

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, August 29, 1956.

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

**QUESTIONS.****WATTLE PARK TEACHERS COLLEGE.**

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Can the Minister make a statement about the proposed teachers training college at Wattle Park that will assure residents that the proposed wooden buildings and the plans for grounds will be aesthetically pleasing and not detrimentally affect the value of neighbouring properties?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Some of the honourable member's constituents are apprehensive about the establishment of a second teachers training college at Wattle Park. It may interest him to know that my wish was that the college be established at the corner of Adelaide Road and Morphett Road, Morphettville Park, in my electorate, but distance from Adelaide and the University and lack of adequate transport finally precluded this proposal. Instead, the residents of Morphettville Park will soon have the doubtful pleasure of free entertainment from two shows nightly from a drive-in picture theatre and, in addition, they will have hundreds of motorists, motor cyclists and others milling around between 8 p.m. and midnight every night except Sunday. I understand the main objections by the residents of Wattle Park to the establishment of the teachers training college are that in addition to the substantial residence on the property we propose to erect there some prefabricated portable buildings and, secondly, that there will be daily some hundreds of students in training there.

I assure the honourable member and his constituents that every reasonable care will be taken in the erection of these prefabricated portable buildings, which will be of modern design and pleasing appearance. They will blend with the property and the outer perimeter of trees and hedges will be preserved, and every suitable tree that that can be saved will be saved. A total of 300 or 400 college students will be in attendance there and I am quite confident that their behaviour will be at least as good as that of the students at the numerous other colleges in that district. On the question of prefabricated classrooms, during the last 10 years the number of children attending our departmental schools has doubled, and that is the largest percentage increase in any State

of the Commonwealth. My most pressing problem since I became Minister has been to provide classrooms and teachers. It has been absolutely impossible for the Architect-in-Chief to keep pace with the construction of solid construction buildings for a variety of reasons, including the shortage of draftsmen and quantity surveyors. During the last 10 years nearly 1,500 prefabricated portable classrooms have been provided. Last year 200 were supplied and this year another 350 will be made available at a cost of about £500,000. I say deliberately and emphatically to those objecting to prefabricated classrooms that without them there would be absolute chaos in the Education Department throughout the State. It is my definite intention to proceed with them.

Mr. Davis—Are they of a temporary nature?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—They are portable and can be transferred from one situation to another as the needs arise. The second problem, equally pressing, is the shortage of teachers. During the last 10 years the number in departmental schools has almost doubled. At present we have 4,500 full-time teachers and 800 part-time. That total is inadequate, and at present the classes in many of the metropolitan schools in particular are far too large; and it is my unpleasant duty this week to close 16 small country schools because there are no teachers.

Mr. Davis—By how many are we short?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The basic shortage is about 100. We are doing our best to recruit teachers from every source. Up to a point the recruiting campaigns have been successful. The most successful field will be the recruitment of students through our Teachers Training College. At present we have 750 in training, next year there will be 950, and we hope we will have about another 200 a year until we reach about 1,600 during 1960.

Mr. Stephens—What percentage will be males and what percentage females?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—They will be about even. We propose adding considerably to the Teachers Training College at Kintore Avenue with a multi-storeyed building, for which land has already been reserved, but it is absolutely necessary for us to proceed with a second college in the meantime. We cannot wait for any solid construction work, but must proceed with prefabricated buildings. I have taken a long time to reply, but I felt it opportune to outline some of the undeniable facts concerning the shortage of classrooms and teachers. I repeat my assurance that

everything possible will be done not to spoil the aesthetics of the delightful suburb of Wattle Park.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I was interested in the Minister's reply to a question of the honourable member for Burnside about the Wattle Park Teachers College, which I naturally applaud. I am in entire agreement with his remarks about the so-called temporary rooms. Has the Minister or the Government considered the future possibilities of establishing a teachers' college or colleges in the country?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. I have personally given the matter much consideration and discussed it with the principal officers of the Education Department but, as at present advised, I am opposed to it mainly on the ground that most of the students at the college get their training at the University where they attend lectures. I do not think it would be practicable in our present state of development. Consideration has also been given to a proposal for a permanent additional college in the suburbs but that has not been proceeded with for the time being. We propose, however, to considerably add to the present college by erecting a multi-storeyed building on land that has been reserved for the purpose. It will cater for many hundreds of students in training at the college and although it will not be a university college it will be the nearest thing to it, as it will be established on the western boundary of the university. At least three-quarters of the students at the college will attend lectures at the university. I think that is far more practicable and desirable than any attempt to establish a college in the country, which I do not think will be possible for many years to come.

#### SOUTH PARA BRIDGE.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Premier say whether the proposed South Para bridge which is to cost about £100,000—and which was announced by the Minister of Works—was referred to the Public Works Standing Committee for inquiry and report and, if so, what was the date of reference and what were the terms of reference?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I would presume that the bridge is part of the South Para reservoir project and would have been included in that reference to the committee. The necessity for the bridge arises out of the construction of the reservoir. I will make inquiries and advise the honourable member.

#### MOUNT MEREDITH ESTATE.

Mr. HARDING—It has been brought to my notice that there are approximately 1,600 acres of repurchased land in the Hundred of Mingbool, known as Mount Meredith Estate, which would not require much development to bring it into production. Can the Minister of Lands say what plans the Government has for the future development of this land and what benefit would the suggested drainage of Dismal Swamp into the Glenelg River have on that land?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I believe the land that could be included in the proposed scheme of draining Dismal Swamp would be improved. Consideration has been given to developing the area, but it would be a costly proposition. I will get a report and let the honourable member have it.

#### CONTROL OF CHEMISTS' CHARGES.

Mr. LAWN—Yesterday I asked the Premier questions concerning the hostility of the Pharmaceutical Guild to the proposed recontrol of chemists' fees and charges and the guild's instructions to its members to increase the fees. Has the Premier any further information on the subject?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no information on the guild's instructions to its members, but I have received a lawyer's letter from the guild objecting to the recontrol of chemists' items.

#### HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. QUIRKE—My question concerns the increases in hospital charges that were recently announced. As is well known the people hardest hit by increases of any sort are those on fixed incomes. In the case I have in mind the income is derived from an investment in Federal securities and the husband is chronically confined to hospital because of some arthritic complaint for which there is no known alleviation, which means that as long as he lives he will be a perpetual charge; therefore, if collected in full, the charges proposed would mean the selling of the securities and a consequently lower income. So the circle would be perpetuated to the detriment of both invalid and family. Can the Treasurer say whether special consideration will be given to such cases under the proposed scale of charges in Government hospitals?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In announcing the scale of increases in another place yesterday the Chief Secretary made it clear that any person who considered that he would suffer any hardship could apply for the remission of hospital fees, either in part or in full.

### POOCHERA SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—In 1950 approval was given for the construction of a school residence at Poochera, but at that time it was not possible to get a contractor to erect a stone building and it was thought that a prefabricated house might be supplied. Since then nothing has been done and the school teacher has had to reside at the hotel, which is not a satisfactory arrangement. Will the Minister call tenders again for the erection of a stone or prefabricated building for the schoolmaster's residence?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I cannot give a definite undertaking on the spur of the moment that I will do either of the things requested by the honourable member. I will certainly examine the position and see whether it is possible to accede to his requests. However, I point out that there are about 600 departmental school houses at present, and as literally hundreds of requests are made for further school houses it is necessary for us to draw up lists of priorities according to the most pressing needs. Sometimes, unfortunately for some districts and some teachers, the priorities must of necessity be varied. From what the honourable member said it seems to me that Poochera comes within that category, but if it is possible to do what is requested without depriving some other district or teacher having a greater need for accommodation I will be pleased to comply with the request.

### COUNTRY ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yesterday I asked the Premier whether charges for electricity at Wilmington and Melrose will be the same as at Stirling North, which is receiving electricity at the same rates as the metropolitan area, and the Premier said that these towns will not receive it at metropolitan rates. He said that the distance of point of usage from power stations is one factor which is taken into account in fixing tariffs, and also that Stirling North is only four miles from the Port Augusta station. Wilmington is 25 miles and Melrose 35 to 40 miles from the station, but Melrose is being charged a tariff computed on the distance from Osborne. Will the Premier inform me why Stirling is charged a tariff computed on the distance from Port Augusta and Melrose is charged on its distance from Osborne?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

### TITLES FOR HOUSING TRUST HOMES.

Mr. FLETCHER—Following on the answer given yesterday by the Premier to my question on notice about titles of Housing Trust purchase homes, can he give the reason why some of the owners of the homes have received titles within three months whilst others in the same area are still awaiting titles? What is the reason for some of the tenants discovering on receiving homes that fences are 2ft. or 3ft. either outside or inside the boundary pegs? Does it mean that the blocks have been pegged out wrongly by the builders and caused the delay in issuing the titles?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will make inquiries and let the honourable member know.

### DILUTION OF SUPER GRADE PETROL.

Mr. STEPHENS—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on August 23 about the mixing of first and second grade petrol by distributors? When he replied the Minister said that he was rather surprised at my statement that there were no means of testing the grade of petrol in this State and that he would be amazed to learn that petrol samples were sent to another State for testing.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received a reply from the Chief Inspector of Factories. It is true, as the honourable member said, that I would be amazed if his statements were absolutely correct. The following is the reply:—

With reference to the question by Mr. Stephens in the House of Assembly on August 23 I wish to report that means are provided in the Mechanical Engineering Branch of the Adelaide University for conducting tests of the octane rating of petrol.

Mr. STEPHENS—I was told by the manager of one of our very prominent petrol firms that there was no machine here to test petrol, and for that reason they had to send samples to Melbourne by air and obtain a reply by telephone. Can the Minister ascertain why it is that these private companies have to send petrol to other States to be tested?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—My reply was that petrol can be tested here, and I thought I made myself quite clear on that point. If he can give me the name of the private company that said petrol has to be sent interstate to be tested, I will make a check and let the honourable member know.

### POTATO SUPPLIES.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Has the Premier a reply to my question of yesterday concerning potato

supplies in this State and can he say whether potatoes may become more readily available soon?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Prices Commissioner reports:—

Figures given by the S.A. Potato Board disclose that the following tonnages of locally grown potatoes have been received by the S.A. Potato Board for distribution on an annual basis:—

12 months ending	Tons.
June 30, 1949 . . . . .	27,003
June 30, 1950 . . . . .	28,333
June 30, 1951 . . . . .	26,386
June 30, 1952 . . . . .	22,202
June 30, 1953 . . . . . (glut year)	37,304
June 30, 1954 . . . . .	17,720
June 30, 1955 . . . . .	33,636
June 30, 1956 . . . . .	31,220

From those figures the honourable member will see that over the period under review potato deliveries to the board from locally grown sources were the third highest on record. The shortage, therefore, is not because South Australian growers have not produced potatoes or have failed to deliver them to the board, but because of the shortages and the abnormally high prices paid in other States, which continually attracted potatoes from the Adelaide market through merchants and other dealers; the shortage is therefore due to factors outside the control of this State. Concerning the present position, during the last week there has been in Sydney another abnormal rise in the price of potatoes. There are now scarcely any potatoes in South Australian growers' hands, most of them being in the hands of merchants and dealers. The board is in the position today of either having to again increase the price or stand the chance of further supplies being diverted to other States. I cannot give the honourable member any assurance that the shortage will lift immediately, but with the coming of spring and changing seasonal conditions new year crops will presently come on to the market, which should ease the position. There may be some shortage, particularly if we are not prepared to chase the fantastic prices being offered in other States.

#### MURRAY RIVER FLOOD.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Lands the latest report on the flood position, especially in the lower Murray areas?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have a report which refers to the whole length of the Murray. Levels at Chaffey, Renmark and Berri remained stationary; rose by 1½ in. at Cobdogla; by 1½ in. at Waikerie; by 2 in. at Cadell; and by 3 in. at Morgan. In the reclaimed areas levels at Murray Bridge and

Jervois rose by 1½ in. The general position at Renmark was the same as yesterday. At Berri, work was commenced on a secondary bank around the pumping plant. Seepage is still a problem at Cobdogla. At Waikerie the pumps are still running. The town of Kingston is in a fairly precarious position. The concrete retaining wall at the packing shed there was breached yesterday, and considerable damage was done to the shed and a few homes were flooded. No change is reported in the reclaimed area, where the weather is fine and calm.

Mr. Gilbert Poole, the engineer in charge of works at Jervois and Murray Bridge, asked me last night for more volunteers and more bags. He wanted men particularly during mid-week periods.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Irrigation issued instructions to any of his district officers or others in charge of pumping stations that a member of Parliament may not inspect any pumping stations though as a private individual he may? If the Minister has not issued these instructions which officer has issued them, and for what reason?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have not issued any such instructions and this is the first I have heard of the matter. If the honourable member will give me further information I will make investigations.

Mr. STOTT—When I was at Waikerie recently I arranged with local councillors and others, including representatives of the advisory committee, to inspect the pumping station at Waikerie. When we got there the officer in charge said I was prevented, as a member of Parliament, from inspecting the pumping house, but that I could make an inspection as a private individual. This officer said he had received instructions to that effect, and I ask the Minister whether he will ascertain who issued them.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—No such instructions have come from me as Minister of Irrigation, but I have heard that some people have been warned to keep away from pumping stations because of their dangerous condition. Some of them are moving, but I will seek further information for the honourable member. I hope he appreciates the terrific strain that some officers of the Irrigation and Engineering-in-Chief's departments are under. The engineer at Waikerie has done a magnificent job, and if ever a man was near a serious breakdown it is that man.

Mr. Stott—The work that those men have done has been marvellous.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I ask the honourable member to give a little more thought to the strain and stress on the officer at Waikerie.

Mr. BYWATERS—It is apparent from today's *Advertiser* and the Minister's report that a shortage of volunteer labour exists during week days. It seems that labour at weekends is adequate, but on other days most people are engaged in their employment. Will the Government employ some of the 600 who are now unemployed to assist in fighting the flood?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The shortage of labour in mid-week has applied practically right through the flood period. During last week-end there were more volunteers than on any previous week-end, but unfortunately during the week statements have appeared in the press that some unemployed should be engaged and paid. Since those reports have been made there has been a falling off in the number of volunteers. Mr. Poole is certain that with more volunteers mid-week until the week-end after the next he will be able to hold Jervois.

#### FINDON SCHOOL SHELTER SHED.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I have asked a number of questions with regard to the shelter shed at the Findon School. The brickwork and carpentry work is of the highest quality, both as regards material and workmanship. Since asking this question some time ago I have also discovered that this contractor's work has always been high class, and I would like to make that clear. Can the Minister give any further particulars with regard to this matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I received a report from my colleague, the Acting Minister of Works on this matter. That report reads:—

I have investigated this matter and have ascertained that this work is not being done by the Architect-in-Chief's Department but by an independent contractor. Several tenders were received for this work and the contract was let to one for an amount of £5,196. Of this amount a total payment of £2,800 has been made to him up to the present time. This payment is calculated on the basis of 93 per cent of the value of the permanent work done and 75 per cent of the value of the material on this site, and included in this latter amount is the iron which is at present temporarily erected on the roof. I understand that during inclement weather when it is impracticable for men to work in the rain contractors carry out as much inside work as possible and also take steps to protect the work already done. In this case the iron roof was placed in position and held with a few nails, both to protect the woodwork and to allow the plasterers to work inside the building. When outside work is practicable the roofing iron will

be properly fixed. It is clear from the above explanation that the Government is fully protected in this matter as no payment has been made in respect of work which has not been completed and the full amount due under the contract will not be paid until all the work is completed to the satisfaction of departmental officers.

#### AMENDMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—I understand that representations have been made to the Government for an amendment of the Local Government Act to give the classification board power to grant long service leave and superannuation benefits to local government officers. Has this matter been considered?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Local government bodies at present have power to do those things, but the amendment requested was one to make it compulsory for them to do so. The Government does not propose to introduce such a measure.

#### ECHO SOUNDING EQUIPMENT FOR WEERUTTA.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the echo sounding device been installed in the Fisheries and Game Department's cutter *Weerutta* and, if not, will it be installed for the summer season for experimental work?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The device had not been installed when I made my inspection of the vessel about two weeks ago. It was expected that the work would be done shortly, but I will ascertain the position for the honourable member. I think it is definite that the device will be installed for the summer season.

#### SOUTH-EAST RAILWAY LINES.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Premier a further reply to the question I asked yesterday about the inquiry into the Glencoe railway line and portion of the Mount Gambier line between Millicent and Beachport?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have been informed that the matter was dealt with at a time when I was not present at Cabinet and that it has been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, as required by law.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. FRED WALSH.

