

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 22, 1956.

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

QUESTIONS.**BAUXITE DEPOSITS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Some years ago it was reported that bauxite had been discovered in the north of South Australia. I noticed in this morning's press a report of an extensive bauxite find on Cape Yorke Peninsula in Queensland and it was suggested that it might be used as a source of the raw material needed for the aluminium plant at Bell Bay in Tasmania. Has the Premier any knowledge of occurrences of bauxite in this State and, if so, have they been investigated in order to prove their magnitude and commercial possibilities? If there are substantial occurrences here will an effort be made to develop them in order to supply material to the Bell Bay plant?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no direct knowledge of any South Australian commercial bauxite propositions. No information has been given to me in the last 10 years of any bauxite discoveries here, although, significantly, it is not a rare mineral. World wide, bauxite is a mineral in plentiful supply: it is the grade that is the determining factor in the working of deposits. At present total Australian requirements of bauxite are about 45,000 tons and that is used exclusively at the Bell Bay aluminium plant. I believe that at the moment the supply comes from Malaya. Whether production from the Cape Yorke Peninsula deposits or from some other source will eliminate this I do not know, but bauxite supplies brought to Australia during the war and off-loaded in New South Wales for possible use when the Bell Bay plant was established are still lying alongside the railway line where they were placed when off-loaded. From that I take it the value of the mineral cannot be very high or the department concerned has engaged in wasteful expenditure.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD.

Mr. KING—I understand that Mr. Gordon (Assistant Director of Lands) and Mr. Dridan (Engineer-in-Chief) are in the upper Murray areas at present. Can the Minister of Lands give us the up-to-date position regarding the flood?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Mr. Gordon and Mr. Dridan are at Renmark today investigating the position. This morning I spoke to Mr.

Gordon and Mr. Katekar, who is chairman of the Flood Emergency Committee, and Mr. Katekar informed me that last night some water came through the Crescent area, and altogether in that locality there are 450 acres of vines and trees more or less under water and 20 to 25 homes have been lost. However, I am pleased to report that most of the heavy plant, such as tractors, has been saved and also most of the furniture and other belongings of those who have been evacuated. Another worrying problem is the question of food for the volunteers. Thousands of offers to supply food and other assistance have come forward, so much so that I opened another office in the Lands Department and installed an officer to deal with them. It was officially opened on Monday when I had one officer and one telephone installed, but the next day it was necessary to have six clerks and six telephones operating. When I reported this to Mr. Katekar this morning he was very pleased to know of the assistance which was forthcoming, and also thankful for the assistance he had already received.

I pay a compliment to him and his committee. They have done a magnificent job, and all of them have frequently been on duty all night getting plant out to deal with the problem. On one occasion when Dr. Rollison was up there an emergency call was made at 3 o'clock in the morning and by 3.15 there were 400 men on the job. That is organization. Mr. Katekar was a major in the army with much experience in evacuating families from towns. This morning these were his words to me, "Sir, we are quietly confident. The only thing that can beat us is the weather. Otherwise we will look after Old Man River." That is inspiring information.

The position at other Murray towns is almost the same, and is most critical. At Swan Reach, for instance, where a number of the stone buildings are actually toppling over the locals are endeavouring to salvage roofs and other things which are still above the surface.

It is a very sad picture. We hear a great deal about Murray Bridge, Mannum and Renmark, but every other Murray town is also in a very difficult position, and in those towns every citizen and people from miles around are doing a mighty job trying to save what they can. The picture this morning is not a particularly happy one, except that the locals are quietly confident, and they are working almost night and day to overcome the problem.

MONTEITH AND MYPOLONGA SCHOOLS.

Mr. BYWATERS—I appreciate the comprehensive report of the Minister of Education regarding schools in the flooded areas which he presented last week, but since then the Monteith reclaimed swamp has gone and the school there is affected and at Mypolonga the water is perilously close to the school. Can he say what is the position regarding those two schools?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I cannot give a detailed report. Last week I prefaced my statement by saying that although a report had been received only during the last hour or so, it was probably out of date before it reached me, and that is happening every day. We receive written reports from the district inspectors and heads of schools, but by the time they are received they are out of date. We keep in touch by telephone. Arrangements are being made in every case where it is necessary to close a school for the children to be transferred to other adjacent schools or to the metropolitan area. Tomorrow afternoon I will bring down a detailed report with the latest information concerning the two schools mentioned.

BUILDING REGULATIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the application of the Building Act and the Town Planning Act to the construction of a pair of maisonnettes?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received the following report from Mr. J. P. Cartledge (Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman):—

The law relating to the matter in question is contained in the Town Planning Act, the regulations under that Act, and in the regulations to the Building Act. In general, the Town Planning Regulations lay down the rule that, in a plan of subdivision, an allotment is to have an area of 7,500 square feet or more. Section 18 of the Town Planning Act provides that, if an owner of an allotment builds on it so that any part of the allotment is obviously adapted for occupation from the remainder, he is deemed to divide the allotment. Thus if an allotment is divided in this manner, it is necessary to obtain approval by means of a plan of re-subdivision. The approval required is that of the Town Planner or, in some instances, of the council. Although the requirement of 7,500 square feet does not apply to a plan of re-subdivision it is taken as a guidance. The Building Act regulations provide, in general, that a dwelling is not to be erected on an allotment of less than 3,960 square feet and thus if, by any chance, a re-subdivision took place or has been effected, which left an area of less than 3,960 square feet a dwelling could not be erected on that site. The Building Act regulations should not

be taken as setting a standard area for re-subdivision because the smaller area was intended not for the creation of re-subdivisions having sub-size allotment, but rather to enable buildings to be erected on allotments having 3,960 square feet or more and which are residual portions of old subdivisions and for which allotments separate titles exist.

It has been the practice of the Town Planner and councils to approve the erection of maisonnettes on blocks where the area of land for each dwelling is 4,000 square feet or more when satisfied that it is desirable so to do and it is probable that the existing method provides a suitable degree of control whilst enabling the class of dwellings in question to be erected. But in these cases the view is taken that the pair of maisonnettes should remain under one ownership. There is no objection to maisonnettes or semi-attached houses provided separate titles are not sought for each unless each has the area required under the Town Planning Regulations.

The honourable member will see that this matter is somewhat involved, but I shall be happy to make a copy of the report available to him.

WHEAT STORAGE.

Mr. HEASLIP—Has the Minister of Agriculture a further reply to my question of last week concerning expenditure by the Australian Wheat Board on wheat storage facilities?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have made inquiries and find that as a result of the reduced quantity of wheat required to be stored, on account of the adverse seasonal conditions, the Wheat Board has abandoned the proposal to build the 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 bushels storage it had intended to build at Spencer Brook in W.A. On the general question of the anticipated wheat surplus the latest issue of the *Wheat Board Gazette*, which I received yesterday, indicates that the position has not improved in the last month and the prospects for the coming harvests in Australia are somewhat dimmer than they were a month ago. In New South Wales and Victoria, in particular, the prospects of harvests are very poor, and to a lesser extent South Australia will be down below its normal crop. Western Australia, however, appears to be likely to reap a normal harvest, and possibly a little better.

