was good of him to do that because he was not compelled to do so. Now in the matter of roads the area is imposing a heavy strain on the finances of the municipality. In the other instance when a vendor applied to the corporation for approval to subdivide land he was asked to provide roads of a certain standard. He provided roads, but they were only 16ft. in width, and of very poor construction. The Bill says that before any subdivision can be approved the vendor must provide roads of decent construction and width.

There has been some controversy over the proposed committee. The main criticism against the proposal is that there is no appeal against its decisions when it is considered there is unfairness in a subdivision, and there may be something in that. I had a letter from an association of fruitgrowers saying that a vegetable garden or orchard may be concerned in a green belt proposal, and the people owning the property, after spending much money on improvements, cannot sell and get a proper profit whereas land just outside the green belt can be cut up and the owners receive the increased value from the subdivision. The people who own the vegetable garden or orchard are restricted to selling the property for that purpose, and thereby are expected to contribute at their expense to the cost of the green belt that will be there for the benefit of many people. I believe that when an appeal to the

committee is unsuccessful there should be the right of appeal to a higher tribunal against committee's decisions if deemed to be unfair. I support the Bill.

Mr. HULLCHENS (Hindmarsh)—Mr. Travers voiced strong objection to this measure and in the main I agree with his remarks. The Bill, of course, is a ghost of something that died last year. That measure came into this House just prior to an intended meeting of town planners in Adelaide early in August. The air was filled with the idea of town planning; broadcast stations and newspapers were alive with articles about this matter and about the intention of holding a conference. The Premier, of course, felt that he must ride on the crest of popularity and hastily introduced a Bill, scheduled to be introduced on August 12, just prior to the conference. Unfortunately, the Minister of Agriculture introduced the Wheat Stabilization Bill and rather spread himself, talking the Premier out, so the Bill was automatically introduced. There was quite a deal of interest in the matter at the time. Members of this House, and I think of the Legislative Council, received a number of letters supporting and protesting against the provisions of the measure. Also, a number of articles appeared in the press for and against the Bill.

This year there seems to be a lack of enthusiasm throughout the State towards this Bill. Last year's Bill passed this House with the blessing of the Opposition. I do not propose to go so far as to oppose this Bill outright, but I shall make some criticism of it. I shall support it because, like the members on this side of the House who have already spoken, I feel that it is the thin edge of the wedge to provide some form of town planning, which we feel is necessary. For far too long slipshod planning in the metropolitan area and some country areas has operated. Some towns, such as Mount Gambier, are well planned, but there has been a lack of planning in the metropolitan area. Kidman Park, a housing trust area between Findon and Grange, has been recently developed and about 240 Housing Trust purchase homes have been constructed and occupied. People have been residing there for months, but they have no postal or transport facilities, and for a long time had no street lighting. They still have no substantial roads, but only graded tracks. These things cause a great deal of irritation to the people and have placed the council in a pretty sad plight, because it is continually

being pestered by the residents, and rightly so, for roads, drainage and all the other things that are required and that should have been provided by town planning.

There is no co-ordination between the councils, Housing Trust authorities, builders, Tramways Trust, railways, Electricity Trust, Highways Department, and Engineering and Water Supply Department, and each organization is continually passing the buck by blaming others for the lack of facilities that are necessary for the standard of living we boast of living under. Something should be done to prevent this very unsatisfactory, slipshod method of settling our people.

There is a great need for town planning and for co-ordination between the authorities. Many areas have no transport, yet in other areas not far away trams, trains and buses run parallel and within a few chains of each other at extreme cost, because one is stealing from the other. While this is going on people in other areas are without transport, yet they are obliged as taxpayers to pay for something they are unable to secure. The people going into these trust areas are naturally those with families, because that is a necessary qualification for obtaining a house. Their children have no transport and are compelled to walk in all types of weather to their nearest schools.