Mr. TAPPING moved—

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

## FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the Premier should approach the Premiers of the other States with a view to arranging for the submission to the Commonwealth Government of a joint request by the Premiers of all the States for the representation of each State, on the basis of one representative of the Government and one representative of the Opposition, on the Constitution Committee now considering proposed amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The purpose of this motion is to emphasize the desirability of having the State Parliaments directly represented on the committee which has been appointed by the Federal Government to discuss possible changes in the Federal Constitution. The Federal authorities have appointed an all Party committee only of Federal members, but we feel that this is inadequate in view of the issues involved and to some extent discourteous to the States.

The Federal Constitution was originally determined by representatives of the States, and whatever its virtues may be, the States were, in fact, the authors of it; and, strictly speaking, the States should have the privilege of reviewing it. In one sense, Federal members could be regarded as being the least qualified—or entitled—to determine any changes that should be made in the Federal Constitution. I mention that because at present under the set-up as between the sovereign Constitutions of the States and the written Constitution of the Commonwealth we get some peculiar expressions of sovereignty. For instance, on the financial side the Federal Parliament is practically in a position to dominate the financial structure of Australia. By virtue of its power to impose customs and excise duties and income tax it is placed in the position where it can literally dictate the financial policy of the States. State Parliaments of course, are charged with the task of developing the lands of the States and providing services such as water, sewerage, roads, railways and education, all of them costly; and even those which are considered to be business undertakings usually have to be carried on at a loss because they are of a developmental nature. On the one hand we have a Federal Parliament comprising members who have access to the spending power of the nation and therefore not subject to any of the cash restraints to which the State Parliaments are subject. I suggest that that is a weighty reason why the States should be represented

on any committee which is considering amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The Constitution itself provides that changes shall be made only if approved by way of a referendum and if a majority of the States and a majority of the electors are in favour of such changes. The purpose of this provision was to preserve the rights of the States as constituents of the Federation. It was also intended to prevent any majority in the Federal Parliament, which might not be truly representative of Australia as a whole, such as, for example, a majority of one Party representing the larger States in the House of Representatives, from making changes in the Constitution. For good or evil, the machinery set up for this purpose was designed to maintain the separate influence of the States. This Constitution was drafted approximately 60 years ago and the separate influences of the States as existing at that time were totally different from the separate influences in the States existing at present. Therefore, the safeguards of the late 1890's have proved in themselves a barrier down the years to any effective amendment of the Constitution.

Unfortunately, by the time any question reaches the referendum stage it is a Party question—perhaps because it has been Party-inspired—and, generally speaking, the questions submitted to the people from time to time have been related to proposed transfers of powers from the States to the Commonwealth, to which, for some reason or other, there has usually been a considerable amount of what one might call prejudiced opposition. We have had the spectacle on one or two occasions of a referendum securing the votes of an overwhelming majority of the electors, but because it did not secure a majority of the electors voting in a majority of the States it was still defeated. Some of the opposition which occurred on those occasions was undoubtedly prejudiced opposition—a fear by certain State members of Parliament, particularly in those States farthest from Canberra, that by the surrender of the powers sought, and which I believe would have been of great advantage to the nation, they would be to some extent disadvantaged.

There are, however, other aspects of the Federal Constitution besides amendments, desirable or otherwise, transferring powers to the Federal Parliament. We have had a Federal Constitution for 56 years, and various difficulties that have arisen from time to time during those years have emphasized two important issues, namely, whether the Constitution, as it is written, means what it was originally

intended to mean and whether what it does mean is what we now desire it to mean. I think the answers to both these questions are in the negative.

The first High Court of Australia comprised men who had had experience in the State legislatures and some had had experience in the Commonwealth legislature; but they were geared to the 1890's when the Constitution was drafted. Some took a prominent part in the drafting of the Constitution. The High Court interpreted certain provisions of the Constitution to mean one thing, but subsequently as we got further and further away from the time when the Constitution was drafted and as the personnel of the High Court changed the court took a different view of certain aspects of the Constitution.

I think a most notable example is to be found in the reversal of the court's opinion of the arbitration powers in the case which has become known as the Engineers' Case. For years the High Court had decided against certain powers being vested in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, but subsequently a differently constituted High Court decided that those powers were properly vested. There are other illustrations of a similar nature as, for example, the interpretation of section 92 which relates to the freedom of trade and commerce between States. I think the generally accepted idea of what was meant by the men who drafted that section was that the old vicious system of border tariffs and State-imposed excise and customs duties should be abolished and that Australia, in a fiscal sense, should become one composite whole. I do not think it was ever intended that the States should not be able to take steps to protect their instrumentalities from unfair interstate competition. In the road hauliers' case—*Hughes against Vale*—the Privy Council determined that the States could not take steps to protect State railways from unfair competition by interstate hauliers.

The time has come when these matters ought to be thoroughly investigated, and I believe the States are the most appropriate authorities to pronounce judgment on them and should at least be represented on a committee charged with the duty of deciding what changes, if any, should be submitted to the people for their consideration. As I have said, the Constitution itself provides that changes shall be made in it only if approved by a referendum. The prescribed procedure is for the Federal Parliament to pass an amendment provisionally on this approval being given, and if such

amendment is not approved by a majority of the people and a majority of the States, it automatically lapses. This procedure emphasizes the Party aspect in that whatever amendment is passed by the Federal Parliament will have been the legislative child of one Party or the other; and when the matter comes before the people, the Party opposing the amendment paints a dire picture both of the amendment itself and of the Party which has sponsored it. As a result, the people are confused and stampeded into rejecting the amendment for that reason.

The first essential seems to be that both Parties in both the Federal and State spheres should go to the people with a proposal which has received their wholehearted agreement. An all Party conference of both Federal and State representatives is the only way to secure such agreement. To the extent that the present inquiry is being conducted on an all Party basis, it is likely to do some good, but I feel that unless the States as such are represented, it will not achieve as much as it ought. Just as the elimination of the Party-versus-Party element in a referendum would assist in giving the people a better chance of dispassionately deciding the issue, so the elimination of the Federal versus State element at the same stage would place the issue in its true perspective.

There is, of course, no doubt that the Federal Constitution needs a good overhaul—and it is impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of the task confronting the committee. The various difficulties that have been encountered by the States, for example, in arriving at a satisfactory solution of the problems created by interstate hauliers using State roads, to mention only one instance, have emphasized the need for a comprehensive review, in the interests of the States as well as of the Commonwealth, of section 92. It must be remembered that it is not just a matter of giving or proposing to give additional powers to the Federal Parliament: it is a matter also of preserving to the States whatever it may have originally been intended to preserve to them, as qualified by existing conditions and any differences in political philosophy that might have arisen since Federation was first inaugurated.

Several years ago—in 1943—the State Parliament passed legislation providing for preference to ex-servicemen in appointments and promotions in the Government service, but although the Premier asserted at the time

that the State Parliament should pass that legislation because it was doubtful whether Federal legislation on the same subject would be valid in peace-time—and although, incidentally, he asserted that the State legislation was to give real preference to ex-servicemen—his Government has long since chosen to ignore an important part of its own legislation, I believe on the ground that the High Court declared a similar Victorian Act invalid because it conflicted with a Federal Act on the same subject.

Without reflecting further on the remarkable change of front by the Government that this represents, in so far as policy is concerned, I am bound to say that it is even more remarkable that the Federal Constitution should be instrumental in preventing a State from legislating effectively for its own purely domestic affairs. I might add that it is somewhat surprising that the Premier has not taken the necessary steps either to persuade the Federal Government to amend its relevant legislation to harmonize with the State's or to have the whole position clarified so that the intention of the South Australian Parliament shall be effectively expressed.

I suspect that the legal uncertainty behind which the State Government is hiding, because it does not really believe in preference for ex-servicemen, arises from the operation of section 109 of the Federal Constitution. That section prescribes that a Federal law shall supersede a State law on the same subject; although, it is only fair to say that such law must be one which the Federal Parliament is competent to make under the provisions of sections 51 and 52. It is apparent that some doubt attaches to the actual meaning of section 109 or, at any rate, to the intended meaning thereof, especially in view of the fact that the Federal Parliament may exercise wide powers in war-time which it cannot in peace-time. I mention this particular aspect of the Federal Constitution because it is just as desirable to clarify the Constitution as it may be desirable to amend it in sense.

In 1942 two representatives from each State met representatives of the Commonwealth for the purpose of discussing what powers should be transferred temporarily to the Commonwealth for post-war purposes. I emphasize that. In 1942 the then Federal Labor Government called a conference of Federal and State authorities to consider certain temporary amendments to the Constitution which they believed were necessary to enable the

Commonwealth to properly discharge its functions in the post-war period. I well remember that the Hon Sir Shirley Jeffries, then Attorney-General in the Playford Government, and the former Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. R. S. Richards, attended that conference as the representatives of South Australia, and they came back with a report that had been unanimously agreed to. Legislation was then passed by this Parliament to embody the recommendations. The conference recommended that certain powers should be "referred" to the Commonwealth for a period of five years following the cessation of hostilities. Among these powers was "reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during any war."

The recommendations were adopted by the Federal Government and were embodied in the Commonwealth Powers Act (No. 3 of 1943) passed by this Parliament at the request of the Commonwealth. I mention the "reinstatement and advancement" provision particularly because it is of special interest in view of subsequent developments, to some of which I have already referred, but in certain respects the same fate befell the other provisions.

Although the legislation provided that it should apply even if any other State did not pass it—but of course only to a State which did pass it—there seems to have been some legal barrier to the implementation of the whole arrangement, with the result that in 1944 a referendum was held seeking an amendment of the Federal Constitution for the same purpose. Incidentally, this was rejected by four States, only South Australia and Western Australia returning majorities in favour of it. The referendum was lost by about 340,000 votes in a total poll of about 4,270,000. It would appear, therefore, that the people of Australia were not in favour of transferring to the Commonwealth the powers specified for a period of five years after the cessation of hostilities; so that it is extremely difficult to understand why any South Australian law made on the subjects included in the referendum can now be deemed to be *ultra vires* and invalid because a Commonwealth law has been passed on the same subject.

In this connection, I point out that no agreement has since been entered into between the Commonwealth and the States on the question of war service preference as there has been in the case of the marketing of certain primary



products, as for example, wheat, for the purpose of circumventing section 92 of the Federal Constitution. The position in this regard is, to say the least, very confused; and the example I have quoted is only one of the many instances of the unsatisfactory consequences of such confusion.

Reverting to the fate of referenda held since Federation, I would like to submit some statistics indicating how the people in the various States voted. These statistics should

be interpreted in the light of the fact that for a referendum to succeed it must receive majorities in at least four States and an overall majority of the total number of valid votes cast. I ask leave to have these statistics inserted in *Hansard* without being fully referred to. To read the list now would not convey much to members, whereas, if printed in *Hansard* it will be available as a permanent record for perusal later.

Leave granted.

# SUMMARY OF REFERENDA HELD 1906 TO 1951.

No.	Year.	Subject.	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qsld.	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.	States' Vote.		Majority Vote.	Result.
									f.	a.		
1	1906	Senate elections .....	f	f	f	f	f	f	6	0	f	Passed
2	1910	Finance .....	a	a	f	a	f	f	3	3	a	Rejected
3	1910	State Debts .....	a	f	f	f	f	f	5	1	f	Passed
4	1911	Legislative powers .....	a	a	a	a	f	a	1	5	a	Rejected
5	1911	Monopolies .....	a	a	a	a	f	a	1	5	a	Rejected
6	1913	Corporations .....	a	a	f	f	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
7	1913	Industry .....	a	a	f	f	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
8	1913	Monopolies .....	a	a	f	f	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
9	1913	Trade .....	a	a	f	f	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
10	1913	Railway disputes .....	a	a	f	f	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
11	1913	Trusts .....	a	a	f	f	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
12	1916	Military service .....	a	f	a	a	f	f	3	3	a	Rejected
13	1917	Military service .....	a	a	a	a	f	f	2	4	a	Rejected
14	1919	Legislative powers .....	a	f	f	a	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
15	1919	Monopolies .....	a	f	f	a	f	a	3	3	a	Rejected
16	1926	Industry .....	f	a	f	a	a	a	2	4	a	Rejected
17	1926	Essential services .....	f	a	f	a	a	a	2	4	a	Rejected
18	1928	State Debts .....	f	f	f	f	f	f	6	0	f	Passed
19	1937	Air navigation .....	a	f	f	a	a	a	2	4	f	Rejected
20	1937	Marketing .....	a	a	a	a	a	a	0	6	a	Rejected
21	1944	Post-War Reconstruction .....	a	a	a	f	f	a	2	4	a	Rejected
22	1946	Social Services .....	f	f	f	f	f	f	6	0	f	Passed
23	1946	Organized Marketing .....	f	f	a	a	f	a	3	3	f	Rejected
24	1946	Industry and Employment .....	f	f	a	a	f	a	3	3	f	Rejected
25	1948	Rents, Prices .....	a	a	a	a	a	a	0	6	a	Rejected
26	1951	Communism .....	a	a	f	a	f	f	3	3	a	Rejected

f. means for; a. means against.

Bracketed referenda held simultaneously.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Altogether 26 referenda have been conducted and only four have been successful. One of these was the first to be held—to change the method of electing senators—and it was approved by all States. Two of the other referenda which have been successful referred to financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States, under which the Commonwealth took over State public debts for the purpose of control and management, and the remaining successful referendum related to social services. In these instances, no doubt, the States believed they were transferring financial burdens. Of the rest of the referenda all except two relating

to conscription during the first world war sought a transfer of powers to the Commonwealth, and all, for reasons which I have explained, were defeated.

If the party element had been absent when many of the other referenda were voted on, I feel sure they would have been approved. Perhaps different referendum machinery might have given such questions a better chance of succeeding, but I point out that to secure different referendum machinery it first becomes necessary to amend the Constitution relating to referendum machinery. I feel sure also that if the whole question of Constitution reform, whether it concerns changes in the

distribution of powers as between the Commonwealth and the States or the even more important question of the meaning, intended and actual, of certain parts of the Federal Constitution, is first argued out by State and Federal delegates and then some common basis is presented to the people, we shall have a Federal Constitution which will not impede progress but be the means of better relations between the Commonwealth and the States, and the instrument of progress.

Before concluding I will refer to the motion passed by the Federal Parliament at the instigation of the Prime Minister, part of which reads:—

That a joint committee be appointed to review such aspects of the working of the Constitution as the committee considers it can most profitably consider and to make recommendations for such amendments of the Constitution as the committee thinks necessary in the light of experience.

It is that committee that I feel representatives of the State Parliaments, both Government and Opposition, should be invited to join, and hence I have moved that our own Premier should approach the other Premiers with a view to making an official approach to the Federal Government on this very important matter.

Some over-bright member, during the debate that will follow, might want to know what has become of the Labor Party's policy of sovereign powers for the Commonwealth Parliament. Let me say that that policy definitely still stands and always will stand with this democratic Party. It is our hope to secure in the future a Constitution under which the growing Australian nation can grow stronger and stronger and take an increasingly important part in the councils of the British Commonwealth of Nations. However, I have not advocated that policy in support of this motion.

The Hon. T. Playford—It is something fundamental?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is beyond the scope of the present motion, which seeks to get State representation on a committee that is now considering amendments to the Constitution to tidy it up here and there. State representation on the committee would serve a useful purpose, because it would eliminate the possibility of State versus State views being expressed when a referendum was held. When the prices referendum was before the people our Premier proudly proclaimed that he could effectively control prices and urged the people to vote "No." The New South Wales Premier urged

his people to vote "Yes" because he felt he could not effectively control prices. About a fortnight ago we had a conference of State and Federal Ministers when the matter was discussed, but the Commonwealth said it would not be a party to Federal price control. Then the States decided to have another look at the matter. Mr. Cahill, Premier of New South Wales, said later that it would be futile for his State to attempt to reimpose universal price control. Whether that was a good decision is for the Parliament of that State to decide, but it shows that the Government of the largest State is satisfied that this is a matter where the Commonwealth should have the powers necessary to protect all the people in all the States. I confidently expect that this motion will be carried.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### COUNCIL BY-LAWS: UNSIGHTLY CHATELS AND STRUCTURES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse—

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 Tumby 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.

(Continued from August 22. Page 361.)