FINDON SCHOOL.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked yesterday relating to a shelter shed at the Findon Primary School?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Through my colleague, the Acting Minister of Works, I

have received a report from the Architect-in-Chief which sets out the following:—

The shelter shed referred to is a combined toilet block and shelter shed. In order that plasterers may proceed without delay, it is the practice for the roof, ridge capping, etc., to be placed temporarily in position purely as a shelter to protect timber, and also the plasterers, from inclement weather. This practice was adopted at Findon. The roof has not yet been constructed. The contractor for this work has an excellent reputation, and his work has always been of the highest quality.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Did I understand the Minister to say it was a temporary measure? In my estimation 35 sheets of 10ft. and 105 sheets of 8ft. new iron of 26 gauge had been placed on the roof. I estimate that the cost to place on and take off this temporary roof would be £50 to provide a cover for eight days for plasterers. To me this seems unnecessary and serves no good purpose. Will the Minister have further investigations made so as to avoid the waste of Government money?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I will be pleased to refer the statement and question to my colleague, the Acting Minister of Works. I receive a large number of questions from members of Parliament, school committees, school councils, parents and friends associations and members of the public concerning the construction of school buildings. I am pleased to receive these questions and reply to them to the best of my ability, but I point out that neither the Minister of Education, the Director of Education nor the Education Department is a constructing authority. We decide what schools and additions and extensions to schools are desirable and the money is voted by Parliament for the purpose. Instructions are given to the Architect-in-Chief, but we must rely on his and his officers' expert advice. In this case, and in other cases, I am only too pleased to obtain reports from the Architect-in-Chief through my colleague.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO DAIRY FARMERS.

Mr. HARDING—Can the Minister of Agriculture inform me what plans have been made for the evacuation of complete dairies and accommodation of dairy men from flooded reclaimed areas, and whether committees have been formed to assess the numbers of unused and partly used dairies in the South-East? Also, have recommendations been considered for a reasonable basis for share farming and agistment fees for dry cows and young stock, and what plans, if any, have been considered for emergency transport of stock?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have received a report from Mr. Itzerott, the chairman of the Flood Advisory Committee dairy section, which was set up to assist in acting as a clearing house and in an advisory capacity to assist in receiving and disseminating offers of agistment and fodder which might be available to the dairymen on the reclaimed areas who are swamped out. The general position is as satisfactory as perhaps it could be. Mr. Itzerott states that of 148 dairy herds that so far have been put out of action or deprived of their normal pasture because of flooding, 63 have been moved to areas where pasture is available within the existing Milk Board area, 48 remain on their present properties on high land adjoining and are being cared for by their owners, and 27 owners are as yet undecided whether to move or not. It is pleasing that only five of the 148 herds have been dispersed, because we hoped to avoid sale and dispersment which would affect production. The Stockowners', Stock Agents' and Dairymen's Associations in the South-East have held meetings at Mount Gambier and Naracoorte to organize arrangements for agistment and fodder. District dairy advisers are in close contact with these associations, and all information is being channelled through the Murray Bridge office to the Department of Agriculture. The basis of agistment or share farming conditions is regarded as a matter for the parties concerned, and it appears that so far the offers by those having pastures available and the arrangements generally have been very fair and satisfactory. In fact, the word used in the report to describe them is "generous," and no complaint has been received from the department thereon. The Transport Control Board has co-operated in the matter of the movement of fodder and, generally speaking, supplies are moving without interruption and on a satisfactory basis.

MURRAY SETTLERS' RENT AND WATER RATES.

Mr. BYWATERS—Will the rent and water rates payable by settlers in reclaimed areas on the Murray be waived during the period of inundation and until they get back into production?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—All matters of hardship will be considered by Sir Kingsley Paine, and if there are any settlers who are embarrassed financially by their rates falling due they should apply to him.

FISHING INDUSTRY CONFERENCE.

Mr. TAPPING—Last Monday's *Advertiser* reported that plans for developing the Australian fishing industry would be discussed by leaders of fishermen's organizations from all States at a conference to be held in Melbourne today. Will the Minister of Agriculture make the delegate from South Australia conversant with the report of the Jangaard brothers, who were here some months ago, because their expert information would be most helpful to the conference?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The conference to which the honourable member refers is a private one called by the members of the Australian Professional Fishermen's Federation, the members of which are the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Limited, the Queensland Professional Fishermen's League, the New South Wales United Fishermen's League, and bodies from Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia. The conference has been called by that federation and is being attended by the South Australian member, namely, the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Limited. As this company was closely associated with the Jangaard brothers I should think the delegate will go to the conference fully briefed in their findings and experiments. The conference is being opened by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. McMahon), but it is not a Government conference and has not been called at Government level.

PRIVATE BUS FARES.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Premier any knowledge of increased fares having been approved for private bus owners, or is this matter under consideration?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know of any additional fares having been approved, nor have I seen or heard of any application. Normally an application would not come to me in the first instance, but I will inquire for the honourable member and advise him in due course.

CREDIT RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any discussion took place at the recent Agricultural Council conference in Canberra about credit restrictions imposed by banks on primary producers and whether any action is proposed by the Commonwealth Government to issue a new schedule of instructions to banks on this matter, or is the Com-

monwealth leaving this matter for the States to take up by introducing hire-purchase legislation? I have received many complaints that certain banks are loth to increase credit facilities for primary producers, and this is hampering their 12-monthly operations. I understand that the Commonwealth Government intends to keep a close watch on the position, but that will not be sufficient because it issued certain instructions to the banks many months ago. Further instructions should be issued to the banks by the Commonwealth Treasurer because the problem is getting out of hand.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This matter was on the agenda at the Agricultural Council conference, but the conference declined to make any pronounced statement thereon. The information available to the council was that in general terms the undertaking given by the banks under the request of the Commonwealth authorities was being generally observed. As to the necessity for further investigation or request, I think the honourable member has answered his own question to a large extent. I am not unaware of the financial problems of primary producers, but whether it is proper or necessary for further action to be taken to the extent the honourable member indicates is open to doubt.

BANK CREDIT FOR HOMES AND HIRE-PURCHASE.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yesterday I asked a question of the Treasurer regarding the attitude of private banks towards advancing money for home building. In his reply the Treasurer said:—

The Commonwealth Bank may set an overall ratio of loans to deposits, but I think the banks decide themselves which securities they will lend money on and what amounts they will lend.

If that is correct, the Treasurer will appreciate that his answer means that the future of family life in this State, apart from the provisions of the Advances for Homes Act, is in the lap of private finance. The State Bank and the Savings Bank are doing a good job in applying the provisions of that Act, but otherwise no homes are going to be built while the present policy obtains. The provision of homes for the people is the responsibility of Government, and if the private banks are failing in their obvious duty to family life in this State, does the Premier intend to use the undoubted powers he has to make finance available, firstly for home building, and secondly, for hire-purchase?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I point out that, rightly or wrongly, trading banks have never been a source of finance for house building; their business in the main has consisted of seasonal and overdraft advances, exchange, and that type of thing.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do they not make overdrafts available to builders?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They may make an overdraft available for building, but not as a long term mortgage proposition. If the person concerned is able to accept an overdraft for building, it may be arranged under those circumstances. I point out that it is a very precarious form of finance for an ordinary person for house building, because an overdraft can be called up.

Mr. O'Halloran—You miss my point. I meant an overdraft for people to build houses.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I understand the point and am answering it. Although there are instances where banks have made overdrafts available to people who have used the money to build a house, I point out that an overdraft is not a satisfactory method of financing house building because it can be called up at short notice. The position is that in the past trading banks have not been a source of money for home building. Such money has been advanced through the Savings Bank, building societies, State Bank and Government instrumentalities. Whether or not we agree with that, that has been the policy for many years. In fact, I believe it was because of the necessity for some long-term credit foncier system that State banks and housing authorities were created. Home building, of necessity, is a long-term finance proposition and trading banks which, in the main, are using depositors' money—which is at short call—are not, and never have been, in a position to make long-term loans.

The amount that will be available from loans this year from Government sources in South Australia will be almost identical with last year's amount. It will be slightly differently distributed because the Commonwealth Government has requested that a certain amount should be diverted to assist building societies. Apart from that diversion to another channel the money, nevertheless, will be available to approximately the same extent as last year. The ability of the Savings Bank to finance additional home building will, to a certain extent, depend upon deposits and withdrawals therefrom. I believe the State Bank and Housing Trust will operate on

exactly the same level as last year. I am not in a position to say what the Commonwealth Bank's policy will be this year, nor am I in a position to say what the War Service Homes programme will be. I am led to believe—although I have not heard officially—that the War Service Homes programme is already overcommitted and the present applications will have to stand over for about 18 months.