Because I believe that this Bill will give us a start in the formulation of a plan I am prepared to support it. Another reason for my support is that I, like the honourable member for Gawler, support the establishment of a greater Adelaide scheme, and I believe this Bill could lead to the formation of such a scheme. During the Address in Reply debate I drew attention to the overlapping of councils. In the metropolitan area there are 20 or more councils and these cost the residents at least £200,000 a year in administration costs alone. Apart from this, a large amount of equipment also lays idle because of the overlapping, and this is costing the ratepayers a great deal of money. The member for Gawler pointed out the position in Queensland. I have considered their scheme and, although I could find some faults with it, from the aspect of cost and planning it has much to offer. I believe we should take steps towards adopting that scheme here.

It has been suggested that this Bill will go into the files after it has passed this Chamber and the Legislative Council, and that it will be forgotten. I hope that it will not, but evidence of the past indicates that it might

share the same fate as other measures. In 1940 an inquiry was held into housing conditions, and the committee that held the inquiry brought down a report. An Act was passed to carry out its recommendations, and it is interesting to note that in the second progress report of September 12, 1940 the condition of a house in Glanville was mentioned. That house is still standing, and I would be surprised if it has had a coat of paint since 1940. The Housing Improvement Act introduced at that time has done very little, if anything.

The 1940 report showed that there were 5,404 substandard homes in Adelaide, Hindmarsh, and Port Adelaide. I would think that the number has increased substantially, in spite of the Act. In the same report it was mentioned that a house in Hill Street, Bowden was in a very bad state. I took along with me a picture of that house, and found that it is still in the same condition. On page 13 of the report it is mentioned that there was a house in Second Street Bowden with a 9ft. frontage. That house is still there, and the rent has been increased considerably since those days. What has the Act done and what will the present Act do if no more attention is given to it than was given to the other Act? Is this Bill to create the impression that the Government is going to do something on the eve of an election, or is there some real intent behind it? I am afraid that, if the Government is allowed to continue in office, the Bill will go into the shelves and remain a memorial to the kidstrokes of the present Government. It will certainly be a reminder to future generations, if it is hung beside the Housing Improvement Act, that a Liberal Government is one for talking, not one for acting. However, as I am confident that there will be a change of Government in the near future and considering this Bill to be the thin edge of the wedge for a more satisfactory system of town planning, I support the second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I was delighted to hear the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) telling us what we ought to do and what we ought not to do in implementing legislation on substandard houses. I think his Party has a Bill on the Notice Paper on this question. I understand that the measure will aim at controlling the demolition of any type of house.

Mr. Hutchens—Unfortunately, we shall have to now.

Mr. SHANNON—I remind the honourable member that he cannot have it both ways. He wants to condemn the Government for its failure to implement the provisions of the Housing Improvement Act, but at the same time he blames it whenever a house of any sort is demolished.

Mr. Dunstan—The Bill on the Notice Paper does not refer to substandard houses.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member is one of the first to complain when any house is knocked down.

Mr. Dunstan—I do not complain when a substandard house is demolished.

Mr. SHANNON—There is a division of opinion on that. Every time an old cottage in the city of Adelaide is demolished the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) complains, irrespective of its condition.

Mr. John Clark—You cannot blame him if the place is habitable.

Mr. SHANNON—Opposition members say that there is no justification for demolishing habitable dwellings, yet the member for Hindmarsh complains of the failure of this Government to implement the provisions of the Housing Improvement Act. Generally speaking, this Bill has considerable merit. I approve of its principles, but there are certain factors that make the whole matter a little ludicrous. I should like to have Colonel Light's views on what has happened to his green belt around the city. The whole of North Terrace and adjacent parklands, and nearly all the parklands fronting West Terrace, have been built upon. If Colonel Light came back he would hardly recognize his fair city. Now we have the avowed objective of establishing another green belt a little farther out from the city but, as the member for Torrens (Mr. Travers) pointed out, the town planners will not have an open go in formulating the plan because most of the land has been taken up. The establishment of another green belt can only be done at someone's expense.