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I am not convinced on the evidence placed before the members that the House would be in order in disallowing the by-laws. For some time local government bodies sought power to deal with nuisances, and in 1952, as the result of repeated representations from councils in various parts of the State, the Government amended the Local Government Act giving them the power to make by-laws to cover a situation where unsightly premises were not only a nuisance but had the effect of reducing the value of nearby land, and becoming a hazard to the area as a whole. Under the Health Act councils have power to deal with an insanitary condition or prevent the occupation of a dwelling, but not for cleaning up unsightly premises and dealing with the removal of goods and

chattels. The matter had become a problem to the councils and there was doubt as to whether there was sufficient authority to control the position. After representations by the councils had been fully examined by the Local Government Advisory Committee, Parliament amended the Act and gave councils the right to promulgate by-laws. As I understand it, councils on Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula, at Salisbury and in some parts of the metropolitan area have availed themselves of the provision which Parliament made in 1952, and which it reviewed and endorsed in 1954. The by-laws have been on the table of the House for perusal and adoption. They have been examined by the Subordinate Legislation Committee and I do not criticize the committee's work for it has done good service in drawing the attention of Parliament to the by-laws and the difficulties that might face the councils that promulgated them. The only reason given for disallowing them is that the committee is not prepared to trust the councils to use the powers given to them by Parliament. Those powers are that the council may serve a notice on the owner of a property and remove goods and chattels if the council is of opinion that premises are unsightly. The council must satisfy itself, and the local court in the case of an appeal, that the premises will adversely affect the value of nearby property because of the unsightliness, or have a bad effect in general on the council area. Councils are capable of exercising the power. Every two years at election time they are answerable to the people in their districts. We have not had a good reason for reversing the previous decision of Parliament in this matter.

Mr. Millhouse has indicated that the Government proposes to introduce a model by-law, which he hopes will meet the situation. We are not treating local government representatives reasonably by dealing with them in this way. There is no reason why the Government should not go ahead, promulgate a model by-law, and make it available for adoption by councils without interfering in any way with the work already done by them.

Mr. Shannon—Do you suggest we should have two by-laws on the same topic?

Mr. RICHES—Model by-laws are drawn up on many topics, and some councils have adopted them and others have not. There is nothing to prevent the Government drawing up model by-laws; some councils will want to adopt them. I am not impressed with the statement that the model by-law will be more effective than those already drawn up by councils after

thorough investigation by their solicitors and the investigation by the Government that must have preceded the inclusion of the appropriate section in the Act. Members who have addressed themselves on this motion admit that the by-laws do not infringe the letter of the law as drafted by Parliament and we would be well advised to allow these by-laws to pass. If the Government intends to frame model by-laws then it should do so. The motion is an unwarranted interference with the powers Parliament has asked councils to accept and we should not interfere in this way unless and until a better argument has been advanced for that interference.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I shall speak only briefly on the motion because it is a storm in a teacup. Further, I doubt whether it is suitable to be dealt with as private members' business. I do not disagree with Mr. Riches' statement that these by-laws or by-laws with a similar spirit are not entirely necessary, but I am not happy with the by-laws as framed.

Mr. Shannon—That is the unanimous opinion of your committee.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes. As passed in 1952 section 667 (48a) provided:—

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 unsightly chattel or any unsightly structure the presence of which is likely to affect adversely the value of adjoining land or which is prejudicial to the interest 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; but every by-law made pursuant to this paragraph shall provide that the owner or occupier shall have a right of appeal to a local court from any notice given by the council.

As amended last year the paragraph now provides:—

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 in the opinion of the council is 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 . . .

Following that amendment these councils very properly introduced the by-laws that are the subject of the motion. Together with the other members of the Joint Committee on

Subordinate Legislation I feel that the powers in the by-laws are too sweeping. Further, I feel they contain no real definition of what may be regarded as an unsightly structure: that is purely a matter of opinion for individual councils. The Committee, however, cannot disallow these by-laws; they must be referred to Parliament and that has been done in this case. By supporting the motion no injustice will be done to councils. All committee members are sympathetic with what councils are trying to do by framing these by-laws and we hope that soon they will be able to pass by-laws to do the work required. When the model by-law is framed there will be nothing to stop councils following it so that the exact meaning may be obtained. The model by-law will give a more specific meaning than the by-laws we are discussing.

To a great extent I believe that the fault in this case could be in the Act itself and I hope that some day the appropriate section may be tidied up, but in the meantime this motion will effectively serve the same purpose as it will not prevent a council from carrying out its duty in getting rid of unsightly structures. Because such model by-law will save councils much legal difficulty I support the motion to disallow these by-laws.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I rise to support the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches). I was surprised to hear the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) speaking as he did this afternoon because, although he has been closely associated with local government, he tried to tell the House that honourable councillors do not know what they are talking about or what they want when it comes to cleaning up their municipalities. Mr. Clark knows as well as I do the difficulty of councils in trying to keep their towns clean. We have had similar occurrences in Port Pirie. We have ratepayers who are too mean and contemptible to try to do something for their own town. There are people who are too mean to pay even a small fee to the council for rubbish removal, and would prefer to dump their rubbish on some other person's block or even on a roadway. Councils have power under the Local Government Act to take action against those people if they can trace them. We know that there are people with vacant blocks of land who encourage others to dump their rubbish on those blocks because they are desirous of filling them. Councils require power to make the owners of the property remove that rubbish. I hope that this House will not carry the motion. I have a great respect

for people who are prepared to give their services freely to the community, because they are only desirous of carrying out their responsibilities to the decent ratepayers. I sincerely hope that honourable members will take the same view as the honourable member for Stuart and myself. I oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I thank those members who have spoken for what they have said. It seems to me that objection comes down to two things. One objection is that we have not put sufficient material before the House to justify the motion, and the other is that in any case it is rather an insult to councils that Parliament does not seem prepared to trust municipal bodies with powers as wide as they would like.

I repeat what I said last week when I moved the motion, and what has been said by the members for Chaffey and Gawler, namely, that the objection of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is that the by-laws contain no definition of what is an unsightly chattel or structure. It is purely a matter of opinion, and the opinion of the honourable member for Stuart probably differs from that of other members of the House.

Mr. Davis—Is it not a question of the opinion of the council concerned?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is what the by-law provides, but the opinion of one council could be one way and the opinion of another council the other way. The opinions of individual councillors may also vary.

Mr. Davis—Surely a council can come to a decision that a structure is unsightly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It is a very bad thing that a council should have to come to a decision with no guidance at all from the by-law which it is considering. That is the very point. There is nothing in the by-law as it stands at present to help councils and councillors to formulate their opinions, or local courts in the event of an appeal.

Mr. Davis—Would not your committee trust the judgment of the majority of the councillors?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It is not a matter of not trusting the opinion of councillors. The point is that in one case in perhaps a dozen or a hundred a miscarriage of justice may occur. There is always a risk if the law is uncertain, as it is under this by-law. That risk can, and we believe will, be eliminated when the model

by-law is made. We should eliminate the risk altogether and make the law certain.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member for Mitcham ought not to look for the disallowance of this by-law for professional reasons.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I admit that such a by-law as this would beget litigation; it would make the law uncertain and would cause unnecessary trouble and annoyance to members of councils, ratepayers and local courts. That position should be avoided if possible. That is all I can say on the first objection, and that is why the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation believes this by-law should be disallowed.

With regard to the suggestion that it is a dig at local government, all I can say is that it is not meant as a reflection upon the honesty and integrity of local government and those who carry it on. I regret that we have been obliged to take this step, and I wish that it were possible for Parliament to suggest amendments to the by-law, but I remind honourable members that under the Local Government Act that is not possible. Section 675 (2) of that Act reads:—

Every such resolution (that is, a resolution to disallow a by-law) shall disallow the whole of the by-law, and no such resolution shall be passed to disallow portion only of any such by-law.

In other words, Parliament either has to allow the by-law or disallow it, and the only alternative to disallowance is a proclamation by the Governor. The Government has intimated that it will bring down a model by-law which will remedy the defect of which the committee complains. I believe that we have no alternative but to move for the disallowance of this by-law, and hope that in the very near future the model by-law will be available and that local government will thus be able to remedy what is admitted on all sides to be an evil for which there must be some satisfactory remedy.

The House divided on the motion—

Ayes (31).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Bywaters, John Clark, Geoffrey Clarke, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunnage, Dunstan, Goldney, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Heath, Hincks, Hutchens, Jenkins, Jennings, King, Laucke, Loveday, Millhouse (Teller), O'Halloran, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford, Quirke, Shannon, Stephens, Tapping, and Frank Walsh.

Noes (4).—Messrs. Davis (teller), Fletcher, Riches, and Stott.

Majority of 27 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

## METROPOLITAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION.

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 these 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.

(Continued from August 22. Page 361.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—The motion deals only with local government in the metropolitan area, so it vitally concerns 60 per cent of the State's population, though indirectly it concerns the whole State. Local government is most important, and I believe that in this House we have at least two mayors, two chairmen of district councils, and many present or former members of local government bodies. The motion asks us to appoint a committee to consider steps to be taken for the better administration of affairs in the metropolitan area. Its wording is innocuous, but the nigger in the woodpile was soon disclosed when the Leader of the Opposition was making his speech because he introduced the question of a Greater Adelaide. I am bold enough to assert that it is not a motion with a view to improving existing conditions in local government, but to foist upon us a scheme for a Greater Adelaide. If that is the case, why does not the honourable member come into the open and move that a Greater Adelaide scheme be established? That is the effect of the motion? Let us consider who wants the scheme apart from the Leader of the Opposition and some of his Party. Who has asked for it? Since the motion was introduced I have made a few inquiries around the metropolitan area from interested bodies and members of councils, but can say unhesitatingly that the principal councils do not want this proposal. The Municipal Association, which comprises all

constituent councils of the metropolitan area, and some country councils certainly do not want it either.

Mr. Davis—Where did they discuss it?

Mr. CUMBE—It has not been brought before them because it has not been asked for. They have not asked for it and they do not want it. The Adelaide City Council, which would be most vitally involved, certainly does not want it.

The Hon. T. Playford—The Opposition do not care what you want; it is what they think you should have.

Mr. CUMBE—In speaking to members of councils I have not found one in favour of a Greater Adelaide scheme, and I include among them many friends who are members of the Labor Party. They prefer the present system. No request has come before this Parliament for many years from any of the interested parties for such a scheme as suggested. The system of government in Australia falls into three main categories—the National, the State and local government. The National Government deals with such matters as defence, post offices, pensions and allied subjects, the State Governments deal with water supply, education, railways and the like, and local government handles matters within a prescribed area, principally roads, garbage collection and so on. Just as certain powers are divided between the Commonwealth Parliament and the State Parliament, so certain powers have been delegated by this Parliament to councils.

What the Leader has suggested is the setting up of a Greater Adelaide scheme. In effect, it would be a State within a State with all its inherent disadvantages. In other words, he advocates a form of central government. That cannot be denied. If his scheme were agreed to there would be no local government in the metropolitan area. The Opposition is advocating a form of central government, despite the fact that one of its principles is decentralization. In the short time I have been a member of the House I have heard members of the Opposition, including the Leader, several times advocating decentralization. This proposal is the opposite. Instead of decentralization with the spreading of responsibility, the responsibility is to be centred in one small area. The motion appears to be the very opposite to one of the principles of the Labor Party.

Mr. O'Halloran—Where does it mention centralization?

Mr. CUMBE—It is your motion, you should know. The very essence of success of the present scheme is the voluntary work done by citizens all over the metropolitan area who have a very fine sense of civic pride in their areas. They have local loyalties and local affections. I am sometimes amazed at the amount of time given by them to council work, and the only reward they appear to get is a huge number of complaints from ratepayers. I suggest that this great voluntary scheme would be destroyed if the suggested new scheme were agreed to. It would be a sort of Colossus or Goliath which would swallow up many of those fine voluntary workers in the metropolitan area. It might even be only a matter of time before we had a central type of government with paid aldermen, which is nothing strange in other parts of the world where greater metropolitan schemes exist. I do not suggest that there would be any scandal, such as graft, involved.

The Leader of the Opposition amply quoted many authorities in favour of a Greater Adelaide scheme. Let us look at the history of these schemes throughout Australia as set out in the official publications of these bodies. We find that suggestions for a Greater Melbourne scheme failed. Premiers in the persons of Mr. Watt, Mr. Dunstan, and Mr. Cain have at various times spoken on it, but all attempts to introduce it have failed. Moves to bring about a Greater Sydney scheme have also failed.

The Hon. T. Playford—They have a certain measure of centralization in Sydney.

Mr. CUMBE—They went a little way and then failed and are going to have another try, but so far the scheme has not been successful. In Perth they were successful to the degree that Leaderville and another suburb to the north of Perth were prepared to enter into a scheme, but other suburban councils would not enter into it to ensure its success. At the moment the position there is in a state of flux. A Greater Fremantle scheme involving about half a dozen councils was attempted, but unfortunately lapsed because of lack of support.

Mr. Jennings—Unfortunately?

The Hon. T. Playford—Unfortunately for the scheme.

Mr. CUMBE—The Leader instanced Brisbane as a fine example of a greater metropolitan scheme. Brisbane's financial position is probably the worst of all capital cities. It is heavily in debt and experiences difficulty in raising loans. It is, of course, subsidized by the State Government. It possesses another feature foreign to Adelaide in that it has paid

aldermen. Most of its work is undertaken by outside contractors. Contracts are let for garbage collection, street cleaning and for parks and gardens. At one time contracts were even let for planting seedlings in the gardens. With so many outside contracts it could be possible for paid aldermen to make something from them. I do not suggest they do, but the possibility is there. The Brisbane scheme, which has been used as a model for us, has no great virtue.

There is a vast difference between the cities that have been mentioned by the Opposition and Adelaide. In most of the other cities they have certain responsibilities in respect of various services—water, sewerage, electricity and public transport. In Adelaide those functions are undertaken by outside instrumentalities. I was interested to hear the member for Enfield, Mr. Jennings, say that I would be concerned with this motion and probably support it. However, I think members will judge from my remarks that I do not support it. I propose now to quote from the findings of the Local Government Commission which was established under the chairmanship of Sir Edgar Bean to investigate the question of amalgamating local governing bodies in South Australia. In respect of the metropolitan area the commission reported:—

1. All the councils involved are of sufficient size and have sufficient revenue to warrant the employment of qualified officers, and on the whole are staffed with competent men and little or no advantage in this regard is to be gained by forming into larger areas.

2. Most councils mentioned have borrowed money for undertakings of different kinds and while the proper apportionment of the liabilities in the event of a union would not be impossible it would be a difficult matter and the problems would be likely to lead to disharmony in the new council.

3. In well developed areas with civic centres of long standing the desire for separate existence is strong.

As no responsible body is asking for a Greater Adelaide and bearing in mind the findings of the commission, I am sure this motion will receive little support in this House or from ratepayers generally. After all, the ratepayers are most vitally concerned. I admit that the problems confronting councils today are great, but I wonder whether they are any greater than those which confronted the councils in the early days when so much developmental work had to be undertaken. That work proceeded and the Leader now suggests that that developmental work which accrued to the advantage of the councils should be handed over to a new combined body.

I admit that councils may be parochial, but most ratepayers, after all, are mainly concerned with their roads and footpaths, garbage collection and street lighting. If a ratepayer has any complaint it is a simple matter for him to approach his local councillor. In most councils there are two councillors for each ward and there is usually an alderman in the council area. Under the proposed scheme the number of councillors would be greatly reduced and a ratepayer might well experience difficulty in locating his councillor.

Mr. Lawn—How do people who want to communicate with their member of Parliament get on? What about the people living in the district of Frome, for example?

Mr. CUMBE—My remarks are confined to local government. Different conditions apply in different parts of the metropolitan area. Mr. Jennings said that there were 21 constituent councils in the metropolitan area whose problems were very similar, but they are not so similar as he suggests. The problems of Adelaide are entirely different from those of Brighton or Mitcham. The Adelaide Council administers building regulations and has the problem of traffic parking in streets, but those conditions do not apply in the heart of Marion or at Burnside. There are different problems in an industrial area as compared with a residential area. The same can be said of the conditions in a seaside council as against a council in the foothills or on the plain. I agree with the Leader that councils have great problems, but I disagree as to the method of approaching them. The greatest problem confronting councils is the financing of road construction and maintenance. Councils use rate revenue or loan funds for this work and are assisted in respect of some roads by Government grants, but most of the internal roads have to be financed entirely from their own resources. That is one of the problems they are up against. One solution is for the States to press again for the whole of the petrol tax to be allocated to them so that they, in turn, can make bigger allocations to councils for road making. Under the previous agreement the Commonwealth collected excise of 11.23d. a gallon on imported petrol, and 8½d. a gallon on locally distilled petrol—that from Kwinana and other Australian refineries—of which they gave the States 7d. This money, of course, went to the Highways Fund. For the year ended June 30, 1956, this State received £2,925,000. Following the "little Budget" earlier this year, an extra 3d. a gallon excise

was levied, of which the States received only a penny. If the whole of the petrol tax were available to the States for road work, South Australia would have received over £4,000,000 for the last financial year. Of course, 40 per cent would have had to be allocated to rural roads, with which I am entirely in agreement, but more money would have been available to the metropolitan area and the problems of councils would thereby have been eased.