FINANCE FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Can the Minister of Education inform the House of the Government's policy in respect of financing private schools which teach up to primary standard?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—It is not only a matter of Government policy but of high Government policy. I shall refer the honourable member's question to Cabinet, have it discussed and report back to him in due course.

DELAYS IN ISSUING LAND TITLES.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I have been interested in the questions asked by Mr. Fletcher regarding the titles of Housing Trust homes because during the last few months I have had a number of inquiries from residents of Salisbury North and Elizabeth who are worried because they have purchased Housing Trust homes but have had the titles held up. In the meantime they are paying a weekly rent. I understand that this rent, when the titles are cleared, is not deductible from the purchase price of the home. Does the Premier know if this is the position and, if it is, will he inquire whether it would be possible for the rent, paid through no fault of the purchasers, to be deducted from the purchase price?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know the reason for the hold-up in the purchase of the homes. The honourable member will appreciate that the rent charged while the house is still in the ownership of the building authority is necessary to pay interest which the authority in turn has to pay on the money. The Housing Trust, or whoever might be the authority, is obliged to pay full interest on the money, and has to maintain the home and pay full rates and taxes whilst the property is in its possession. The rents that the trust receives do no more than provide for that. If the purchase had been completed the purchaser would have had to pay interest on the money, or if he had the money in his possession he would have taken it from where it

was earning interest in order to pay for the house, so he is actually not at a disability. Why the purchases have been held up I do not know, but I will find out.

Mr. FLETCHER—Can the Treasurer say whether the purchasers of Housing Trust homes who have not yet been issued with their titles are encouraged to effect improvements such as garages and sheds and make gardens on their properties? If because of sickness or some other cause the owner must surrender his home what will be his position and will he be reimbursed for any improvements made? Finally, will the Treasurer endeavour to have the issue of titles expedited?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The important thing is to find out the reason for the delay. In some instances it may be the fact that the War Service Homes Commission is so far behind in making payments that the transaction cannot be completed for a considerable period, but whether that is the case or not I do not know. If it is, then it is entirely outside the power of the Housing Trust to remedy the position. At any given moment the War Service Homes Commission is usually £300,000 to £400,000 behind in its payments to the trust on houses provided by the trust. That is the normal figure as the commission is at present very far behind in dealing with applications. I will, however, examine the reason for the hold-up of these transfers and see if action can be taken to correct the position. Normally, if the applicant has an agreement with the Housing Trust for the sale of a house he will be safe in making alterations to the property.

The trust would not take advantage of an applicant who suffered some unusual hardship and I am certain that, if the applicant substantially improved the property and it reverted to the trust, the trust would protect him in that respect.

Mr. John Clark—Would he be allowed to build sheds and so on?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think the trust would give permission pending the transfer and would deal with the matter in a high, wide and handsome manner.

COUNTRY SEWERAGE.

Mr. FLETCHER—Can the Premier say whether, apart from the one sewerage project that is to be proceeded with, anything has been done regarding the sewerage of country towns as recommended by the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will look at the explanation I made in the Loan Estimates he will see what the Government proposes to do with Loan money this year. In general, it does not provide for sewerage extensions in country areas this year.

WORKERS UNDER FEDERAL AND STATE AWARDS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any information in reply to the question I asked yesterday about the percentage of employees in the respective States working under Federal or State awards?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The information is as follows:—

State.	Total employees.	Not covered by awards.	Covered by Federal awards.	Covered by State awards.
Males—				
New South Wales	788,600	87,530	343,040	358,030
Victoria	565,600	74,660	335,970	154,970
Queensland	274,300	19,480	53,210	201,610
South Australia	184,900	24,220	105,580	55,100
Western Australia	136,200	14,170	17,020	105,010
Tasmania	65,000	10,200	34,190	20,610
Females—				
New South Wales	300,700	22,550	109,760	168,390
Victoria	233,400	16,570	111,330	105,500
Queensland	91,000	4,370	21,020	65,610
South Australia	63,300	8,740	20,190	34,370
Western Australia	45,000	4,270	8,420	32,310
Tasmania	23,000	2,970	7,820	12,210

RENMARK HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. KING—Will the Minister of Education explain the present transport arrangements for the Renmark High School children now attending the Glossop High School?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—From the latest information available it appears that all but 80 of the 250 students who were enrolled at the Renmark High School have had arrangements made for them to attend other

schools. A number, for example, have come to stay with friends and relations in the metropolitan area and are attending metropolitan high schools. Arrangements have now been made for the 80 students, who are still unprovided for, to attend the Glossop High School. As it has not been possible to arrange with the railways for a rail car to be available, and as it is unwise for buses to cross the road bridge into Renmark, arrangements have been made for these 80 students to be picked up at the Berri end of the road bridge and conveyed to the Glossop High School. For this purpose two buses will be available; one will be sent from Glossop each day. The other bus is being sent specially from Adelaide and will be engaged on the service as long as it is required. It is the only available bus in the Education Department and was sent hurriedly to Renmark. Members of the high school staff have been transferred to the Glossop High School and other high schools as directed by the Superintendent of High Schools, and members of the women's staff are already in residence at the women's hostel at Berri. Of further interest to the honourable member and members generally, last Friday the Director of Education wrote to the heads of some of our large metropolitan schools inquiring whether parents of students could accommodate children from the Renmark High School and other schools who had been displaced from the Murray district, and up to this morning offers to accommodate well over 500 children had been received, and the Director estimates that eventually the number will easily increase to 1,000. Some individual householders have offered to accommodate a mother and up to four children.

DAMAGE TO COUNCIL ROADS BY HAULIERS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question regarding damage by hauliers to council roads?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following report from the Highways Commissioner:—

Apart from the normal procedure of making by-laws, a council has power under section 779 (b) of the Local Government Act to regulate traffic on any particular street or road. The necessary procedure is outlined in that section.

RENTAL HOUSE AGREEMENTS.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week concerning rental house agreements under the Landlord and Tenant Act?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received the following reply from the Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust:—

The trust has information as to house uncontrolled rents only where those rents are brought to its knowledge. A number of cases have been brought to the notice of the trust where rents have been substantially increased. The actual number of these known cases is small, but there are very many tenancies which have been entered into on a basis of uncontrolled rents as to which the trust has no information. It can be expected that in a proportion of these tenancies the rent demand is unduly high. It may also be expected that it is this class of case which would be reported to the trust and not the class of case where the tenant is satisfied with the rent.

LEIGH CREEK COAL FREIGHT CHARGES.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Premier give any information regarding the agreement entered into with the Commonwealth Government for the transport of Leigh Creek coal to Port Augusta as it affects the electricity undertaking? Also does he know when the Port Augusta power station will be completed and how its output will affect projected country electricity schemes?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In reply to a question recently I outlined the position regarding Leigh Creek coal freights. The freight rate is now 11s. 6d. a ton, which is an increase on the previous rate; but having regard to the fact that we expect a much better service which will enable us to cut down materially our cost of production on the field, the rate is regarded as satisfactory. The previous rate was low, but on the other hand the service was extremely bad and resulted in a wastage in production on the field because of the uncertain and inferior railway service. Honourable members almost without exception had an opportunity to see the progress made at the Port Augusta power station and it is expected that the second station there will be completed in 1962. In connection with power requirements it is necessary to plan ahead; in fact I have already discussed with the chairman of the trust the early investigation of a power station which must be built to follow the Port Augusta No. 2 station. Investigations will probably be made soon into two sites: one for an ordinary thermal plant and the other for a nuclear plant.

FLOOD RELIEF.

Mr. KING—Can the Treasurer say how long it will be before people in distressed circumstances arising from the Murray River flood may expect some tangible form of relief?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—About 10 days ago the Governor appointed Sir Kingsley Paine and gave him authority to make immediate payments in cases of personal hardship. An officer of the Welfare Department has gone to the honourable member's district today and he will undoubtedly bring to Sir Kingsley's notice for immediate attention any applications he receives.