Recently the Government made available a large area near West Beach for recreation purposes and appointed a competent committee to develop it. Some members opposite have said that the Government is not sincere in bringing down this Bill and that it will not be implemented, but the establishment of the West Beach Recreation Trust is at least some indication of the Government's intentions in this field. That is a better approach than that of this Bill, which proposes a committee having power to say that certain areas shall be set aside indefinitely or permanently for

certain purposes. The committee may say that a landowner cannot subdivide his land, but must continue to use it as it has been used in the past, whereas his neighbour may be able to subdivide his land and sell it at a high price for housing. The person denied the right to subdivide his land should be adequately compensated, but who will pay the compensation?

Mr. Fred Walsh—Who paid for the land for the new town near Salisbury?

Mr. SHANNON—It was bought by the Housing Trust out of funds provided by the Government. The trust set aside considerable areas for various activities, including sport. The trust drew up a good plan for the new town, and it had the land to do that, but that is not available in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It will not be long before it will be the metropolitan area.

Mr. SHANNON—I am not going to join issue with the members for Torrens (Mr. Travers) and Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who have different views as to how far this leads. I have some sympathy with the view taken by Mr. Travers that the word "contiguous" is something of a stumbling block; that two things must be adjacent to be contiguous. If the metropolitan area is increased by tacking on a piece of contiguous area, the next piece further on then obviously becomes contiguous. As the honourable member contended, the metropolitan area could be indefinitely enlarged and, taking the argument to absurd lengths, as he did to illustrate his point, the whole of the State could eventually become the metropolitan area. For those reasons I have some serious doubts about the wisdom of such a wide provision. I would like to see a more definite delineation of the area to which this committee shall apply itself. To put it at its mildest, it is very indefinite as it stands. I take it this committee will consist of experts in this field. It will be a great shame if that is not the case.

Mr. Travers—The Bill does not say so.

Mr. SHANNON—I realize that. The only man who can be said to have qualifications is the Town Planner. The other four nominees, I take it, will be men having some knowledge of the problem; I trust my Government for that, but this is a factor which worries me a little. Having surveyed the situation and prepared its master plan, and set aside land as open spaces for the use of the people in perpetuity, that plan becomes of greater importance than the actual control of subdivisions and such detailed work because it represents an attempt to look into the future

and see the ultimate likely growth of the city and its environs. The only thing Parliament can do about it, when the plan is laid before the House, is to move for its amendment or disallowance. It is then referred back to the committee and ultimately comes back to Parliament again. I fear, however, that there will be many interested members of Parliament, and they will not all be metropolitan members for it is not they alone who will be concerned with this Bill. I can see at once that this House will probably be taking a very serious view of some of the plans that will come before it. The vested interests of the people whose rights are being over-ridden may be heard here as effectively on either side of the Chamber, because members opposite will have just as much pressure brought to bear on them as those on this side, and sometimes it will be hard to withstand the justice of the case put forward for a person to get more adequate compensation than is proposed. Of course, we know nothing of the basis of compensation at this stage and obviously we should know that certain principles will be applied in assessing compensation.

The member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) told us that we should look to Brisbane for all the answers; that the Greater Brisbane plan was the be-all and end-all of town planning. I have one or two friends who reside in Greater Brisbane and they are not at all as happy about it as some who reside at greater distances away from it. I believe that Brisbane, of all the capital cities of the Commonwealth, is least served with sewerage.

Mr. Travers—And instead of getting honorary work they pay handsome salaries.

Mr. SHANNON—The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) put the cost of running the various municipalities in the metropolitan area at £200,000. Obviously, it must have been a stab in the dark, but probably it was an understatement of the actual cost. Be that as it may, an area of the size of Adelaide and its environs cannot be administered without personnel, and probably the very same officers whom he complained about would be employed by some consolidated local governing body. The bigger the ship the greater the difficulty of finding the leak. The bigger the organization the easier to hush things up, and Greater Brisbane has not proved the unalloyed success sometimes claimed for it. It is a peculiar thing that in the heart of London there should be a City of London still operating as a separate entity. I do not know

why it should be continued if it so wrong in principle. If it is so utterly wasteful of manpower effort why is it continued in the greatest city of the world? Surely we should be guided by what has been done over the centuries in the older parts of civilization rather than rush in and develop some new and untried method. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) said that this Bill constituted only a short step, but it goes a little further than I would go, for I would have preferred a Bill to increase the power of the Town Planner and his department to see that areas were not subdivided for dwellings, if they could not be served by the necessary public services such as sewerage, electricity and transport. The Public Works Committee has heard much about the high costs involved in providing such services in areas which should have been set aside for industrial development, but which have been developed as residential areas.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The Housing Trust determines that.