Another problem facing most metropolitan councils is the damage done to roads by tramways buses. The councils are recompensed on the basis of a penny a bus mile, but that is totally inadequate; it is not enough for maintenance, let alone for reconstruction. What I have said relates to main roads, but the position of light traffic roads is even worse, because many of these that are now taking huge buses were not designed for vehicles weighing more than five tons. Councils will have to reconstruct many such roads because they are not main roads. My council will have to reconstruct two roads in the next 12 months, and this will be entirely beyond its financial resources. I suggest that the Government should examine this matter and work out a satisfactory solution with the Tramways Trust. Part of the solution would be to revise the Main Roads Schedule, which might be of benefit to some councils.

The Leader's motion is not an answer to this problem. If a Greater Adelaide scheme were introduced I do not think for a moment the people would be better represented, or that these financial problems would be overcome. In conclusion, let me say that as no request has been received by this Parliament for a Greater Adelaide and councils do not ask for it, I am not in favour of the scheme. I suggest that setting up a committee would not in any way alleviate council's difficulties, therefore I strongly oppose the motion.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—The honourable member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) laid very great emphasis on the term "Greater Adelaide," but the Leader merely suggested a Greater Adelaide as an example of what has been done elsewhere, particularly in Brisbane, to draw attention to what might be the recommendation of this committee. He pointed out that the committee might suggest a two-tier system. In other words, he did not say that it would necessarily suggest a Greater Adelaide. If he had not suggested what might be the decisions of the committee he would have been accused of not having constructive ideas, and

it would have been said that there is no necessity for the committee. Mr. Coumbe not only started his remarks by stating that the Leader wanted a Greater Adelaide scheme, but also concluded them by using the term again. The Premier also did that, and attempted to twist this motion as though it is centred around a Greater Adelaide scheme. The motion is simply that a committee should be set up to do certain things in view of 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 these problems and the untoward consequence of the existing system of local government now obtaining in the metropolitan area. No member has so far denied that those problems exist.

Mr. Millhouse—You do not deny that a Greater Adelaide is behind the idea, do you?

Mr. LOVEDAY—The Leader only mentioned it as a possible solution, but he also mentioned a two-tier system of local government. Mr. Coumbe said that the Municipal Association does not want this, but I know as a member of that Association that it has not considered it. The ratepayers, who are the people interested, want improvements in the matters listed in this motion, so there should be an investigation on how these matters can be improved. Mr. Coumbe said also that the powers in this country are divided between Federal, State and local government bodies, but he failed to mention that the history of government is one of greater centralizing of powers as civilization becomes more complex. We have a federal system, which is a recognition of the fact that as our civilization became more complex we had to delegate more powers to a central body. The same thing is arising in connection with local government in the metropolitan area. Mr. Coumbe twitted this side on its plank dealing with decentralization but he failed to define the word. We on this side favour decentralization in industry and of the people, but we also favour the centralizing of power and policy where necessary to guarantee certain needs in the community. The motion aims at the co-ordination of services where the centralization of policy is necessary to achieve co-ordination. Mr. Coumbe also cast aspersions on paid aldermen, as though the receipt of a payment made



them unreliable and corrupt. He was unable to follow up his argument in this respect. There is no reason why a paid alderman in a Greater Adelaide, or a more centralized form of local government, should be any more or less corrupt than one who receives no payment.

Mr. John Clark—Or a paid member of Parliament.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Yes. Mr. Coumbe referred to the financial difficulties of Greater Brisbane but he did not put forward evidence to show that they were due to its size. He said that Greater Brisbane engaged private enterprise to a great extent but he was not persistent in that line of argument because it might be used as evidence why Greater Brisbane is in financial difficulties. All local government bodies in Australia are in financial difficulties and obviously there is an overriding reason for that position. Those of us who are associated with local government know that it is in the horse and buggy stage as far as finances are concerned. A tremendous number of people are receiving benefits from local government but contribute little towards it. The work of local government has expanded greatly in recent years, both socially and culturally. It must receive more from the common pool of taxation in order to meet its financial liabilities. Its share of the total revenue in Australia is decreasing instead of increasing, despite its added responsibilities. In answer to the point made by Mr. Coumbe I will quote from an article by Mr. Mainerd, secretary of the Local Government Association of New South Wales, who has made a study of this question. He said:—

The national income has increased by 266 per cent since 1939, from £112 to £409 per head. Commonwealth and State taxes have risen by 510 per cent, from £18 to £110 per head. Local government has had to be content with an increase of 100 per cent from £2.3 to £4.7 per head. Local government needs both an increased allocation of Loan money and a more equitable share of the Commonwealth's grants to the States.

These are the reasons why Greater Brisbane is in the same difficulties as our local government bodies. Mr. Mainerd also said:—

Since 1943 these grants have increased by 480 per cent, from £27,000,000 to £157,000,000, but the States' assistance to local government has increased by only 75 per cent, from £5.6 million to £9.8 million in 1952. And at a time when the demand for new capital works is greater than ever, Loan allocations to local government are being reduced each year. The Loan allocations for local government and

semi-local government bodies in all States were:—

	£
1952 .. .. .	96 million
1953 .. .. .	127.9 million
1954 .. .. .	90.5 million
1955 .. .. .	90 million
1956 .. .. .	80 million

He later said:—

Local government is being asked to face a modern world with the financial tools of a by-gone age. The present system is outmoded, inadequate and unjust. Outmoded, because it makes no provision whatsoever for the needs of the modern age; inadequate because the returns are grossly insufficient for what is required; and unjust because the contributions now made must come not from a section of the people but from those who enjoy the benefits and privileges of local government.

These sentiments can be directly and faithfully applied to the present situation in the metropolitan area. They provide the strongest reasons for an investigating committee to be set up as proposed in the motion. Mr. Coumbe also said that the principal concerns of rate-payers were footpaths and roads. Certainly there is reason for concern there, but the motion does not deal in detail with the kerbing outside someone's house but with major services that need co-ordinating, and where the different policies of various small bodies prevent co-ordination. Mr. Coumbe admitted that there was a degree of parochialism in local government that prevented a common policy from being adopted. The Premier adopted similar tactics. He made great play with the terms "centralization" and decentralization" and the same answer applies to him as to the remarks made by Mr. Coumbe. The Premier did not define "centralization" or "decentralization" but said that the most efficient Government is usually the Government nearest to the people. Government members do not believe that. They always oppose full adult franchise. I have noticed that when a proposal is put forward to make it more practicable for a wage earner to take part in local government every obstacle is placed in his way. That is not bringing local government close to the people, especially in a town where most of the people are wage earners.

Mr. Hambour—That is not quite fair.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I could produce evidence to support it.

Mr. Hambour—It is not a nice statement to make.

Mr. LOVEDAY—It was brought up here not so long ago. It was pointed out that wage earners who had to attend functions associated

with local government during working hours received nothing for loss of wages. It was suggested that they should be paid a basic rate for a limited number of hours in every year to offset to some degree their loss of wages, but it was turned down on the ground that people in local government worked in an honorary capacity.

Mr. Hambour—You assume that all employers are Liberals.

Mr. LOVEDAY—It has nothing to do with all employers. It was a Liberal Government that turned down the proposal. In the instance I mentioned the Minister seemed deliberately not to understand the proposition in the correspondence that passed between the local government body and himself, although the letters were perfectly plain.

Mr. Heaslip—Local councillors are honorary.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Yes, and no-one wants to make them anything else as far as I know, but there is a great difference on the local government body to which I belong between the three members who are salaried men and lose nothing by attending functions and the other three who are wage earners and must lose their wages when they attend. The request to which I referred was modest but some people said, "Working men should not be in local government."

Mr. Heaslip—Who suggested that?

Mr. Davis—The Municipal Association.

Mr. Hambour—You're one of them?

Mr. Davis—Yes, but a minority.

Mr. LOVEDAY—During his speech the Premier ridiculed the motion and said that the three existing bodies were competent to deal with such matters, that nothing was to be gained by setting up another body and that nothing could be added to the total of knowledge already in hand. The matters mentioned in the motion, however, have worried many people for a long time, yet the three existing bodies have failed to attend to them, so apparently they have attached little or no significance to them and there is every reason to set up an investigating committee.

In South Australia we have many public utilities and all members will agree with the Premier's statement that they are necessary, but whenever a public utility has been set up to deal with such matters as water, electricity or sewerage it has necessarily stripped local government of some of its powers; yet I have not heard the argument advanced that

some of these utilities should not be set up merely because they have that effect. If the opposition to this and similar motions is successful there will sooner or later be such a public outcry about the lack of co-ordination in such matters as transport, that bodies will have to be set up to deal with these matters and further power will be stripped from more local government bodies. Therefore, opposition to this motion simply means that instead of councils retaining the powers they have they will lose still more in future. It is only a matter of time before public transport will have to be dealt with either by a controlling body or some central form of local government with the necessary power. In the last analysis, therefore, the effect of opposition to this motion will be to take local government further away from the people.

This is not a question of setting up some over-riding authority which will be distant from the people and ignore their requirements: it is mainly a question of the co-ordination of services that at present cannot be co-ordinated because of differing policies. An investigation is required into the matters set out in the motion so that recommendations may be made to overcome the difficulties which face metropolitan councils, which are common to other councils and which need the earliest possible airing. For these reasons the motion should receive the strongest support from all members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—No doubt all members were looking forward with great interest to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition introducing the motion and to the speeches of his supporters, but I for one have been disappointed. Very little has been said about the motion: indeed, it is now obvious that it was simply a peg upon which Opposition members could hang their argument for a Greater Adelaide. The only Opposition member who has touched the gist of the motion has been the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), but after a promising start he, too, sheered away from it. The recitals we have heard from Opposition members have been simply propaganda and carry the matter no further, which leads me to believe that they either could not be bothered to go to the trouble of framing a Bill containing detailed proposals or that they did not know what they wanted, except, perhaps, some vague principle of a Greater Adelaide.

Of course, from their point of view I suppose it was much easier to put a motion of this kind on the Notice Paper because it is vague and

contains very little to defend; certainly it is much easier than to introduce an amendment to the Local Government Act because that would require justification clause by clause. In other words, Opposition members are trying to have their cake and eat it; they are trying to take advantage of their belief in a general principle without getting down to tin tacks on the matter. That is also obvious from the speeches we have heard. Mr. O'Halloran referred vaguely to a two-tiered system of local government but he was not specific. Mr. Jennings said that either Greater Adelaide, some other over-riding metropolitan authority—presumably the two-tiered arrangement suggested by his Leader—or extensive amalgamation was required. In other words, the ideas of Opposition members on this matter are completely woolly.

The motion contains three recitals that are sheer propaganda and then His Excellency the Governor is requested to appoint a committee comprising four members of the House of Assembly and three of the Legislative Council; but nothing has been put before us to justify the abdication by Parliament of its undoubted right to legislate on this subject. Why pick out this matter for investigation by a committee? Why cannot Parliament consider it as it considers other matters? Not one word has been said by any of the Opposition speakers to justify that abdication of our undoubted rights and privileges. No reason has been given why there should be four members from this House and three from the other House. The Opposition has simply ignored the motion, and has merely used it as a peg upon which to hang some propaganda for their Greater Adelaide scheme.

There is one matter upon which I entirely agree with the Leader of the Opposition. I agree that the Local Government Act is in a shocking mess and that it should be consolidated and reprinted. There is probably no other Act so frequently consulted by laymen, and it is almost impossible for anyone, whether a layman or one trained in the law, to find his way through that Act. I part company here with the Leader of the Opposition because I do not think we should go to the trouble of having a committee simply to overhaul the Act. It can be done much more simply and should in fact have been done many years ago. My opposition to the motion springs fundamentally from the principle that the Government closest to the people is the most effective, and there is no doubt that local government is the form of government closest to the people.

Mr. Riches—It does not have to be small to be close to the people.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Perhaps not. In the metropolitan area most people only have to walk a few streets to reach their local councillor or alderman, and that is a very good thing.

Mr. Riches—What makes you so certain that an independent committee would recommend the Greater Adelaide scheme?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am not certain that it would.

The Hon. T. Playford—The whole purpose of appointing the committee is to recommend it, according to the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition told us quite frankly what he wanted recommended.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Every speaker from the other side has advocated that, and every other phrase contains the magic words "Greater Adelaide." The whole thing is transparent, and the City of Brisbane is their glorious example. The principle upon which I oppose the motion is that government should be close to the people, and if one body were to represent the whole of Adelaide that principle would not apply; aldermen and councillors would be much more remote from the average ratepayer than they now are. Even though local government may have faults as at present constituted, it is as close to the people as it possibly could be. Other members will probably agree that diffusion of government is a safeguard to the liberty of the subject, and that is an overwhelmingly important consideration. We certainly have a diffusion of governments in the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Mr. O'Halloran—"Confusion" is nearer the mark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Even though there may be some drawbacks to our present system, that diffusion of government is a safeguard. I believe that is a very good thing and should be maintained. Local government is a very large reservoir containing men and women who are trained in public affairs and administration. There are a number of members on both sides of this House who have risen through the ranks of local government, having had their early training in that field. I have not been fortunate enough to have had such training, and I regret that. I cannot understand why members opposite who have had local government experience should turn upon it in the way they so frequently do.

The Hon. T. Playford—They do not believe in local government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do not think they do. This motion absolutely screams it, and I remember the same thing happened during last session of Parliament. Opposition members in this House are prepared to give lip service to local government, but all their actions belie it; they lose no opportunity to attack local government and weaken its structure in this State. They have lost their belief in local government.

Mr. Corcoran—Who says we have?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Their actions speak louder than their words, and that applies even to the member for Millicent. All the arguments applied by the Opposition to local government in the metropolitan area could be equally well applied to outside areas.

Mr. Riches—So they do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Then why has the Opposition limited its attack on local government to the metropolitan area?

Mr. Riches—It is not an attack.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Of course it is; it is a blatant attack on local government.

Mr. Riches—Sooner or later there will have to be an inquiry into local government generally.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The cat is out of the bag. Apparently this motion is only the thin edge of the wedge. The Opposition envisages in due course abolishing local government throughout the State so that we may have centralized control, presumably here in Adelaide, but that is a principle with which I do not agree. Because the Government which is closest to the people is the best government and because diffusion of power of Government is a safeguard to the liberty of the subject I do not agree with the contentions of those supporting the motion, and I oppose it.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—Despite the accusations made by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) a few minutes ago about woolly thinking by the Opposition, it has at least given rise to some most interesting debating. The Leader of the Opposition, as usual, made an excellent speech. The Premier followed him, but I doubt whether he thinks he made a good speech, which followed the normal pattern when he opposes Opposition measures. He does not think it necessary to put forward valid arguments: he simply says “No,” and after talking for about a quarter of an hour and introducing many red herrings, he sits down, knowing that his colleagues, once they have heard his “No” will not say “Yes.”

I have no objection to that practice if that is the way he likes to debate our motions, but I object to his colleagues getting up afterwards and trying to say what a remarkably good job he has done. I was disappointed with the Premier's lack of support for the motion. I have always given him credit for being a practical man. He may say that is his reason for opposing the motion, but this is an eminently practical motion. It simply gives the House an opportunity of appointing a committee to get the benefit of advice from the best authorities on local government, including the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham, if they wish to give evidence. When the member for Mitcham was supporting government close to the people he was advocating adult franchise for local government, and I am sure he would want to present evidence to the committee in support of that claim. The appointment of a committee of inquiry would give everybody the opportunity to bring forward ideas to help local government. Whatever has emerged from this afternoon's debate it is clear that many members in their own way—and we have heard some peculiar ways from the other side of the House—are anxious to help local government.

The appointment of a committee would be the ideal way to get ideas, and I thought the Premier would have grabbed this opportunity with both hands. He seemed to think that the Opposition would have a majority on the committee, but that is a remote possibility with the House constituted as it is. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) inferred that the proposals contained in the motion would become the law of the land as a matter of course. Are some Government members afraid that the justice and rightness of the arguments put forward by the Opposition will so overwhelmingly convince the committee that it is a foregone conclusion what it will decide? From the Premier's remarks one would imagine that the Leader of the Opposition would be the only member of the committee. No-one on this side of the House suggested that, though it might be a good suggestion. Even the suspicious minds of Mr. Coumbe and Mr. Millhouse did not hint at such an idea.