TRUST HOMES FOR AGED.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Treasurer a reply to my question of last week concerning the Housing Trust policy on building further accommodation for the aged?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—So far the trust has completed 202 cottage flats for elderly persons. There are current contracts for a further 140 cottage flats of which 40 are under construction. The rate of completion is about eight a month. In due course it is likely that further contracts will be placed.

TRUST HOME FOR LARGE FAMILY.

Mr. QUIRKE—In my district lives a family comprising father, mother and eight children. It has been increased over the last two years by two sets of twins. In response to an application to the Housing Trust for a rental home, I understand, the family has been told it is too great numerically for a rental home, but I find that difficult to believe because I do not think eight children would frighten the Housing Trust at this stage. The conditions under which the people are living today owing to the increase in their family in the last two years are deplorable. They are urgently in need of a home, and are people that anyone would be proud to call friends. If I give the Treasurer the name of the family will he take up the matter with the trust with a view to confirming or denying the statement that the family is too big for a rental home?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

COUNCIL BY-LAWS: UNSIGHTLY CHATTELS AND STRUCTURES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I move:—

That By-law No. 25 of the District Council of Stirling, laid on the table of this House on May 8, 1956, By-law No. 29 of the District Council of Tumbay Bay, laid on the table of this House on May 8, 1956, By-law No. 58 of the Corporation of Woodville, laid on the table of this House on May 15, 1956, By-law No. 41 of the Corporation of Brighton, laid on the table of this House on August 14, 1956,

By-law No. 26 of the District Council of Minlaton, laid on the table of this House on August 14, 1956, and By-law No. 36 of the District Council of Salisbury, laid on the table of this House on August 14, 1956, all dealing with unsightly chattels and structures, be disallowed.

Although the motion is quite lengthy, I am happy to say that the explanation is not unduly long. All these by-laws deal with unsightly chattels and structures and are in substantially identical terms, so that when we consider one we are, in fact, considering all. They appear to be based on amendments to the Local Government Act passed by Parliament in 1952 and amended in 1954. Placitum (48a) of section 667, enacted in 1952, is the relevant portion of the Act, and provides for the following to be inserted into the principal Act:—

For enabling the council by notice in writing to require the owner or occupier of any land within the municipality or any township within the district to remove therefrom any chattel or structure which the council is of opinion is unsightly and the presence of which is, in the opinion of the council, likely to affect adversely the value of adjoining land or is prejudicial to the interests of the public and for enabling the council on default of compliance by the owner or occupier to remove the chattels or structure and to recover the cost thereby incurred from the owner or occupier:

To this the 1954 amendment added the following:—

but there shall, in manner provided by section 721a, be a right of appeal from any notice served upon any owner or occupier in pursuance of any by-law in pursuance of this paragraph.

In other words, in 1952 Parliament gave councils additional powers, and relying upon those powers they proceeded to pass by-laws. If members read the by-laws and consider them in the light of the section I have just read, they will see that they are probably within the letter of the law, but it was the unanimous opinion of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation that they could be open to abuse. The committee does not say for a moment that they would be abused in all cases, but there would be a risk that the committee considers should be removed, and that could be done by a reframing of the by-laws. There have been two objections taken to the by-laws.

Mr. Riches—By whom?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—By the members of the committee. They were unanimous objections of members, both from this House and the Legislative Council, and of both parties. One was that there is no definition in the by-law of what is an unsightly chattel or structure, which gives a council too wide an administrative discretion.

Paragraph (2) of the by-laws is in the following terms:—

If, in the opinion of the council, there is on any land within the area any chattel or structure which is unsightly, and

- (a) the presence of which on the said land is likely to affect adversely the value of adjoining land, or
- (b) the presence of which on the said land is prejudicial to the interests of the public.

I need not go further than that to show that it leaves a tremendously wide discretion to councils.

Mr. Riches—But there is a right of appeal against that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes, but it is a matter of opinion whether something should be done. Although there is a right of appeal, it is to the Local Court of Full Jurisdiction in the area concerned. In other words, it is from the council to a magistrate who visits the district to constitute the Local Court, but there is no more guide to a magistrate, who cannot know the needs of the district and the feeling in the district, on what he is to base his opinion than there was in the first place to members of the council for them to give an opinion. That is substantially why members of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation viewed the by-law with no favour. There may be need for some such by-law to deal with certain cases, but the members of the committee do not believe that the by-laws as at present framed are the answer. The committee has carefully considered the matter and all members have expressed their opinions. The directions given to the committee under Standing Orders are:—

The committee shall with respect to any regulations consider—

- (a) whether the regulations are in accord with the general objects of the Act, pursuant to which they are made;
- (b) whether the regulations unduly trespass on rights previously established by law;
- (c) whether the regulations unduly make rights dependent upon administrative and not upon judicial decisions.

We have no quarrel about (a). I suggest it is outside our province to deal with (b), because it appears that the by-laws fall within the amendments I have mentioned. It is upon subclause (c) that the objection is based. Notwithstanding those considerations, the committee might have hesitated to recommend the disallowance of these by-laws had it not known that the Government was preparing a model by-law to replace the draft upon which these by-laws have been based. I have not seen the

draft model by-law, but it is expected that it will contain a definition of unsightly chattels and structures. In other words, the law will have a greater degree of certainty than it has now. The draft model by-law will be a guide not only to councils but to all ratepayers, and also to local courts if appeals are instituted. That will remove the great objection that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has to these by-laws. In view of the fact that a model by-law is being prepared and will no doubt be adopted by many councils the committee resolved to recommend the disallowance of these by-laws.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I desire more information before voting on the motion. It seems that the councils concerned have acted within the four corners of the Local Government Act. They could not have passed the by-laws unless they had a certificate from the Crown Solicitor that the by-laws were within the law and that they were competent to pass them. Parliament has set up the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation to examine by-laws and inform it whether they infringe the law, but members will agree that it was not appointed to unduly interfere with the rights and powers of councils, which have an extremely difficult job in considering the question of unsightly premises. I believe the councils concerned acted in good faith and within the powers Parliament has conferred on them, and that they are doing everything possible in the interests of local people. I do not agree with the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) that the by-laws give too much power to councils, and it would have been better if the Government had indicated that a model by-law was being framed so that if the by-laws were disallowed councils would have a model to follow.

Mr. Millhouse—That is being done.

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member did not make that clear when he was speaking, but that removes my main objection. If we pass the motion how soon can councils act in this matter? It is a question of some urgency to them and rather than move for the disallowance of the by-laws and thus create a feeling that councils cannot do this, that and the other it would have been better to notify them that a model by-law was being prepared. Have the councils concerned been consulted about this matter and do they intend adopting the proposed model by-law, and are they happy about the motion for the disallowance of their by-laws?

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support the motion. I am a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which carefully considered the by-laws before deciding to move for their disallowance. We were quite aware that by-laws on unsightly chattels and structures were submitted by six councils under powers conferred on them about two years ago. It was commendable to use the powers conferred on them, but why did they take their time before framing the by-laws if it was a matter of urgency? I think the main object of the by-laws was to prevent the countryside becoming an eyesore, and councils had little power to deal with this question previously.

The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has no wish to thwart councils in exercising their powers under the Local Government Act. Our main difficulty, in considering the by-laws, was the question of the definition of unsightly chattels and structures. On a moment's reflection it will be realized that all sorts of constructions could be placed on a word that is capable of being used ambiguously. Until such time as this matter has been properly defined, I think there would be a possibility and a danger of abuse; it would be far better to reconsider the matter now than to allow these regulations and then find that they are unsuitable and have to be replaced with more suitable ones. In my opinion it would be better to have these regulations disallowed and a fresh set of regulations which can be more particularly defined as to their object. These could be placed before the House and thoroughly approved.