Mr. SHANNON—The subdivisions to which I refer were made before the Housing Trust commenced to operate. Be that as it may, the Housing Trust is not the only authority that buys land today.

Mr. Fletcher—The Town Planner operated even in the old days.

Mr. SHANNON—Yes, but his powers were limited. I would have preferred the Government to tackle that problem and not to get tangled up with the problems of overall planning. Then if the Government, or the Housing Trust as its agent, purchased land from time to time and held it for public parks, we could have repeated in various parts what has already been done at West Beach. It may be said that the proposed committee will do that in any case, but it will not be responsible to foot the bill. Although there is nothing in this measure about compensation for people whose rights will be over ridden, sooner or later we must face the cost. It is no use our passing legislation in the fond hope that we will get all these things for nothing; somebody will have to pay and it would be better to say in this Bill who will pay and how the sum will be assessed. I support the second reading; but I hope that in Committee certain amendments are made. For instance, the power of the Town Planning Committee should be limited, and I will support any amendment that will confine its power to some specific metropolitan area.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support the second reading, but, like most other members,

with some misgivings because, although this is a somewhat feeble and faltering step towards town planning, the Government has merely meandered down the road, pattered through a few puddles on the way, and only gone a little way from the starting point. It has introduced a Bill that is not a proper town planning Bill.

Mr. Macgillivray—It is a mixed grill.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, and not a very savoury mixed grill at that. The member for Torrens (Mr. Travers) said the people who would have to foot the bill for the things that the subdividers would be compelled to do under this measure would be the poor, unfortunate purchasers of subdivided blocks; but with great respect I do not agree. The demand for blocks in speculative subdivisions around Adelaide (and there are many such subdivisions at present) is not an inelastic demand; consequently the people who would have to foot the Bill would be those compelled to do the things required by the measure. If the price were too high the people would not buy the blocks, and the sellers of such blocks would have to watch the market. Indeed, quite a few sellers have not managed to sell under existing conditions. It is significant that the members of the public who are most outspoken against this measure are the very speculative landholders to whom I have referred. In South Australia many speculative landholders have reaped a good profit from the public by means of improper subdivisions and if they must now foot a few extra bills I, for one, will cheer.

I agree with Mr. Travers that the qualifications of committee members are not adequately set out in the Bill, and if the honourable member moves that their qualifications be

set out, I shall be pleased (depending, of course, on the qualifications he requires) to support that amendment. I do not, however, agree that the method of approval by this Parliament of the overall plan as set out in the Bill is improper; it is far more effective than the drawing up by the committee of a plan and then introducing it in a Bill. It is preferable to table the plan and make it possible for members to move for its disallowance and refer it back to the committee, because members of this House have not the expert qualifications of a town planning committee. Parliamentarians may be able to see certain objections to a plan, but the redrafting of a plan is beyond the capacity of most of them. It is certainly beyond my capacity. If a plan were referred back to the committee, re-submitted to Parliament, and still considered unsatisfactory, it could again be referred to the committee. Mr. Travers suggested that individual members would not get sufficient support from other members to amend plans affecting their own districts, but members who advance a reasonable case will receive support from other members if such support is justified. Surely that principle operates in respect of all measures that come before the House, and I do not see why it should not apply in respect of this Bill. Consequently, although the measure has not any great virtue because it does not go nearly all the way it should, it is some slight step along the road and therefore I will give it my support.

Mr. FRED WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 12, at 2 p.m.