The Premier tried to assert that the Leader talked about nothing else but a Greater Adelaide. The Opposition, in this motion, is only submitting questions that might be considered by a committee. After all, under our present

Parliamentary system putting forward such a motion is about the only chance the Leader of the Opposition has of having local government brought before the House. So he did his best to put it before the House. The Premier's criticism was not valid, because the short paragraphs of the motion tell the complete story of what the committee's functions should be. In listening to him I thought at any moment I would hear about the faults and failures of the Greater Brisbane scheme, and the Queensland Government in particular, but along came the usual dig about spending, borrowing and debt of the Greater Brisbane scheme. That was echoed by his followers this afternoon. These same gentlemen during the course of the debate on the Loan Estimates told us that spending and debt are essential in modern government. Surely they would not object to allowing local government a little debt as well. We have heard something about the magnificent town hall in Brisbane, but members opposite did not mention its splendid university. They made particularly certain that they did not mention the Brisbane tramway system run by the Greater Brisbane Council and providing the best and cheapest transport system in Australia. That is only one thing which comes to mind, but no doubt there are many others. When painting a picture it is wise not to pick out only the things which suit your argument, but to tell the whole story.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You tell us the whole story of the outer suburbs of Brisbane.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I am afraid I will have to leave that to the Minister, who apparently as on all other subjects knows much more about it than I do. I was very interested this afternoon in Mr. Coumbe's remarks. Without wishing to appear patronizing, I think it was an excellent effort, particularly as it was virtually his first speech in the House. He was most interesting, put his points forward clearly and showed that interjections will not worry him very much. That is all to the good. I was interested when he referred to the nigger in the woodpile, the particular nigger he found being the Greater Adelaide scheme. Apparently he did this because he obviously feared the implications. The arguments which Labor members could put forward on the subject would be so forceful that they would be able to convince the committee of their claims—that was his fear. This committee would have to report back to Parliament, but apparently he believes when it does Parliament will

be convinced of its claims. From what I have heard this afternoon, there will have to be a great change of heart.

Mr. O'Halloran—They are afraid of the evidence.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Obviously. That is only one of the niggers in the woodpile. I claim it would be proved to be a very fair skinned nigger. I hope I will be able to produce some other dark skinned gentlemen which are also niggers in the woodpile, for the Government members to discover. I was interested to hear the honourable member speak of local loyalties and affections, which are very good things at times for a particular area, but there are times, and I think honourable members on both sides, including Mr. Coumbe will admit—indeed he did—when things become over-local. He said we could be over parochial. That is surely one of the things we are hoping to do something about under this motion. He went on to say that he agreed that there are many grave difficulties facing councils, but his approach differed from that of the Leader of the Opposition. I agree they are grave, but he failed to say that these grave problems he speaks about are the very ones we are seeking to overcome through the appointment of the committee. I will not comment on Mr. Love-day's speech. Here we have another instance that we have new talent coming into the House that will add to its lustre.

Mr. Millhouse appears to have a fear concerning the possibility of a Greater Adelaide. I have been trying to work out what danger he envisages. He suggested that the motion was simply a peg on which to hang arguments in favour of a Greater Adelaide. I am certain that if a committee is appointed it will provide pegs on which to hang anything worth-while concerning local government in the metropolitan area. He said that Parliament was abrogating its rights in advocating the appointment of this committee but that is the very thing it is not doing. It proposes the appointment of the committee to consider evidence, arrive at its findings and report back to this House which, if it does not like them, can throw them out the window. No powers are to be abrogated. He seemed to be certain that the committee would plump for a Greater Adelaide, but I do not know why. It could be a fear complex, but I fail to see what there is to fear. I was interested to hear his very eloquent appeal that we should keep closer to the people as we have always done in local government. I feel I can be quite certain that I can

rely on his support of adult franchise. It is rather amazing how some members tend to get bees in their bonnets that cannot be shifted.

Mr. O'Halloran—They have to have something there.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes, but it is a pity they cannot find room for something else. Last year the member for Mitcham said that he had grave doubts about the interest of Opposition members in local government: now he suggests we are merely rendering lip service to such interest. This motion has been sponsored because of our interest in local government. We have no criticism of councillors. Mr. Millhouse said that many members have taken and still take part in council affairs. Over 100 years of service to councils has been given by Opposition members. We commend them for their activity and by this motion are endeavouring to assist them. We are attempting to institute a thorough investigation into local government in the metropolitan area. A special committee appointed by Parliament is to undertake that investigation. Our aim is to provide councils with the means of working more satisfactorily and of removing the hindrances that make it impossible at the moment to co-ordinate the development of the metropolitan area. The motion relates only to the metropolitan area, although the Opposition realises that there are many grave and varied problems in the country. In introducing this motion the Leader said:—

I suggest that a Parliamentary Committee should be appointed to investigate the matter thoroughly, with a view to recommending, without fear or favour, what reform would be appropriate in the case of our own metropolitan area, and that it should be representative of the Opposition and the Government. I am prepared to concede that the Government—because for the time being it is the Government, irrespective of how it became the Government—should have the right of representation on this committee, but I feel that the representatives of both Houses of Parliament should be of both the Government and the Opposition.

It is not always easy to forget how this Government was elected or to forget our political differences. However, this motion was not introduced as a political stunt, but as an attempt to pool our resources and brains to get the best results in the interests of the orderly and co-ordinated development of the metropolitan area, which, we claim, at present is not being done.

Let us consider the present situation. There are 21 entirely separate local authorities in

the metropolitan area—20 municipal councils and the Gardens Suburb Commissioner. All are exercising wide powers which have been conferred on them through that long, complex and virtually unconsolidated Local Government Act. Most members are familiar with the manner in which our local government system began. Many areas commenced as district councils with wide open spaces. That, of course, was long before the metropolitan octopus—aided and abetted by this Government—spread its ever swelling tentacles and removed most of the open spaces. Those areas have now become municipalities and their problems have not only increased, but have interlocked.

It has been suggested this afternoon that the problems of the various councils differ. That is true, but many of the problems interlock and are closely related. For 100 years we have had local government in South Australia and our legislation is based, in the main, on the premise that local councils should control purely local affairs. Parliament has delegated responsibilities to councils in their own particular zones or areas and by this means authority has been decentralized. It should, and does, to a great extent afford scope for local citizens to prove and improve their citizenship. In the main it develops civic pride, but because of the hindrances against adult franchise, it develops it in a rather narrow sense. It certainly lessens the obligation on the central authority, although we must remember that it is always Parliament's right and responsibility—and one reason for the motion is to make use realize that that responsibility has not always been borne as it should have been—to amend our legislation to make certain that the best results ensue from the authority delegated to local government. In the past this has been done rather haphazardly.

I would like members to recall that I said councils were given responsibility over particular zones or areas. At one time those zones could be clearly defined, but now they overlap and combine. We believe the time is long overdue for a thorough investigation to ascertain what changes are necessary to secure the best results from local government agencies. I think most of us realize that as time goes on the disadvantages of our complicated system of local government administration, with its multiplicity of councils in the metropolitan area, are becoming more and more pronounced. Perhaps at one time there were not any border clashes between various areas, but there certainly are now. Most of the old vacant inter-

vening areas have been built on and soon practically none will remain. The development of the metropolitan area in recent years has accentuated this difficulty.

Surely members must realize that it is essential to have full co-ordination between the various areas to deal with this problem, and we are not going to get this co-ordination without legislative action. That is one of the major reasons for the introduction of the motion, which simply seeks to set up a committee to make certain that such legislation will be the best possible. The Opposition does not aim to foist any particular brand of theory on Parliament; it wants a committee to decide on the best things to do, and to bring the matter back to Parliament for ratification or otherwise. Surely, with increased population, it has become virtually impossible for councils to carry out construction and maintenance of roads satisfactorily. Indeed, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) mentioned that as one of the grave difficulties councils have to face at present. Here again, surely this matter needs close co-ordination between various councils.

The road problem has become too great for many councils, not only for their physical resources but even more for their financial resources, yet the Local Government Act not only empowers but compels them to carry out this work. A further complication is that so many authorities exist in council areas, something councils did not have to cope with in earlier times, and these authorities perform duties quite distinct from those of councils. Various trusts and boards have been set up from time to time to control something or other, and the very fact that they have had to be set up is an indication that it is necessary for something more to be done. I am not, however, condemning local government for this. Health and hospitalization are sometimes administered wholly by the Government, sometimes in co-operation with the councils and sometimes even by independent bodies within council areas. What a mixture!

We should also remember that various so-called policies followed by the Government over recent years have caused an enormous expansion of public services, and this again has further complicated the already very complicated problem of the metropolitan area. That is an additional reason for a complete review of the whole basis upon which councils are attempting to operate. The Opposition believes that a committee such as that sug-

gested in the motion is the only suitable way to get the best amendment to the Local Government Act. We are convinced that the small problems that once faced councils are now enormous because of the development in the metropolitan area due to increases in population and expansion of industry.

I would not like members to think that the matters I have mentioned should comprise the whole of the scope of this committee, and I would not like to disappoint those who might be hoping for other niggers to be produced from our particular woodpile. There are other injustices, too many for me to mention in any detail, which are inherent from the past when conditions were different. This afternoon we heard a little about adult franchise. Probably when local government was first introduced in this State ownership of land was considered the only fair criterion of interest in public affairs. That, of course, is still considered by some to be the only criterion. Ever since, despite modern advances and enlightened ideas on democratic principles, legislation has continued to prescribe the same property qualifications for municipal and district council elections. In other words, the electors must be ratepayers. Although that is a narrow conception of human rights it might have been justifiable when all council funds were provided by ratepayers. However, the amenities are now provided not only by the ratepayers but also to a very great extent by allowances from Government revenue, which we all help to provide. Today universal suffrage prevails in all democratic and civilized countries, in Parliamentary elections at any rate, but an even more cogent argument for adult franchise is that money for works undertaken for the benefit of ratepayers is provided out of revenue.

From a practical point of view, apart from the justice of the matter, surely the present rating basis which shapes the personnel of councils has a deadening effect on them. I ask members if they have ever noticed ratepayers' representatives on a council keeping rates down to a minimum when higher rates have been necessary? I think possibly they have. Have they ever noticed ratepayers' representatives opposed to costly essential works for the very same reason? I am not blaming the representatives for their attitude, but simply wish to point out just what happens because of the basis of representation. Also, have members ever noticed that certain parts of a district are highly favoured with many

improvements because of the influence of property owners whereas other areas without that influence have suffered from lack of development? I have noticed that around Adelaide. We have all noticed these things, unless we were wilfully blind. Surely adult suffrage and proportional representation seems to be the only equitable way of electing a council. If there are Labour members on the proposed committee this matter will certainly be considered. They will have to convince the committee of the justice of their claim before it will be recommended to Parliament.

There are other matters that might be considered, such as rental or unimproved values. Some councils have one system and some the other, and it causes confusion. We might have higher or lower assessments. At present there are low values associated with high rates, and high values with low rates. The whole picture gives us an extraordinary mixture of old and new ideas, with multiple administration of the major and difficult affairs that all councils are striving mightily to handle against impossible and hopeless odds. It is obvious that the Government must have had doubts about the need for co-ordination because recently it introduced town planning legislation. Even if it were a patchwork affair and not likely to be effective, it was an indication that the Government had thought about the matter. Also we had the ill-fated taxicab Bill, which, unlike Julius Caesar, came, saw, but was not conquered. It was evidence that the Government had been stirred from its apathy and decided that it must get closer to the people.

I have not mentioned Greater Adelaide except in reply to remarks made by members opposite. I have always believed that sooner or later a Greater Adelaide scheme must be contemplated and the time is now ripe for it. That does not mean that the proposed committee would decide that we should have such a plan, but the matter will be considered and Opposition members will certainly see that it is considered. If the committee decided that a lesser number of councils, amalgamating those with kindred interests, would be a better plan, then we will be satisfied.

Mr. Millhouse—Have you any suggestions?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Dozens, but I prefer to give them to the committee. If the honourable member wants to hear them I suggest he support the motion. I have tried to show that because of the existence of so many local authorities there is of necessity a lack of cohesive unified effort. That is not the fault

of councils but the system under which they are forced to work. I do not think a satisfactory solution can be found to this and the many other problems unless we as legislators seek out the best steps to take and then boldly attack them. It is for the proposed committee to suggest the steps to be taken. If Mr. O'Halloran were the only Labor man on the committee we would have had a Greater Adelaide, but it will be an impartial committee, probably loaded with Government members. Whatever the committee decides must be ratified by Parliament. Its suggestions must surely be in the interests of the metropolitan area as a whole, and I support the motion.

Mr. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 370.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This Bill seeks to permit the promotion of lotteries for certain purposes and sets out ways to control them. I have not compared the measure with the one previously introduced by the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Frank Walsh), but I believe it to be similar. It has for its object assistance to hospitals, various other institutions and sporting clubs that have insufficient revenue to carry out their functions. I have carefully examined the Bill in the limited time at my disposal, and I cannot support it. I have two fundamental objections to the Bill. It has been the practice in this House to deal with social measures as honourable members see them and I am not now speaking on behalf of my Party or Cabinet, but simply stating my own views. Lotteries have been considered many times in this House and at least since 1933, when I became a member, there has been an agitation for a lottery here. Some private people have agitated for a lottery for gain and have given the Government of the day an attractive bait in the form of revenue in return for the required franchise. A lottery has been advocated on the grounds that money is going to other States and it has even been said that a lottery is required to maintain the State's solvency.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Frank Walsh) has also said that by means of a lottery we can alleviate sickness and also benefit the community by providing funds not otherwise available. This matter has been



continually considered by Parliament and discussed at length for many years. At one stage that discussion reached the point where the Government felt constrained to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the matter and furnish expert advice to Parliament. The commission took evidence in this and other States where it saw lotteries operating and it furnished a comprehensive report, which, together with minutes of evidence, was printed and included in the 1936 Parliamentary Papers. The members of that commission were:—Mr. H. B. Piper, who subsequently became Chief Judge of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration; Mr. F. J. Condon, present Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council; Mr. C. R. Cudmore, the Leader of the other Party in the Legislative Council; Mr. J. M. Beerworth, who represented the district now represented by Mr. Riches in this House, and Mr. H. C. Hogben, a former Liberal member of this House, who played a prominent part in establishing the Housing Trust. That commission brought in a unanimous recommendation, which should be examined by all members interested in lotteries because it was made by experienced people against whom there could not be the slightest suspicion that they were either in favour or against lotteries. It was an unbiassed report.

Mr. Dunstan—What were the terms of reference?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They were wide and empowered the commission to inquire into and report upon the question whether it was desirable to authorize by law the holding of lotteries for the purposes of raising funds to assist in the finance of hospitals and other charitable institutions, and to make recommendations thereon. Those terms included the very objective now sought by Mr. Walsh, the sponsor of this Bill: the assistance of charitable institutions. The commission's unanimous finding was as follows:—

We, therefore, recommend that it is not desirable to authorize the holding of lotteries in South Australia for the purpose of raising funds to assist in financing hospitals and other charitable institutions.

In its conclusions the commission stated:—

We have come to the conclusion that arguments advanced in favour of legalization of lotteries for the purposes set out in our commission are, as regards the premises on which they are based and the conclusions attempted to be drawn, unsound. The principle reasons leading to our findings which are based on our investigations and the evidence submitted to us, and are amplified earlier in this report, may be summarized as follows:—

- (1) The evidence presented to us shows that the hospitals of South Australia compare favourably with the hospitals of the other States of Australia, and are capable of meeting the reasonable requirements of the public.
- (2) The amounts which are found by the Government and local governing authorities in South Australia do not constitute an undue burden on taxpayers or ratepayers.
- (3) Hospital authorities in South Australia do not favour a system of finance through the medium of lotteries.
- (4) No evidence has been presented to us by any charitable organization of a desire for a lottery, and the presumption therefore is that it is not wanted by charities.
- (5) A system of lotteries for charities is objectionable on many grounds.
- (6) Lotteries are transient and uncertain in their results.
- (7) The existence of a lottery does not solve the problem of hospital finance in the States which have lotteries.