The proposed by-laws may create hardship, they may be difficult to administer, and they may be applied to a situation which was never envisaged by their sponsors. It has been pointed out to the house that these by-laws have been submitted to the Crown Solicitor, and there is no doubt that they are within the framework of the Act. The by-laws do, in fact, follow the wording of the Act and to that extent they apply, but there is still a lack of definition. We have not unduly interfered with the powers of councils, corporations or any other local governing body, and we have no wish to do so. Local governing bodies should be able to manage their own affairs, but it is our duty in this House to see that their by-laws are properly defined. I do not think they have been given too much power in the past, and I feel that they could perhaps be given a little more power in the future. However, I think the committee

has acted properly in moving for the disallowance, and I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION.

(Continued from August 15. Page 306.)

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran:—

That in view of—

- (a) the great and increasing problems associated with the construction and maintenance of roads, the provision of drainage, the control of transport and other functions of local government in the metropolitan area;
- (b) the financial difficulties encountered by the metropolitan councils in their attempts to solve those problems; and
- (c) the untoward consequences of the existing system of local government now obtaining in the metropolitan area—

His Excellency the Governor be requested to appoint a committee consisting of four members of the House of Assembly and three members of the Legislative Council for the purpose of investigating these matters and recommending such amendments of the Local Government Act as it may deem desirable for the better administration of the affairs of the metropolitan area.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I regret that I was not present last week to hear the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in connection with this important matter, but I have given some attention to them and some study to the form of the motion which he has brought before this Chamber.

One thing that puzzles me is what his remarks had to do with the motion. The operative part of it is as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor be requested to appoint a committee consisting of four members of the House of Assembly and three members of the Legislative Council for the purpose of investigating these matters and recommending such amendments of the Local Government Act as it may deem desirable for the better administration of the affairs of the metropolitan area.

The matters that the committee are expressly told to examine are:—

The great and increasing problems associated with the construction and maintenance of roads, the provision of drainage, the control of transport and other functions of local government in the metropolitan area; the financial difficulties encountered by the metropolitan councils in their attempt to solve those problems; and the untoward consequences of the existing system of local government now obtaining in the metropolitan area.

The Leader made no attempt to disguise what he wanted done. Whether the appointment of the committee was necessary or not, he had made up his mind, and it appeared to me that the appointment of the committee was merely something to give effect to what he had decided upon.

Mr. O'Halloran—I anticipated that if appointed the committee would give effect to it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In his remarks the Leader did not dwell upon the problems, but he undoubtedly dwelt upon what the committee's findings should be. Knowing the honourable the Leader as I do I would say that from one point of view the appointment of this committee is superfluous as far as Opposition members are concerned, because they do not have to take any evidence at all upon these topics. The Leader dwelt on the matter from one point of view only, saying in effect that all councils in the metropolitan area should be amalgamated with the object of getting a better efficiency and a better overall control in local government.

The Leader brought this resolution along, not in the inquiring frame of mind that the resolution seemed to indicate but rather as an operative measure to get in the thin edge of the wedge for the proposals he had already decided to support. I have no doubt he has already got some of his friends and neighbours behind him to agree to these things. I do not believe that this committee would add anything to the sum total of the knowledge of this problem. I do not say that in any sense of criticism of committees which are appointed by Parliament, because I know that on many occasions and on many topics committees do make investigations and bring in important reports. This really gets down to a fundamental question of policy, and that is whether we believe in centralization or in decentralization of government. I believe that my honourable friends opposite, in the main, believe in a central form of government.

Mr. O'Halloran—We believe in an efficient form of government.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Let us deal with it from the point of view of centralization or decentralization, because the most efficient government is usually the government closest to the people, as I have pointed out to the Leader on a number of occasions. There is a fundamental difference between the policy of the Party that I have the honour to lead and the policy followed by

the Leader and his colleagues opposite because in the main the Labor Party has given support to the Commonwealth Parliament. If members opposite were asked to take a secret ballot upon whether all powers should vest in the Commonwealth Parliament, or whether we should have a system of Federation, I believe that the big body of labor supporters would favour the centralized system of government.

The Leader went outside this State for examples to bolster his proposals. The first shining example was Greater Brisbane. I believe that proposition was introduced by a Labor Government and it has undoubtedly been maintained consistently by a Labor Government for over 20 years. There is no doubt that it is part of the Queensland Labor Party's policy to have complete centralization of local government in Brisbane. I doubt whether the Leader of the Opposition believes in local government in the metropolitan area because, by this motion, he proposes to abolish local government and set up a central form—if such is possible—of local government. I believe there is a vast difference in the problems of Adelaide and, say, the problems of Marion, because they are in an entirely different state of development. The Leader mentioned three examples—Greater London, Sydney and Greater Brisbane. He has failed to appreciate the difference in the matters concerning our metropolitan councils and those in the cities he referred to. For example, our municipal councils have no responsibility in providing electricity services, water services or sewerage. At the moment they have no responsibility in providing transport.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is an example of the benefit of centralization.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is an example of the benefit of establishing efficient utilities. In Queensland, where there is a plentiful water supply, a local water board can provide water without going outside its boundaries, but in South Australia, as a result of the very nature of our climate, it is necessary to transport water hundreds of miles. I do not believe it has been detrimental to the State's development that we have had to establish a number of public utilities. I do not think any member would suggest that they have not been successful, but in the examples cited by the Leader they have not been necessary. Greater London, for example, deals with almost all the problems with which this Parliament deals. It has similar powers in its administration and scope

and is dependent for financial assistance on the House of Commons as we are upon the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. O'Halloran—I think you have the principle in London somewhat confused.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. I merely suggest that the Leader's examples undertake functions of an entirely different nature from those of our councils.

Mr. Dunstan—A committee might recommend different functions here.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If I were assured that councils would assume a greater degree of the responsibility of government I might be rather tempted to support this motion. The local authority in Greater Brisbane is getting more and more into financial difficulty. It is negotiating for enormous loans and is piling up debts. Anyone who objectively examined the affairs of Greater Brisbane—and by that I do not mean going to look at the magnificent town hall there which would overshadow any Parliamentary building in Australia—would, I am certain, return to South Australia and take the Leader into a quiet corner and say, "Pipe down on this one, because it is a bird that won't fly."

Mr. O'Halloran—Has your Party in Queensland objectively examined the position?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has not been discussed by my Party here.

Mr. O'Halloran—Your Party in Queensland supported the proposal.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—And as a consequence has been in the political wilderness in Queensland ever since. That is the whole trouble. They have imitated a policy which is not good, instead of attempting to get a policy that is original and effective. I believe that local government is important. No member will disagree with that statement. Local government is always important. The Leader of the Opposition said that if we wait for the people concerned to suggest what he proposes they will not suggest anything for too many would be opposed to it. He said that the matter would have to be dealt with by Parliament. At present we have two local government associations—The Local Government Association and the Municipal Association. I am sure that if there were a secret ballot amongst them Mr. O'Halloran's proposal would be rejected 100 per cent.

Mr. Jennings—They could put that to a committee.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They would be opposed to it. A Victorian Labor Government sought to do what Mr. O'Halloran proposes.