At page 33 of their report the commission states:—

It appears that other charitable institutions not only do not want a lottery, but actually prefer their present systems of finance, and we find that there is no demand by charitable institutions for a lottery in South Australia. If a lottery is on other grounds undesirable, it does not become desirable because the proceeds are to be devoted to a good cause. We have already referred to the confusion of motives which actuates the mind of the average investor in a lottery. The spirit in which he buys his ticket is in direct antipathy to the spirit of charity.

There are pages of conclusions of this Commission which was one of the very highest order, comprising people who have for a long time enjoyed the esteem and the confidence of the people of South Australia. The chairman of that Commission was subsequently appointed Chief Judge of the Federal Arbitration Court. All the evidence adduced by this very competent authority stressed the undesirability of lotteries.

The honourable member seeks to prevent the growth of a large lottery. Although he did not say so, I am attributing this to him, because he apparently desires a number of safeguards to prevent large unsocial lotteries springing up. He stresses that no club or association shall have more than one lottery a year, and that no person shall have any direct reward or payment for running a lottery. As the crowning effort to keep this thing small and not anti-social he says that no prizes shall be money prizes. I assume that all these things represent a desire on his part

to keep these lotteries small and not of more than district or local significance.

Mr. Frank Walsh—No more than what is contained in the provisions relating to art unions today.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I point out that the provisions of the Bill are so wide that one could drive a horse and cart through every one of them. One such provision is that no person shall provide or distribute any money prize in any lottery, but I point out that in one of the largest lotteries interstate the prize offered recently was a hotel.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Worth £450,000.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The fact that it is not a money prize does not limit the lottery or the prize. Under this activity one could offer the biggest hotel in South Australia as the prize.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Or a motor car.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. One could have such things as prizes, and any amount one liked as the subscription. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### LOAN ESTIMATES.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House to make provision by Bill for the appropriation of such amounts of the revenue and moneys of the State as were required for the following purposes:—

- (a) The repayment with interest of the sum of £25,475,000 to be borrowed for the purposes mentioned in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1956-1957, and of any other sums to be borrowed pursuant to the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1956.
- (b) To make payments from the Loan Fund of repaid loan money and surplus revenue for the purposes mentioned in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1956-1957.
- (c) Any other purposes mentioned in the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1956.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 28. Page 427.)

Grand total, £28,135,000.

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—From the total loan programme of £28,135,000 it is proposed to grant two-thirds under three items: £5,500,000 to the Electricity Trust, £6,500,000 to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and £6,396,000 to the Architect-in-Chief. This means that allocations to other services must be curtailed. The Leader of the Opposition dealt fully with the housing position, but

£1,900,000 has been allocated for housing. We all realize that the housing problem has been a difficult one for many years, for most members have had many requests from constituents to help them find accommodation. The Leader of the Opposition said that big deposits had to be found by people wishing to buy houses and that it was difficult for most young married people to raise the necessary deposits. Nowadays most young people of both sexes are earning good wages. Most of them start earning before the age of 18, though those entering the professions must study for years, but they earn more when they become qualified. I believe that if many young people were more careful they could save sufficient to find the deposit on a home when they married. The fact that many cannot do so shows a lack of responsibility. Of course, many young people have to help their families financially, but they should realize that if they saved money they would benefit later.

The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) got away from the subject when he spoke about the cessation of quarterly adjustments to the basic wage. He said that South Australians had lost much money for this reason, but I shall refer to two factors—the tremendous increase of hire purchase in the last few years and the fact that many families today have more amenities and comforts in their homes than ever before. The *Statistical Register* shows that Commonwealth Savings Bank balances to the credit of depositors at June 30, 1946, totalled £12,665,403. At June 30, 1955 the amount had increased to £30,546,167. The corresponding figures for the State Bank, not including school savings bank accounts and certain other special accounts, were £52,177,268 and £98,923,998. During that period there had been a wave of prosperity and South Australians were better off than ever before.

Mr. Heaslip in his speech mentioned certain deficiencies in the railways service between Adelaide and Gladstone. I live at Balaklava and use the same service occasionally and fully agree with what he said concerning the slowness of the service. It takes me more than twice as long to get home by rail than by road. There are long delays, particularly at Gawler, only 25 miles from Adelaide. By the time the train leaves there to continue its journey more than an hour has elapsed since it left Adelaide. This line and others were converted to broad gauge about 30 years ago, and my only regret is that all the narrow gauge lines were not included. However, the Treasurer of the day

was short of money and it was not possible to do as much as those in authority would have liked. When the lines were being relayed, the northern line should have been duplicated from Gawler to Hamley Bridge. This would have resulted in an immense saving to the railways eventually. Mr. Tapping advocated, as he has done previously, a daylight service between Adelaide and Melbourne to give the public an opportunity to see the country, which they do not now enjoy because most of the journey is in the dark. I agree with him that this matter should be seriously considered.

I think I am now the oldest member in length of service on the Land Settlement Committee, and during my term have visited many parts of the State. Much development has taken place, particularly on Kangaroo Island and in the South East, and to a lesser degree on Eyre Peninsula, in connection with war service land settlement. The Commonwealth Government has found the greater part of the money necessary for this developmental programme. The benefits accruing from the land settlements undertaken by the South Australian Government have been very impressive. Some of the projects recommended for approval have not been accepted by the Commonwealth Government. I have in mind particularly the settlement of the Konetta property in the South East. About six years ago this project was referred to the committee for consideration as a war service land settlement scheme, but the recommendation was rejected by the Commonwealth. This land is getting much benefit from the drainage already undertaken in the area. The State Government went ahead with its developmental work and has sowed pastures with gratifying results. Now the Commonwealth Government has acceded to the request of the South Australian Government to use this land under the War Service Land settlement scheme.

Mr. Corcoran has already mentioned the area known as Fairview in the South East, which has been in the possession of the Government for a number of years. Difficulties have been met in its development because portion is very wet. This project is now being considered by the Land Settlement Committee, which has done very valuable work. I support the first line.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—From the outset I desire to make it clear that I do not intend to follow what the member for Onkaparinga last night described as "the thin red line of Labor policy," but I do

intend to follow the thin clear line of Labor policy. I do not like the word "red" and I am sure Mr. Shannon did not use that word with any ulterior motive. I shall follow Labor's clear policy because it will be a change from Mr. Shannon's non-existent line of Liberal policy. I congratulate the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) on his courage. It was obvious when he spoke on Thursday immediately after the Leader of the Opposition that other Government members were prepared to sit tight at that juncture, which is their usual practice. Apparently they preferred to have the weekend in which to read the Leader's remarks before they replied. Mr. Hambour, who can be regarded as a comparative novice here, with true courage did not hesitate to throw himself into the breach.

It is not easy at any time to follow the Leader and on this occasion, if I may use a cricketing term, the Leader was bowling particularly well on the sticky wicket of Liberal Government bungling in both Federal and State spheres. Mr. Hambour was not afraid to lose his wicket under those conditions, but he did so in hitting out, which was something. The experience should stand him in good stead and his performances will no doubt improve on better wickets. I do not intend to criticize his remarks because he was trying, which was more than can be said for his colleagues even though they have greater Parliamentary, if not other, experience.

Of course, those members who were reluctant to speak on Thursday entered the fray yesterday. They had devoted some time to studying the Leader's remarks, but after hearing them I doubt whether that study made much difference to the results. Let us consider what we did hear from them yesterday. For a while we listened to the high priest of private enterprise. The member for Onkaparinga, Mr. Shannon, made a delightful speech in which he did a remarkable job of clouding the issue. I would not suggest for one moment that it was deliberate. His was a good red herring speech and it was reasonably successful. When the Leader spoke, he was in excellent form and it was obvious from the attention given to him by both sides that he held the interest of the House, which is not always easy. He presented a comprehensive survey of the chaotic conditions of State and Federal affairs. Any person not satisfied with the justice of his remarks as to the gravity of our financial affairs is either extremely biased, or ostrich-like has his head, and perhaps even his hindquarters, submerged in the sand.

Much of the trouble we find ourselves in is due to the Government's policy of virtually forcing country people into the metropolitan area. We are faced with huge expenditure for enlarging and extending facilities in the city to cope with the situation. We have had to increase our sewerage, water and educational services—all necessary—but our State debt is growing and our interest bill is sky-rocketing annually as a result. It might be possible to put up with that if the finances were spent on the overall and best development of the State, but we should be certain that that is being done. I admit it has become necessary to spend where we have in the main, but this has been provoked by the Government policy of acute disinclination to permit country districts—and I except the recognized industrial centres—to expand. This, of course, may possibly be directly linked with the Government's desire to preserve its own skin at any cost and at this stage I am not attacking the gerrymander.

I frankly admit that my own district has had more money spent on it than ever before in the history of single electorates. There is nothing amazing about that, because since the last alteration of boundaries the complexion of my district has completely changed. Even if some members, because of their political affiliations, could not express agreement with what the Leader said, I believe all members concurred with his timely statement about interest charges. An attempt was made to refute this yesterday, but the real facts were not denied. The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) also made some telling points on the same subject. The people should realize the implications of this and I am hoping my colleagues will reiterate it in an attempt to drive it home, although driving anything home in this place is sometimes extremely difficult. However, that is no reason why we should not continue to attempt to do so. The difference between interest rates paid during the Chifley era and those of today is  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The annual interest due on every million pounds is £18,750, so the yearly interest alone on the £28,000,000 appearing in this year's Loan Estimates reaches the staggering total of £525,000. It must be remembered that that is interest only on this year's loan money, which is a significant fact indeed.

Even those who attempt to conceal it know what the interest policy of the Menzies-Fadden Government has done to people, many of whom denied themselves during the war years to invest in Government loans. What can be

classified as a deliberate policy of increasing interest rates as a method of frenzied finance has been followed by this Government. Recently this was brought home to me in a very simple way. A clergyman in my district told me that his church is anxious to build a new church hall, and although it had invested quite a reasonable amount in Government bonds, it would lose money by realizing on them. That certainly would not have been allowed in the Chifley era but it has been allowed to happen by our present Government not only to such people as those I have mentioned but also to many individuals and organizations.

Mr. O'Halloran—I know of a case in which £220 was lost on selling enough bonds to buy a house.

Mr. Dunstan—And I know of one similar case in which £700 was lost.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—They are very interesting examples that are typical of what is happening to individuals and organizations right throughout Australia. I now wish to draw attention to a few matters that concern my own district and which might in their implications concern other districts as well. Sometimes we are accused of bringing forward parish pump matters, but very often they relate to things that are required not only in our own districts but also in many other parts of the State and therefore ultimately benefit the whole State. Last night I was very interested to hear the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), who has the benefit of specialized knowledge, say something about sewerage. I know that I have dealt with country sewerage *ad nauseam* but I must do so again in the interests of a particular section of my district. Many country members on both sides of the House hoped to see something in this year's Estimates relating to the introduction of country sewerage. We have been told for at least 20 years, probably more, that sewerage is just around the corner for country towns, but with one notable exception mentioned during the debate it is still around the corner.

Mr. O'Halloran—That corner must have been the Cape of Good Hope.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—It might have been, or perhaps it was Cape Horn; at any rate it must have been a very distant corner. There is no sewerage in some parts of my district, although I am happy to say that Salisbury and Elizabeth have been sewered. Perhaps other parts have not been sewered because of the geography of the district. Elizabeth was sewered first and as Salisbury was close it benefited. However,

although people there are getting the advantages of the system they are finding that the cost will be fairly high, to put it bluntly. Nevertheless, I sincerely believe that the ultimate benefits will be very great.

I am concerned not only with that part of my area but also with the chief town there, that from which the area takes its name, Gawler. The residents of that town and the members of the council have been concerned for many years to improve the sewerage. I was interested to hear Mr. Shannon list the towns that he thought possibly required sewerage most. I was sorry that Gawler did not appear in that list, because I think it needs sewerage perhaps more than any other town. At one stage I was led to believe, and I am still hoping, that the proximity of Elizabeth would be of benefit to Gawler in this respect.

We have heard a good deal about the "horror Budget" of the Menzies-Fadden Government and I feel that before long we will be compelled to listen to a budget presented in this House that we will have to describe similarly. I hope that will not be the case, but I am afraid it will, and if it is I am afraid that country sewerage will still be around the distant corner. Nevertheless, I am still hoping that the time is coming when the antediluvian pan system in Gawler will be discontinued. The local council has tried to replace it, but it cannot do so without a sewerage system. It is unsatisfactory in these days for a town only a few miles from the city to have a system of sewage disposal that is keeping industries away from it.

I was happy the other day to read a press report where the New South Wales Government proudly stated, and produced figures, that it had accomplished decentralization after setting up a committee for the purpose. When the Leader of the Opposition here was asked the towns he thought would be suitable for decentralization purposes he mentioned Gawler. It is evident that it is an ideal town for industries. At one time it was the greatest industrial town in South Australia and there is no reason why it should not be again, but we cannot get industries because of the lack of sewerage. I mentioned previously that the Gawler Clothing Company had great difficulty in disposing of its sewage and effluent. It has had experts from all over the place to help, but the only solution is to have a sewerage system. Other industries in the town are in a similar position. New industries will not go to Gawler when they learn that there is no way to dispose of sewage.

I was sorry to learn the difficulties the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler is experiencing in connection with sewerage. It has septic tanks but they are proving troublesome. It is scandalous that a hospital serving a big area should suffer from the lack of sewerage. I remind several members in this House that Gawler is not the only place where the local government body is rated for the Hutchinson Hospital. I hope they will realize that the hospital must be helped and that their constituents are rated for the hospital. Mr. Shannon said last night that Port Pirie should be one of the first towns to be sewered, but I am not certain that it wants to be sewered. In 1947 Gawler was represented in this place by Mr. Les Duncan, and on July 23 of that year he asked the then Minister of Works the following question:—

Some weeks ago the press published a list of country towns likely to be sewered. Can the Minister of Works say why Gawler was omitted?

He received the following reply:—

From every point of view I should say Gawler would be entitled to be amongst the first towns to be sewered. It is one of the oldest and most important towns in the State. It has an adequate water supply and I hope it will be amongst the first to be sewered.

It is still one of the most important towns in the State, has an adequate water supply, yet it is still waiting to be sewered. Since that time Mr. Dunstan has passed to his reward, but the Playford Government is still with us and the sewerage of the town is still around the distant corner. Country towns decay because of the lack of a sewerage system and other amenities.

A line on the Loan Estimates deals with railways. I support Mr. Hambour's commendation of the diesel cars running in his area. They are excellent cars and are speedy. In fact, they are too speedy because when they get close to Adelaide they have to coast the last few miles in order to arrive on schedule. They are a boon to country travellers. Mr. Heaslip spoke about the slow and tedious rail journey he had on his return home one night last week. I had a great deal of sympathy with him in this matter until I remembered that he is a staunch supporter of a Liberal Government that has been in power since 1933. We would have thought that in all those years, with the excellent representatives the district has had, there would have been an improvement in the position. It seems that the people in the

area have been forgotten by the railways. Consideration should be given to the plight of the people in the honourable member's district. It may have been wise for him to have bought a motor car. This may seem a small matter but it is important to people in the district. On July 1 this year I addressed a letter to the Minister for Railways, and the following is a portion of it:—

During the winter months I have had numerous complaints from residents of Salisbury who regularly travel home from work from Adelaide to Salisbury on the 6.05 express train (actually it is a Diesel) to Moonta. Some of them are very incensed because passengers to Salisbury are regularly held up at the barrier until a few minutes before the train leaves: this is particularly irksome in the winter weather. I realize fully that the main idea of this is to allow long distance travellers to make certain of a seat. However it has been pointed out to me that usually there is ample room even after the Salisbury passengers have taken their seats. These Salisbury passengers also assert that they travel regularly and are in the long run worth more to the railways than the long distance passengers who travel only casually. I am fully aware however that this train is primarily a long distance one.

I was fully aware of that, but I thought these people had genuine grounds so I asked the Minister whether more discretion could be used by those on duty to allow Salisbury passengers to board the train earlier. I received the following reply from the Minister:—

The Commissioner points out that the Moonta railcar which departs Adelaide at 6.05 p.m. is a country train and the standard practice is that persons travelling to destinations within the metropolitan area are not permitted to join such trains earlier than 5 minutes before departure thus ensuring that long distance passengers have the choice of the seats. He regrets therefore that he cannot agree to your suggestion that the men on the barrier be allowed to use their discretion, as he considers that to do so would be most unsatisfactory. The Commissioner further points out that there is a local North Gawler train departing Adelaide 5.47 p.m. on which Salisbury passengers can travel. This train arrives at Salisbury at 6.18 p.m., 5 minutes before the railcar to Moonta.