Mr. Jennings—Who did it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Cain, the Premier, and every local government authority in Melbourne metropolitan area opposed it. If we agree to Mr. O'Halloran's suggestion we will have a committee, but we know now what it will recommend because the Opposition has already provided the solution. The Government has a committee to advise it on local government matters. Almost every year recommendations come from it for alterations to legislation, yet it has never suggested what Mr. O'Halloran proposes. On a previous occasion when Parliament said we had too many small councils with insufficient revenue to justify overhead expense a commission was appointed to amalgamate certain councils. It will be remembered by some people that no local government matter was more bitterly disputed than the proposed amalgamations. Sir Edgar Bean, a most tactful and patient man, was the chairman of the commission, yet wherever it went and suggested alterations they were always bitterly opposed. Because of the questions asked here Parliament, in fact, had to tell the commission to go quietly, because there was so much antagonism to the matter. Mr. O'Halloran's proposal is easily the most controversial local government matter that can be raised. Surely local government means that people in a particular area can express themselves on local government affairs in their own way. Now it is suggested that there should be local government by enforcement of something that is not wanted. That is centralization of government and it would prove ineffective because it would not have the support of most of the people in the area concerned. I do not want Mr. O'Halloran to assume from my remarks that when the vote is taken on this motion I may support it.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I support the motion. I have no pleasure in saying that I am certain most of the members in this House, irrespective of Party allegiance, feel acute dismay that the Leader of the Government has shown once again that when a matter is brought up by an Opposition member, in all sincerity and good faith, he has no weapon to oppose it but ridicule. He has, by his ineffectual attempts, not ridiculed the matter before the Chair, but cheapened the institution to which we belong. I do not think I need say much more about the

Premier's remarks. Mr. O'Halloran moved the motion because Labor members feel they have an obligation to Parliament and to the residents of the metropolitan area, as well as the State in general, to initiate action that might help to avert an impending crisis in local government affairs in the metropolitan area. I am sure no-one can seriously deny that local government in the Adelaide metropolis is hopelessly, inevitably, and irrevocably inefficient because of its present constitution. It is not because of any lack of talent, sincerity or industry on the part of those associated with local government affairs. I join with the Leader of the Opposition in his tribute to those who over the years, at great sacrifice, have voluntarily done such splendid work. We all owe them a great debt. From certain sneering remarks of the Premier it was to be inferred, I imagine, that members on this side are not supporters or believers in local government. I remember a very junior member of this Parliament recently making such a *faux pas*, but there was some excuse in his case. He was very neatly and adroitly put back in his place by the member for Gawler, who pointed out that members on this side have a splendid, and I think matchless, record of service in local government, which surely cannot be challenged. We recognize the weakness of local government as now constituted. It is not the fault of those engaged in it that the system has declined and decayed, but the fault of Parliament. In this atomic age we are expecting councils to carry on under a horse and buggy constitution which is completely beyond them. If we do not act now to speedily remedy the limitations and weaknesses of our local government set-up in the metropolitan area, it will be a job which will be completely beyond our resources. It is complex and cluttered up with the consequences of long neglect. We are asking for the appointment of a Parliamentary committee comprised of members of both Houses to make a full investigation and submit recommendations for amendments to the Act. That is all that the motion proposes, that is all the House will vote on, and it will not vote on the remarks the Leader of the Opposition or any other honourable member may make.

It is true that Labor policy favours a Greater Adelaide authority. I am confident a committee will be set up despite the Premier's opposition. Since the election we have seen evidence from some of the new members on the Government side that there is more character and independence among the Government Party than formerly, and I am certain that the great

whip which used to crack around the Government benches will not lash so hard as previously. Some of the new members are capable of thinking for themselves, and on this occasion if they think at all they must support the motion. When the committee is set up the Labor Party will advance arguments in support of its policy, but we are not directly asking for that now. We realize that other alternatives might be advanced which are not so radical as our proposals, and in our opinion not so effective, but such a system would be infinitely better than the one we have now and might be acceptable to all members. The only people who could oppose this motion, and by so doing deny the opportunity to have evolved a better city administration, would be those who are now perfectly satisfied that all is happy in metropolitan local government affairs. I doubt whether any member of this House would be so blind as to agree that all is satisfactory, except he who is so blind that he will not see. Recently, we have seen an example of this..

Let us examine what the existing local government set-up is and what are its inevitable results. Firstly, there are 21 councils in the metropolitan area, 20 of them elected and one, the Garden Suburb Commission, a very strange anomaly. In this misbegotten pattern of 21 different authorities we have thrown in one which is completely foreign to the rest. That in itself is a reflection on our local government system. It is a Heath Robinson scheme from end to end. We have 21 authorities in what, after all, is only one metropolitan area. Let us see what they have in common. I submit that the whole metropolitan area has a general community of interests within its own compass. What have the 21 councils in common? Their areas vary so greatly that any attempt to establish a relationship on that basis would be ludicrous. Their populations vary from just over 4,000 to just under 58,000. Regarding design and shape, a look at the map will cause one to believe that a demented person was let loose with a pencil. When these boundaries were originally drawn up they may have been an admirable arrangement, but after all, one purpose of the motion is to draw attention to the fact that what was considered all right a century ago is certainly not good enough today.

It will be admitted that one of the things necessary to justify dividing the metropolitan area into different subdivisions must be a community of interest within a subdivision, but nothing of that kind can be claimed today.

The community of interest is within the whole of the metropolitan area: we are one city; the people do not vary from district to district; their problems and needs do not vary. Today a man may live in one council area, attend church in another, play cricket in yet another, and travel through three others each day on his way to work; so we no longer have that parochialism in evidence today that may have been the case when local government was set up. Consequently it is no small wonder that interest in local government at present is at an all time low. It is easy enough for us to airily dismiss this lack of interest as apathy, but we should realize that what we are prone to describe as apathy usually has a cause. People are not as apathetic as we sometimes think. What we may describe as apathy is frequently a silent protest, and I believe the people of the metropolitan area today are protesting silently by their non-participation in something which they know is antiquated and which, as at present constituted, can no longer serve them properly and effectively. In other words it is not apathy but frustration.

It should be fairly easily seen that the existing system of metropolitan local government must necessarily produce the most acute overall chaos. Firstly, it is manifest that there is not the slightest conceivable prospect of 21 separate authorities in the one metropolitan area ever agreeing to co-ordinate any of the things that obviously need co-ordinating. This would be too much to expect. After all, only last week we saw six State Premiers and the Commonwealth Treasurer with immeasurably more at stake fail to agree on even the items to be put on the agenda paper, so what hope have metropolitan councils of agreeing?

There is an indescribable confusion in the matter of rates. We have two rating systems, one a hybrid system, thanks to this Government, and no uniformity of rating or assessment irrespective of which system is adopted. I do not claim that we should have uniformity but surely in the one metropolis there should be some relation between the rates in one area and those in another, no matter what the basis of rating. At present, however, the situation is incomprehensible. A man living on one side of the street may congratulate himself that his rates have not risen although the householder immediately across the street may bemoan his ill-fortune in having his rate increased by 6d. in the pound; but when the accounts are delivered the man who has congratulated himself finds that he must pay

more than he paid last year and considerably more than the man who had his rate raised. The first man has overlooked the increase in his assessment. The real trouble is the confusion this leads to in the minds of ratepayers. After all it is the amount paid that counts. A man living on one side of the street in a similar house to that of the man opposite may, even though he enjoys only the same standard of municipal service, pay considerably more in rates each year merely because he is in a different council area where ratepayers suffer from some legacy of debt. This is fair neither to the ratepayer nor to the system of local government.

We should see that the metropolitan area is one area and that the rates paid bear some relationship and are based throughout the whole area on some reasonable fundamental foundation. Members opposite may claim truthfully that what I am saying is tantamount to asking for a subsidy from one part of the metropolitan area to another, but if the metropolitan area is all one under the one local government authority then the blood must flow to that part of the body that needs it most. Indeed, even now within the subdivisions of the metropolitan area one part of an area subsidizes other parts of the same area. Although members might wish to be parochial and say that that should not be done, I will be quite honest and say that I believe the financially more fortunate sections of the metropolis should assist the financially less fortunate section. It is all one city and cannot be cut up into different self-contained compartments; one section is inextricably bound up with the others. If some amalgamation of council areas resulted from the decisions of this committee, not the least beneficial thing that might accrue would be help to the areas that most need it.