That sounds simple and satisfactory and I believe it is with regards to country passengers, but there is a little more to it than that. Until the diesel car was introduced on this route, for some years Salisbury passengers were allowed to enter and were not required, as they are now, to line up at the barrier like horses waiting for the start of a race. Why should there be any difference now? True, the 5.47 p.m. train may reach Salisbury, only

five minutes before the 6.05 p.m., but it leaves Adelaide 18 minutes earlier and many Salisbury passengers who catch the 6.05 cannot catch the earlier train. Possibly the station-master could make a check and use his discretion in this matter instead of keeping passengers who have travelled regularly on this train for years hanging around the gate in discomfort when there is ample room on the train for all.

I had intended to speak on education this evening, but I will not do so because the introduction of the Budget will provide members with the opportunity to discuss such subjects. I do not believe that everything in the garden is lovely with regards to education; in fact, I know the Minister believes that the situation is difficult and that much needs to be done to bring things to the stage that he and I desire. I have often criticized the Government on education, but this evening I wish to say a few pleasant things about education facilities. I am happy that during the past 12 months desirable improvements and additions have been made to some schools in my district. At the Gawler High School much has been done following on the purchase of the property previously owned by the late Honourable R. J. Rudall, and the school now has breathing space. Most of this land, however, cannot be used until certain clearing, grading and fencing has been carried out by the department, and I hope this is done soon because, following a successful competition about a year ago, the Gawler High School Council has now more than £1,000 in hand for the specific purpose of laying down new sports and recreation fields, and they want to spend that money. Part of the former Rudall property has been converted into a delightful library, which I hope the Minister will be able to inspect soon.

The Education Department has apparently realized that the present growth of Salisbury and Elizabeth must result in more students for the Gawler High School. A satisfactory number of new rooms have been provided there, including a three-room unit that can be converted into a large assembly hall. That is a great advantage to the school; in fact, one such unit should be in every large school. A fine school has been opened at Elizabeth South and after a rather peculiar start is taking good shape now. I hope that other schools in this area will be ready on schedule when the homes there are occupied soon. At Salisbury North a new infant school is nearing completion. A new high school is projected

at Salisbury. Obviously, much has been done in this district.

I pay a tribute to the work being done by the adult education centres, formerly known as country technical schools. I pay a sincere tribute to the work being done in Gawler by the principal (Mr. John Chambers) with his council who are actively behind him. They have held a series of first-class lectures by experts, but unfortunately I have been able to attend only a few because many of the lectures are given on evenings when the House is sitting. In addition, musical evenings devoted primarily to the music of various nations have been held. The first one was devoted to the music, singing and dancing of Esthonia, and featured the Esthonian choir as well as the local choir. Pictures were displayed showing the beauties of Esthonia, and it was a delightful evening. Recently, another such evening was held at which the singing and dancing of Austria were demonstrated. I believe the type of work which enables us to see the culture of other countries is very desirable, because it is helping to make a fusion of the cultures of European countries with that of our own. This particular school is to be very highly commended for what it is doing, as should the Education Department for giving it the opportunity to do it. All these activities in my district will give members a fair indication of the amount of finance required for education. It is a very great deal, because this work of building is going on in all districts. Some members may say that their districts have not been quite so fortunate, but my district has not always been so fortunate either.

Last Saturday I had the pleasure of attending the centenary celebrations of the school at One Tree Hill, situated in the hills between Gawler and Smithfield. The Minister of Education also attended. People who had been at school there many years before came back for the occasion, and one lady maintained that she had been at the school more than 60 years ago. This school was built by a man named Moses Garlick, who had been a British Army officer in the Peninsula War before coming out here to settle. He picked this particular area because it reminded him so much of his home town of Uley in Gloucestershire. He named the area after that town, and the school bore the name of Uley for some time. I learned during the day that Mr. Moses Garlick collected £250 for the establishment of a school in the district, and the Government supplied the remaining £150 needed to build

this school. I am quite certain the Minister would be very happy if schools could now be built at that figure and still be standing in a very substantial fashion in 100 years' time. The Minister must have thought, as I did, that educational problems with regard to building would be considerably eased today if that were possible. It will be an increasingly heavy cost to do everything that should be done for children in our schools and for the teachers who shape them for citizenship, but even though the cost is great we must realize that it should be even greater.

I would have liked to devote some time to a most interesting policy adopted at the recent conference of the South Australian Institute of Teachers with regard to what they claim, after long and serious consideration, is necessary to help education in this State. I may have the opportunity of speaking on this matter at greater length later, and I am sure that many members will be interested in it. I would not like it thought that this policy is an idealistic one, because it is not; it is based on very hard facts and drawn up by people who have had long experience in the profession and know what they are talking about. I personally agree with all their conclusions. The Institute has a platform which I believe should be the blueprint for progress if we could possibly adopt it. I can sense that the feeling among members is, "Where are we going to get the money?" I know that it would cost a lot of money, but I am certain the ultimate benefits to the State would be immeasurably greater than the cost. Who can measure the benefits to a State and nation of a complete education for our youth? It just cannot be measured. The final plank in the policy is as follows:—

In view of the lag in school building, etc., brought about by the war, and by the rapid growth of school population since the war, the South Australian Institute of Teachers considers that special Commonwealth financial aid for education is necessary to establish schools on a proper basis.

It is a very great pleasure for me to read that and find that someone agrees with me. I have been advocating that inside and outside the House for a number of years, because I believe it is the only solution to the problem.

Members may recall that over the last week the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Fletcher) and I, although our districts are very far apart, have discovered that we have a kindred problem relating to the purchase of Housing Trust homes. I do not wish it to be thought that I am casting any reflection on the Housing

Trust, because I do not mention the matter for that purpose. I do not suppose there is any district in which more homes are being built at present by the trust than the district I have the honour to represent. I am concerned that in Salisbury North and Elizabeth a number of houses have been built for purchase and the occupants are still paying rent. In quite a number of these places the people have been in occupation for a long time, and although they are purchasing these houses they are still paying rent because the titles are not clear.

In a question to the Premier on August 22, I sought to find out the cause of the delay in the issue of titles, and I also asked the Premier if this matter could be cleared up. I know that one person at least in Salisbury North had been paying rent for well over 12 months while waiting the clearing of the title. I asked the Premier whether it would be possible, instead of treating these payments as rent, to deduct them from the purchase price. It is not the fault of the purchasers that titles have not been cleared, for they have signed agreements and intend buying their homes. The Premier said that my suggestion could not be carried out because the rental charges only met interest and other commitments. I realize that these people are paying less weekly than if they were buying their houses, but when they are paying off principal and interest they are reducing the amount owing.

I now suggest that they be charged the full weekly amounts they will have to pay when their titles are cleared, and those payments should be deducted from the total cost of the home. Let us assume they are paying about £2 a week now. If a purchaser has to wait 12 months for his title—and some of them do—he must pay over £100 which he can kiss goodbye because he will not see it again. I had a list of 20 people in Elizabeth who wanted to buy their homes but were waiting for the titles to be cleared before starting to pay for them. I asked the Premier how many were in this category at Elizabeth and he said 63. Two of them have been waiting over six months for their titles.

Mr. Riches—Some in Port Augusta have waited 28 months.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I only know the position at Mount Gambier and in my district. In those two areas there are 95 people in this unsatisfactory position. The Housing Trust is only too anxious for the titles to be cleared, but the purchasers are suffering in the mean-

time. Some of them are middle aged. It will take them many years to pay for their houses and that extra 12 months at the end of the period may mean the difference between a man living to see his home become his own and not doing so.

Mr. Stephens—What is the reason for the delay in clearing titles?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The Premier gave an answer yesterday, but it did not explain much. He said:—

There has been no undue delay, although it has been necessary to close roads and grant easements to the Electricity Trust and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Titles are now being numbered and will be issued by the end of September.

Although I disagree with much in the Loan Estimates I support the first line so that some development of the State may go ahead.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria)—I support the first line. I am reminded of a forecast made by the Premier about 12 years ago when he said that he visualized the time when the South-East would accommodate 250,000 people. During the last few years the population has increased at least 200 per cent and the stock carrying capacity and the value of that portion of the State has increased at least 500 per cent. I am particularly concerned about Crown lands and surplus lands. In the South-East there are between 2,500,000 and 4,000,000 acres of Crown and surplus lands. I have said before in the House that I am opposed to large tracts of land being held out of production by private people, but I am more concerned about land being held out of production by the Government. I join with the Leader of the Opposition in stating that I am disappointed to see the meagre sum of £50,000 on the Loan Estimates for the development of Crown lands. This is just a drop in the ocean. I hoped that when the War Service Land Settlement Scheme tapered off—which is happening now—the Government would take over the large amount of machinery and the many bulldozers being used under that scheme.

The Loan Estimates provide £100,000 to the State Bank for advances to settlers. The average amount for this item from 1951 to 1956 was less than £30,000, so the proposed allocation this year compares favourably with that. However, £28,000 was overdrawn to June 30, so there will be only about £72,000 available for settlers, and that is not sufficient. The following tables shows advances to settlers



and loans to producers by the State Bank from 1950-51 to 1956-57:—

Loan Estimates.	Advances	Loans to
	to Settlers.	Producers.
	£	£
1950-51 . . . . .	15,000	180,000
1951-52 . . . . .	5,000	150,000
1952-53 . . . . .	5,000	175,000
1953-54 . . . . .	50,000	400,000
1954-55 . . . . .	50,000	432,000
1955-56 . . . . .	50,000	200,000
1956-57 . . . . .	100,000	100,000

The drainage of the South-East is an important matter and was started in 1863. Royal commissions inquired into this problem in 1892, 1899 and 1925, and the South-Eastern Drainage Board made an investigation in 1947. I think all members are familiar with the western drainage scheme. It has released water from an area of about 400,000 acres. This land has been inundated probably for centuries and because of salinity there are serious problems to get full production. The eastern division comprises about 380,000 acres and this is also wet country. From 800 square miles in the western district of Victoria a considerable quantity of water is drained on to the eastern division in South Australia, which includes Mosquito Creek, the Penola area and also Morambro Creek. In this area there are many soldier settlers, the first of whom did exceptionally well, but as the scheme progressed and the partly improved land became available for other settlers the properties gradually extended into wetter country, and I regret that some of these settlers, particularly the last four who were allotted land in the Glenroy Forest area, are in a serious plight. At least 50 per cent of their blocks is completely inundated and pastures will have to be replanted.

I issue a warning to members of the Land Settlement Committee and remind them that the South-East has its peculiar problems. Surprising mistakes have already been made in settling this country. Some blocks allotted had to be enlarged to enable the settlers to make a fair living. I also know of one block of about 1,900 acres allotted in the Glenroy Forest area on which the developmental work has been so astounding that the size of the block has been decreased. I have the highest regard for the personnel of the Land Settlement Committee, but regret that there is not one member who has had practical experience in the South-East. I believe we all agree that the real wealth of this country is derived from the soil—whether it is coal, oil, iron, pyrites, wool, wheat, dairy produce or forest products. With the works programme

facing the Government, we all realize that the amount provided in the Loan Estimates is not enough to complete it.

I agree there are other urgent matters than those associated with the soil, such as hospitals, schools, roads and country sewers. I have in mind particularly the needs of Naracoorte where I have lived for a number of years. The population has increased considerably, and the amount of money invested in the district is astounding. Many new businesses have been established. It has been necessary to sink many deep bores for drainage, and on the other hand the town water supply is pumped from deep bores. Hospitals, schools, roads and sewers directly affect 80 per cent of the public, and I am sure that these matters will not go unheeded by the Government. Those who are developing the real wealth of the country include people represented by the Opposition as well as by Government supporters. There are the shearers as well as the actual woolgrowers, all of whom are playing their part. Because of the shortage of money I am rather afraid that some of the land I have mentioned cannot be brought into production at this stage. I support the first line.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I congratulate Mr. Harding on his speech, and because of his closing remarks I realize there is one member opposite who has a heart. He has had the courage to praise the working class and admits that they produce the wealth of this country. He is the only Government member prepared to make such an admission. His colleagues assert that our country's wealth is produced by those who live on the working class. I have listened with interest to the arguments advanced for various projects, but I disagree with most of what has been said by Government members, some of whom tried to criticize the Opposition's contentions.

I could not follow the arguments of the member for Gouger (Mr. Goldney). I assume he was suggesting that the workers receive too much money and he objected because many of them had amenities in their homes obtained through hire purchase. I admit that that is so, but some workers have suffered as a result of the hire purchase system. When overtime was plentiful many workers obtained such amenities, but when their wages reverted to normal they were unable to meet their commitments. I think most business men would admit that trade has decreased considerably in the last few months. I claim—and it is the opinion of many business men in my

district—that hire purchase is responsible for that. Some persons obtained goods believing they would get what they were entitled to under the quarterly adjustments, but unfortunately that was not so, and the workers are not receiving what they should under the C series index figures.

Mr. Goldney suggested that this was a period of prosperity. It is true that employers are receiving greater profits as a result of wage pegging, but employees are not prosperous. We were told that if wages were pegged the cost of living would fall, but costs have increased and housewives have had to restrict their budgets and a lower standard of living has resulted to employees in industry. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) made a ridiculous speech and accused the Leader of not looking after the workers' interests. Mr. Heaslip has never looked after the interests of the working class: his attitude has been the reverse.

Mr. Lawn—He is only concerned with sacking men.

Mr. DAVIS—I would not be surprised at that. During a recent conversation with him he said that manufacturers could charge what they liked for their goods and when I suggested that was the reason for our financial position he had the audacity to say that we were not forced to buy the goods. Of course we are not, because this is a free country. If a person hasn't a pair of boots he can go without. I was pleased to hear him say that his district has not an efficient rail service. He told us of his recent train journey back home. I suppose his motor car broke down and he was compelled to travel by train and it was only then he realized what his constituents had to contend with. I have never previously heard of his travelling by train, but if he has it has probably been on the wonderful train from Port Pirie which was obtained through my efforts. The honourable member for Rocky River spoke about the wonderful service between Port Pirie and Adelaide, and I have to admit that there is a slight improvement at times, but I do not think he has been on the train when dog box carriages are used. They are old suburban coaches and become very uncomfortable when travelling such long distances. He criticized the Government because of the train services, and told the story about a wool buyer who used to bring down all his wool by freight train, but since the increase in freights has since used the roads. I think he should be the last person in the world to criticize the rail-

ways, because he has been robbing them for many years.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member is out of order making statements like that about another member.

Mr. DAVIS—But the honourable member has been.

Mr. HEASLIP—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member for Port Pirie has said that I have been robbing the railways for years, and I do not like to be accused of robbing anybody. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. DAVIS—I will withdraw the word "robbing" and substitute "depriving."

Mr. HEASLIP—I still resent that.

Mr. DAVIS—I will not withdraw that word.

The CHAIRMAN—The member for Rocky River has taken objection to the remark.

Mr. DAVIS—I object to withdrawing it.

Mr. HEASLIP—I have never deprived the railways of any dues, and I take exception to being accused of having done so. I ask the honourable member to withdraw his remark.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member for Port Pirie withdrew the word "robbing" and substituted the word "depriving," and I see no objection to that.

Mr. HEASLIP—He has accused me of depriving the railways of their dues, and I object to it.

The CHAIRMAN—My ruling is that the objection is not sustained.

Mr. DAVIS—Instead of using the railways he has used his own vehicles.

Mr. Heaslip—What is wrong with that?

Mr. DAVIS—The member for Rocky River cannot criticize others for not using the railways.

Mr. Heaslip—I have never criticized.

Mr. DAVIS—The honourable member has complained about the service, and he cannot expect people to patronize the railways if members of this House do not do so. Furthermore, he has an advantage over the ordinary person who sends goods by rail because he gets his motor registration at a half rate.

Mr. Lawn—That is what the Government does for its own supporters.

Mr. DAVIS—I am not criticizing the Government but the people who abuse the privileges given to them.

Mr. Heaslip—Who abuses any privileges?

Mr. DAVIS—Anyone who uses for these purposes a vehicle on which only half the normal registration fees are paid is abusing a privilege.

Mr. Heaslip—That is not a privilege, but a right.

Mr. DAVIS—It is only a right because the Government has made it so. This privilege has been given to primary producers to enable them to cart their goods from their farms to rail heads, not to compete against the railways. The honourable member mentioned betting facilities in my district, and said that he could not see why we should have them when other districts have not. I agree with that, but I believe they should exist in other districts, not that they should not exist in mine. The honourable member was criticizing my district.

Mr. Heaslip—I was not, as you will see in *Hansard*.