Parliament has delegated other matters to councils to be dealt with. One such matter is zoning of industrial and residential areas, which needs to be carried out on a metropolitan basis. As far as I can gather no two councils in the metropolitan area have the same policy on zoning, and it could easily happen that one council would be preserving its easternmost area as a residential section while the council on its eastern side might be reserving its westernmost area for industrial purposes. If this happened people who had been led by the dictum of their own council into believing that they were establishing themselves in a residential area would suffer from the smoke and dust from the area just over the road because

there happened to be an artificial council boundary down the street.

Mr. Millhouse—Has that ever happened?

Mr. JENNINGS—I have no idea. Have you?

Mr. Millhouse—I asked you. I am only seeking information.

Mr. JENNINGS—Then you have not obtained much from my reply. I was pointing out something that could happen and is happening every day under this completely hotch-potch system in the metropolitan area. Zoning cannot be carried out properly by councils as we know them now. Although I do not intend to go fully into the subject of taxicabs, I mention transport control to show that metropolitan councils cannot possibly agree on anything. Petty parochialism came in and asked for local government itself to be protected from the inroads of State legislation, and as an alternative to it some advisory committee or something of that nature was set up. Shortly after, there was friction right throughout the committee, and once again an approach was made to this State Parliament by the people who asked for protection against the encroachment of the State for legislative action to put their own house in order.

I now come to roads and footpaths, an all-important matter to the public. In the metropolitan area are new housing areas where women and children have to flounder around in mud up to their knees for several months each year. This is disgraceful. I have received complaints on innumerable occasions that furniture waggons bringing furniture to new homes have been bogged. This sort of thing might be bearable if there were any prospects of amelioration, but there are not. In some of the older areas, established for perhaps 20 or 30 years, frequently there are no proper footpaths, roads or drainage facilities. I live in an area that has been established for about 20 years, but I have no footpath and only an apology for a road. My milkman recently entered the Round Australia Reliability Trial as a pleasant respite from delivering milk over these roads. In some sections of old established areas such as Hindmarsh and Thebarton there have never been proper footpaths, roads or drainage facilities.

For years and years local government has not been equal to the task that Parliament has asked of it. What hope is there for people in new areas when these conditions exist in older areas? Members have only to look outside the door of this House to see that roads that were properly established are deteriorating at an

alarming rate. Heavier and faster vehicles are using the roads and the main thoroughfares of this city are deteriorating so much that many of them are becoming almost unusable. The substitution of buses for trams is creating great problems, and the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) is worried about this slight aspect of the larger problem, and I am sure he will be foremost amongst Government members to support the motion. As the member for Hindmarsh interjected a little while ago, it is time Parliament did something to solve the problem. Every metropolitan member is often approached about matters that are essentially council matters, and I usually state that I cannot interfere with council matters and the person concerned usually replies, "Who is running this sanguinary State anyhow? Isn't it Parliament?" I then say that Parliament delegates certain powers to councils, but the person concerned replies, "I have been in touch with the council on innumerable occasions, but it cannot do anything about the matter. Isn't it time Parliament did something?"

That is what Labor is asking—that Parliament initiate steps to evolve a better system of local government in the metropolitan area. My view, which is supported by members on this side of the House, is that the solution of the problem is a Greater Adelaide, but we are not binding any committee of inquiry to that. It is certain that Labor will not have a majority on the committee, which will make recommendations after hearing evidence from anybody prepared to offer it. If we do not have a Greater Adelaide there should at least be some overriding metropolitan authority, not a Greater London authority that the Premier conjured up out of his imagination, but an authority like the London County Council. If we do not have such an authority there should be an extensive amalgamation of various councils in the metropolitan area. This would permit greater co-ordination and planning.

Mr. Tapping—And economy.

Mr. JENNINGS—It should result in considerable reductions in administrative costs. I have studied the book that the Leader of the Opposition referred to, *Great Cities of the World*, by Professor Robson. It contains contributions from leading municipal authorities all over the world, most of whom state that an amalgamation of councils within a large city results in considerable savings in administrative costs. We cannot guarantee that because we do not know from our experience here, but we know that tremendous overhead expenditure

and overlapping results from the metropolitan area being cut up into 21 compartments. A Greater Adelaide authority would be in a better position to solve the problem of raising finance, which is the greatest problem facing councils today, and it could tackle problems that councils are afraid to face.

Further, a larger authority in the metropolitan area would be able to purchase the machinery necessary for modern roadmaking and other works. Councils cannot afford the modern machinery available, and even if they could they would not be able to employ it economically throughout the year. A greater Adelaide authority would be able to solve many of our local government problems, but we are not asking for a vote on that issue; we are only asking the House to appoint a committee of inquiry so that the present completely inadequate system may be supplanted by something better.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CITY OF MARION BY-LAW.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I move:—

That By-law No. 27 of the corporation of the city of Marion relating to weight limit on streets made on the 5th day of September, 1955, and laid on the table of this House on the 8th May, 1956, be disallowed.

This by-law was made to cover one particular case. A company known as Concrete Industries took over the old Brighton cement works and was running a heavy truck over one of the lightly constructed roads in the Marion district. That truck weighed about 25 tons and the Marion corporation desired to protect the road from damage. It therefore passed this by-law limiting the weight of vehicles travelling over it to 10 tons. Since the by-law was passed the company discussed the matter with the council and, I have been informed, gave an undertaking that it would not use the vehicle on that road in the future. The vehicle has already been withdrawn and has not been using the road for some considerable time. That being so, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has been informed by the council that it is satisfied that this by-law should be disallowed because the purpose for which it was made has already been fulfilled.

For that reason the recommendation for disallowance has been made on the unanimous opinion of all members of the committee, consisting of members of both Houses and both Parties.

Motion carried.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—
I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a replica of the Bill which I introduced last session. Although it is entitled a Lottery and Gaming Act Amending Bill, it is an amendment to the provisions relating to Art Unions in the Lottery and Gaming Act. On one occasion after I had introduced a lottery Bill into this House and it had been negatived I said that while I was in Opposition I would never again attempt to introduce a Bill for what I understood to be a lottery. However, this Bill is the result of discussions I have had with senior police officials, who were perturbed and alarmed to learn that things were being done that should be legalized and thought a Bill such as this was the real approach to the problem.

To explain this Bill it is necessary to refer to the Lottery and Gaming Act as amended and reprinted in 1950. Section 9 of that Act reads as follows:—

Nothing in this Part of this Act shall extend to or affect—

- (a) any allotment of real or personal estate or interest which according to law is legally allottable, or may be allotted or held by, or by means of, any allotment or partition by lots:
- (b) any voluntary association or branch thereof formed or established in the State for the purchase of paintings, drawings, or other works of art to be afterwards allotted and distributed by chance or otherwise among the several members, subscribers, or contributors forming part of such association, or for raising sums of money by subscription or contribution, to be allotted and distributed by chance or otherwise as prizes among the members, subscribers, or contributors forming part of such association: Provided that—
 - (i) such sums of money so allotted and distributed are expended solely and entirely in the purchase of paintings, drawings, or other works of art; and
 - (ii) the proceedings of such association are carried on in good faith for the encouragement of the fine arts.

This Bill provides that an application in accordance with section 9 of that Act may be made to the Chief Secretary for a permit to conduct a lottery by any club, the principal object of which is to carry on an outdoor sport or game and which makes no charge for admission to matches or contests, and does not derive any income from any such charge.

Application may also be made by the following:—

Any association or body of people carrying on any school or religious institution, hospital, or other institution to assist the sick, the infirm, the aged, or the needy, so that such institution is not carried on for gain or profit to the individual members thereof.

Any association which is not carried on for the purpose of profit or gain to the individual members thereof and which carries on some other work or activity which, in the Chief Secretary's opinion, is charitable.

I say at the outset that it is not intended that this Bill should take away any of the charitable work or donations that people make to hospitals or other charitable institutions. These institutions could themselves conduct a lottery under this Bill. I do not desire to take away the rights of anybody. If people wish to make a charitable donation to any organization or institution, so much the better. I would not like people to say, as they did on the last occasion, that it is the answer to the running of hospitals such as the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I do not wish to convey that; but if there is a body of people who desire to conduct an art union or a lottery under this Bill and desire to offer prizes, provision is made for it. So long as the proceeds go to the organization, club or sporting body interested, they will be the ones to benefit.

In subclause (2) it is provided:—

A club, association or body of persons shall not be granted more than one permit under this section in any financial year.

I do not, however, insist upon that provision. I am not quite in step with the provisions contained in section 9 (b) of the Lottery and Gaming Act which places no limit on the number of raffles that may be conducted provided the money is going back into fine art. The Bill also provides that application must be made to the Chief Secretary, and that the net proceeds of the lottery will be devoted to a purpose, work or activity such as mentioned in subsection 1. In general, the provisions of the Bill are that no person is to be paid a salary for any work connected with any lottery or raffle; no money prizes are to be distributed—and I am not concerned whether the prize is a pin cushion, motor car or a house; nine-tenths of the members of the body or association conducting the lottery must reside in South Australia; no body or association can hold more than one lottery in any financial year; and an application must be made to the Chief Secretary for permission to conduct a lottery and certain fees are payable.

Section 9 of the Act provides that lotteries and raffles can be conducted if all money raised is devoted to the purchase of paintings, drawings and fine arts. I seriously suggest that there is art in all sport. Sporting bodies are entitled to greater consideration because of the discipline they inculcate into the minds of their members. All members have received a circular from the South Australian Olympic Council and I hasten to assure them that I have not solicited the support of that body. According to that circular His Excellency the Governor is Patron of the council; the Hon. Thomas Playford, President; Mr. C. R. Aitken, Chairman; Mr. F. C. Bott, Honorary Treasurer; Mr. R. A. Blythman, Assistant Secretary and Publicity Officer and Mr. T. J. Wigley, Honorary Secretary.

I regret that last Wednesday one member asked whether, because the Premier was president of the Olympic Council, he unanimously favoured this Bill. I think it fair to suggest that because of his high office the Premier is frequently called upon to support various organizations, but that it would be impossible for him to be present at all discussions of such bodies. That is probably the position in respect of his presidency of this council. I would suggest that he occupies far more honorary positions than the questioner. The letter accompanying the circular states:—

The South Australian Olympic Council unanimously adopted a resolution supporting the Bill and the eighteen bodies affiliated with the council have carried similar resolutions. In other words, over twenty thousand amateur sportsmen and sportswomen in this State support the proposed amendment wholeheartedly.

Without exception, amateur sporting bodies proclaim their object to be "the improvement of the physical, mental and social well-being of the citizens of South Australia." We see nothing in the proposed legislation at variance with these objects; rather do we embrace it as an opportunity to lift us from our penurious pit to a level where we may, without begging, finance the many projects planned for the "physical, mental and social development of the young men and women of the State."

We exhort you to support the amendment and so assist the thousands of hard working officials who ask no other reward than seeing about them healthier and happier citizens.

The South Australian Olympic Council also said:—

Amateur sporting bodies are in dire need of finance. They do not charge entrance fees and have no other sources of income. Their members, being young, cannot afford large subscriptions. Yet the cost of fielding a team, or of entering your State representatives in Olympic or Australian title events, is extremely high.

Mr. Tapping—Would it include football clubs?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Everything.

Mr. Tapping—No.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—New section 9a says that an application can be made to the Chief Secretary for a permit for any club, the principal object of which is to carry on an outdoor sport or game and which makes no charge for admission to its matches and does not derive any income from such charge. The Olympic Council said further:—

Lack of funds is sapping the vitality of amateur athletics in South Australia.

I do not care whether a football club or any other sporting body is not affiliated with the council. I am opening the gate for clubs, which do not charge for admission to their matches, to run lotteries. The South Australian Football League charges for admission to its football matches, and in view of that I do not know how any club affiliated with it could apply properly to the Chief Secretary for a permit to conduct a lottery. But, there are workers in industry who practise sport of an evening during the week and play matches on Saturday afternoons merely for the love of the sport. They do not impose admission charges and therefore could apply to the Chief Secretary for a permit. Organizations associated with women's athletics, basketball, soccer and swimming are affiliated with the council and they need funds. First of all the members of those organizations must have a uniform. Should we say that the people who engage in such sport must purchase their own uniforms or pay towards the compensation they would get if they met with an injury? It must not be forgotten that some officials get a remuneration for their services; sometimes umpires in these sports receive a fee at the expense of the players in the matches. The Bill will give these organizations the opportunity to collect revenue. The council further said:—

“A healthy mind in a healthy body.” More important today, perhaps, than at any other time in our history. And nothing does more to give your Australians a clean, healthy outlook on life than vigorous outdoor sport. Amateur sporting bodies foster and maintain the spirit of fair play and fair competition by which our community lives. Will you please help amateur sporting bodies to raise funds? It would be so much easier for them to do so if they were legally enabled to sponsor raffles and similar money raising schemes. In the belief that you will be doing the community a great service we ask you to support the amendment to the Lottery and Gaming Act introduced by Mr. Frank Walsh. The finest

traditions of team spirit and fair play are kept alive by amateur sporting bodies. Please help them to stay alive. It is not the province of the South Australian Olympic Council to press the claims of other non-profit organizations but we would remind you of the urgent need of these bodies for assembly halls, meeting rooms, playgrounds and playing equipment, etc. Those who do not wish to avail themselves of the proposed legislation need not do so but you can make it easier for those who do.

Under the Bill any organization could press its own claim. It would be possible for an amateur sporting body to develop a player of distinction, and it is likely he would desire when he had finished with that particular sport to participate in another in which he could accomplish affiliation with the Olympic Council. The letter further states:—

South Australian citizens are now thinking of Adelaide as the venue for the British Empire Games in 1962. We think that we can get them for Adelaide, but much will depend on the progress we make in amateur sport in the ensuing years. South Australia has a potential equal to any other State—our school-boy and schoolgirl performances compare more than favourably with Australian performances.

Our main needs are the facilities to keep the youngsters interested in amateur sport. To do this we need finance. The proposed amendment can provide us with the means to get it—not vast amounts, but sufficient for our needs.

The Olympic Council says it wants to be able to conduct the Empire Games in 1962. It is not the sportsmen and sportswomen in the amateur field today who will be the competitors in 1962, but the younger people who are still coming on. There is need for financial aid for the council to enable it to prepare for these games. We have proved down the years that we have the talent necessary to compete in the Olympic Games. Not only is the training of the sportsman involved, but there is also the need for financial assistance for this purpose. They need equipment and coaches in order to bring them up to the high degree of efficiency necessary to compete. For instance, another oval may be necessary and also other amenities to cater for the 1962 events. In newly established areas in the metropolitan area, including my own electorate, assembly halls are required to encourage the community spirit, which is so desirable in the interests of the nation. If we could provide such community halls sufficiently large enough to meet local needs, money would be required not only to build them, but to continue their operation. At St. Mary's, through the efforts of school committees, the people have been able to erect an assembly hall, which is to be used in the interests of the public, but it is not big enough.

At Plympton, Morphettsville Park and Brayville there are no such suitable halls. The most successful appeals held today for funds are those for which a taxation deduction is permitted, and the most successful appeal which could be expected under the Bill would be one which offered something in return for a chance. I draw members' attention to section 9 of the Lottery and Gaming Act which I have already quoted relating to "exceptions" and particularly to the words "being allotted and distributed by chance or otherwise as prizes amongst the members, subscribers or contributors forming part of such association." I do not mind whether or not more than one application a

year is made. I trust that the Bill will be treated as a non-Party measure and given the consideration it deserves. I do not desire to deny those people wishing to donate money to hospitals and other charitable institutions the right to do so, but in view of the interest taken by the Australian Olympic Council and the obvious merits of the Bill I ask members to support the second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 23, at 2 p.m.