Mr. DAVIS—The honourable member said, "I am not talking politics." I do not know why he is here if that is so. He also said:—

I do not agree that Port Pirie should have betting shops and Peterborough none. If it is right for Port Pirie to have betting shops it is right for Peterborough, Gladstone, or other towns to have them.

I enjoyed Mr. Shannon's remarks. Although he submitted some good material I could not agree with all of it. He referred to anti-Communists, but apparently that is a subject about which he knows nothing.

The member for Gawler mentioned country sewerage problems. It is now beyond some country towns to install sewerage schemes. It was said about 12 to 13 months ago that it would cost £1,000,000 to sewer the Port Pirie area, but since then costs have risen. In addition, there has been a new assessment, which will have the effect of increasing any sewerage charge. Port Pirie has been forced to declare certain parts of the city to be septic tank areas. By the time the Government decides to install a sewerage scheme all the areas will have been supplied with septic tanks. It was said that the cost of sewerage for each ratepayer at Port Pirie would be £17 10s. a year. The charge in the metropolitan area was to be only £7 10s. On present-day costs the Port Pirie charge would be about £20, and business people would have to pay much more. Consequently, it is doubtful whether the Port Pirie ratepayers would want a scheme.

Railway services on narrow gauge lines and the condition of the rolling stock that brings ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie were referred to. I agree with Mr. O'Halloran that the rolling stock is in bad condition. The damage is caused by the different methods of unloading. Years ago it was done with a hand shovel, which did little damage, but now

a grab is used, and that causes much damage. It is a matter which will have to be considered.

Mr. Heaslip—Were you asleep when the Premier replied to me on that matter yesterday?

Mr. DAVIS—I am not concerned with what the Premier told the honourable member.

Mr. Heaslip—He gave a reply in connection with derailments on that line.

Mr. DAVIS—For many years I have heard all about railway standardization. I was told that the Broken Hill-Port Pirie line would be the first to be dealt with. I went to Broken Hill about 10 years ago in connection with having a broad gauge line from that city to Port Augusta, but nothing has been done. The honourable member would not know anything about that. He criticizes members who have for years tried to improve conditions in their areas but I think I have been successful in my efforts.

Mr. Heaslip—That's what you think.

Mr. DAVIS—In any case I have had no special concessions, and I have not abused any concessions the district has received. Members have spoken about schools and hospitals. I shall refer to hospitals later, but in regard to schools I think the wrong type of building has been erected. The Education Department has a difficult position in relation to teachers. I was told that it is 100 teachers short and that it had to close 16 small country schools. I honestly believe that the Minister was sincere when he said he regretted that action, but he must realize that when he closes small schools he overburdens the larger ones. Further, it is time the Education Department considered building colleges in the country. I was delighted to learn that the construction of a private college had been commenced at Port Pirie and that apparently some people realized the necessity of building colleges outside the metropolitan area. It is wrong to expect young people from the country to travel to the metropolitan area to receive a college education; they should be able to attend a college near their home.

Mr. Shannon—Do you say a college education is of a higher standard than that of a high school?

Mr. DAVIS—Yes. These people are giving the Government a lead.

Mr. Heaslip—The Government does not provide colleges.

Mr. DAVIS—Then it is time they woke up to their responsibility. I appreciate what the Education Department is doing in providing high school facilities in Port Pirie. Because

of my efforts the Government has decided to build a new high school there and the information I received recently from the Minister pleased my constituents as well as me. I congratulate the Minister on his efforts for I am always prepared to express my appreciation of help from a Minister, although I have not many opportunities to do so in this House.

In reply to an interjection the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said the Menzies Government could adequately handle the financial situation, but I remind him that the Menzies Government has almost ruined Australia for the "horror Budget" is killing many businesses and has lowered the standard of living of many Australians. By its introduction the Menzies Government has imposed a huge penalty on most Australians. Mr. Heaslip said that during the regime of the Chifley Government it was unnecessary to increase interest rates because money was plentiful, but I claim that the Menzies Government by restricting bank credit has placed those workers trying to buy homes in an impossible position. Prior to the restriction of credit many workers who had saved a deposit were able to obtain the balance of the purchase price of a home from the banks, but that is impossible today. The restriction of credit has operated only in the interests of the man who has money to lend.

Mr. Shannon—Only one bank apart from the State Bank lends money on a home.

Mr. DAVIS—Go to those banks today and see how freely they will lend money.

Mr. Shannon—I do not know a trading bank that will do it.

Mr. DAVIS—It is all very well for members of the Government to tell us what the workers should do in order to build a home. The honourable member for Gouger said that if a young man were to save his money he would be able to build a home. I know that it took me 50 years to save enough to buy a home for myself because I would not get into the grips of the money lenders or banks. Everyone is not fortunate enough to be able to save that much money. It is no good members on the other side of the House trying to tell me that the young people of today are wasting their money and not building homes. I am wondering what is to become of the young people of this country. A man needs about £5,000 to get married today, build a home and furnish that home decently, and 90 per cent of young men could not possibly save that much money. I say that it is the duty of this Government to do everything possible to speed up the building

of homes for the community. There are many people in a desperate position with regard to housing, and if we are to leave them in that position we will find that many young people will not be able to marry at all.

Mr. Lawn—There are many in that position now.

Mr. DAVIS—Probably there are. I think every member of this House is desirous of seeing the young people of this country married and living happily. I have much pleasure in supporting the first line of the Estimates.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I think that if a member is going to make his speech around the remarks of another, he should keep awake to listen to it and then read the speech later in *Hansard* to make sure that he has heard it correctly. The last speaker seemed purposely to attribute certain remarks to the member for Rocky River so that he could knock them down more easily than the actual remarks. It seemed to be rather pointless.

I turn to the line on the Estimates which deals with the sum of £107,000 for lands, and I want to refer to two projects of land development, one on Kangaroo Island and the other in the Upper South-East. I have seen a good deal of land settlement in those areas, although I cannot claim to be conversant with the settlement of soldiers in the South-East, on Eyre Peninsula or on the irrigated land. This scheme at Kangaroo Island began about 1948, and was the last of the big areas to be started. I have watched it grow from nothing to the very large scheme that it is now, and I have a good deal of confidence that it is a successful one. I approve of the way the Land Development Executive went about its task, but on the other hand I have some criticism to make of its work. These settlers on Kangaroo Island are not finding things easy. It may be said that their blocks will come good later and will be productive, but one cannot get away from the fact that the cash position will be difficult for young soldier settlers newly placed on that land. That is the difficulty. It is not that they have not got good property or that their pastures will not carry a fair amount of stock when they are fully developed, but their immediate position after being put on the land is one of being rather short of cash. It has a very worrying effect upon the settler.

These men are on blocks averaging 1,200 acres, of which 800 acres are put down to pasture before the settler is allotted a block. That amount of really good, clean pasture on level ground is at least one man's full-time

occupation, but the blocks these men have are not level or clear of all growth. The men have a good deal to do on them in the way of improvements, and it is really more than one man's work. There is regrowth to be countered, and topdressing is difficult because the rather rough ground slows down the vehicle doing the topdressing and makes the job a good deal rougher than it would be on level ground. I am glad to say that those settlers for the most part are meeting their commitments to the Lands Department very well, and I have frequently heard the Minister confirm that fact. They have a good landlord, and they are doing their bit to honour their obligations, which, of course, is as it should be. On the other hand, it does not necessarily mean that their position is an easy one. They all have commitments to stock firms for the stock they have put on those blocks, and they also have to provide money for everyday living. I imagine that the tradesmen there are extending a substantial amount of credit to some of those settlers. The spirit over there is particularly good. I have no complaints about the settlers on Kangaroo Island or the way they are getting on, but I know they have a difficulty with regard to the ready cash available.

Mr. Heaslip—How much an acre will these blocks cost to the settlers?

Mr. BROOKMAN—There is no final cost yet to the settlers because their blocks have not been finally assessed. All they know is that they will be assessed at the end of the scheme and know their full commitments then. In the meantime they are being assessed on guesswork. We do not know whether they are paying too much or too little, or whether the assessment is about right. A typical block might at present be assessed at £330 a year for the land. With insurance, interest on improvements and other matters their commitments would be between £500 and £600. In addition, they need plant and have been financed for it by the Government. This would bring their annual commitments up another £200 to £400, so their full commitments to the Lands Department might be £750 to £1,000, but the Minister would be able to give more accurate information.

I believe their cash position could be improved if the establishment of pastures were under a different method. The condition of the pastures is all important in a land settlement project. The finances of the whole scheme are based on pastures achieving a certain standard and, in my opinion, at present those pastures are achieving that standard

too slowly. An unnecessarily long time is taken to attain a pasture that will carry enough stock to support the settler, and I think the main cause is that insufficient superphosphate is being used in the early stages. The superphosphate plan of development was evolved some years ago by highly qualified people. Many developments have occurred since in this direction, but the plan has not been altered. If it were brought up to date the pastures would come into production more quickly. I am not merely giving an amateur's opinion because there is a research station on Kangaroo Island which gives the same advice as I am giving. The Department of Agriculture's research station there is situated at Parndana. Meanwhile, the Lands Department is going ahead with its plan, which differs in essentials from the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. That sounds unusual, but I shall give specific instances.

Let us consider the Lands Department's method on a typical block in the hundred of Newland. The details I shall now give are from the *Government Gazette* of June 21, 1956. In 1954, 905 acres were logged; in 1955, 905 acres were burnt, swept and Majestic ploughed. In 1956, 905 acres were twin-disced, chain levelled and seeded to four pounds subterranean clover, quarter pound perennial ryegrass, and half ounce Yorkshire Fog grass with 1½ cwt. superphosphate (copper molybdenum) per acre.

The top dressing plan is, for 1957, 1 cwt. superphosphate per acre; for 1958, 2 cwt.; and for 1959, 1 cwt. The superphosphate applications in hundredweights in successive years are as follows:—1½, 1, 2, and 1—a total of 5½ cwt. The general recommendation of the Department of Agriculture for the Parndana areas is as follows:—at sowing 3 cwt. superphosphate (copper molybdenum), and a minimum of 4 lb. Mount Barker subclover, 2 lb. Yarloop and 4 oz. perennial ryegrass. The top dressing thereafter is 1½ cwt. a year. The Department of Agriculture's recommendations for superphosphate are 3 cwt., 1½ cwt., and 1½ cwt. thereafter. It is the policy to apply 5½ cwt. of superphosphate to blocks before they are ready for the settler to take over. If that 5½ cwt. must be adhered to the Department of Agriculture's recommendations would be 3 cwt., 1½ cwt. and 1 cwt., or 3 cwt. and 2½ cwt., with grazing in the second spring.

The important difference between these recommendations and the Department of Land's policy is the initial policy of at least 3 cwts. of superphosphate. Under these recommendations the 5½ cwt. is applied in two

or at the most three years. This saves one or two or often more years that are financially difficult for the settler. The effect of the heavier initial dressing is spectacular, and it alters the whole aspect of the pasture. Instead of a number of clover plants separated by bare spaces the ground is covered by the clover in the first spring. It seeds down over the whole areas, and in the second year the new seedlings germinate everywhere and make use of all the superphosphate in that year's topdressing. Where there are blank spaces left in the first year, superphosphate falling on those areas in the second year is probably not used by the second-year clover. Clover plants will spread readily in the first year's soft seedbed, but cannot make the same distances in the second year when the ground has consolidated. Once a good cover of clover is achieved, and this should be in the first year, the pasture is virtually made and only bad management can undo the work.

The problem of regrowth is better answered by a strong stand of clover. Firstly, the regrowth is discouraged by the strong growth of clover; secondly, the land can be stocked very much sooner when there is plenty of clover to carry it. The stock will appreciably bite down the young shoots. When an adequate number of stock cannot be introduced to the pasture for a much longer period the shoots get too large to be eaten back. I can produce evidence by research agronomists working at Meadows and Parawa, south of Yankalilla, to show that the need for heavy initial superphosphate dressings is widespread in the good rainfall areas. I do not think, however, that it should be necessary to go past the findings of the Government research station at Parndana. It has been suggested to me that heavy initial dressings are all right, but that the practical difficulties of early fencing and stocking the blocks are too great. My answer is that the difference in the success of the pasture is so marked that a determined effort should be made to overcome these problems. I am not sure how difficult these problems are to overcome, but I feel they could be overcome and I should like to see an attempt made. Regrowth is not the all-important problem, and it should not be the predominating problem on Kangaroo Island. It is one aspect of the difficulties and would be countered to a large extent by the initial heavier dressings. With quicker pastures, the blocks will produce more quickly, and the settlers will sooner get past the extremely vulnerable financial condition of the early years. I have given much

thought to this matter and hope something can be done to alter the position. I do not want to give the impression that the scheme is unsound. As a whole, I think it is a particularly good one. We have been very fortunate in the Minister and his officers who have carried out this work. They have pursued a steady policy with great success. One feels a little reckless to criticize them. However, I believe there is room for improvement.

An amount of £50,000 has been provided in this year's Estimates for developing land in certain hundreds in the South-East, including the hundred of Jeffries in the upper South-East. It comprises about 40,000 acres situated 15 miles east of Meningie and consists of old miscellaneous leases which have been gathered in by the department and are ready to be developed for soldier settlement. However, there is a snag, as the area has not been acceptable to the Commonwealth for soldier settlement. We cannot proceed very far unless we have the financial backing of the Commonwealth. The development of the upper South-East is a monument to private enterprise. It includes a portion of the land in what was known as the 90-Mile Desert. In the hundred of Jeffries the rainfall is slightly higher than that in the area north-east of the railway line toward Pinnaroo and is possibly more than 18in. The soil is by no means good and it is mostly scrub country. Before the war it was occasionally burnt and when the green shoots appeared stock were placed on it. It carried a small number to the square mile. There were isolated instances of people going there and doing well, included among them being the Minister of Works, Sir Malcolm McIntosh. He took up the land in 1938. His son, by his enterprise and hard work has made a very fine farm. This land would be very close to that of the Lands Department. During the early 1940's the Commonwealth Scientific Industrial Research Organization carried out investigations on trace elements and found that copper and zinc were essential for satisfactory pasture growth and that cobalt was frequently necessary for the stock. Armed with that knowledge and with the postwar impetus for land development, many private settlers went to the area and developed it successfully, not being deterred by past history. There were all kinds of stories about the land being subject to erosion, there not being enough water for stock and the soil being too poor, but the risks were taken and these people succeeded.

Mr. Davis—And made a good job of it.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Yes. It is light carrying capacity country and will only carry about 1½ sheep to the acre. However, the sheep are always in good condition and stock diseases are at a minimum there. It is particularly healthy soil for stock and as long as it is not overstocked the country will not suffer from erosion. In the early days the State and Federal Governments missed an opportunity of securing large areas of land there for soldier settlement. They have watched private people settle on the land and succeed. Our Lands Department has 40,000 acres for settlement. There are 15 potential farms, but we have had no Federal approval. The Commonwealth has rejected the proposition every time it has been submitted. The proposal was referred to the Land Settlement Committee years ago and, after investigation, that committee approved of it. The Land Board and the Lands Development Executive also agreed that it is a worthwhile proposition. There are persons who doubt the possibilities of the area, but each year, as more private settlers succeed in that area, the number of doubters decreases. Some people are concerned with what would happen if we had a drought similar to that of 1914, but what would happen there would happen everywhere else in this State. We have modern machinery nowadays and are in a better position to withstand climatic disasters. The mallee country north and north-east of this area got a bad name because of the cereals farmers had to grow there in the 1930's under trying conditions. There has been no suggestion that this is cereal growing country, although possibly cereals could be grown there after a decade of good pastures.

Other persons are concerned about the lack of water in the area, but I am familiar with a property adjoining this land and the owners

have never experienced a shortage of water. The water is quite hard, but it is good for stock and there is an abundance of it. Water is available at 15 to 30ft. and although it is never deep in the wells, the wells can be pumped dry and overnight replenish themselves.

Mr. Hutchens—How many wells would be needed on a property?

Mr. BROOKMAN—Probably one or two every 1,000 acres would be sufficient. One of the successful settlers, who has been there for more than eight years, has never had a well go dry. A wide variety of pasture seeds could be grown there, including subterranean clover, lucerne, evening primrose, phalaris and perennial veldt grass. In the flush of spring a heavy growth of mixed pasture could be obtained. Last spring I went with the Minister of Lands to the area and inspected it. Of the 40,000 acres, the Government has developed between 5,000 and 6,000 acres. The pasture is really first-class and I do not doubt that similar pastures could be grown on the entire area. I can see no possible pitfalls in developing that area. I suggest that the Minister of Lands again asks the Federal authorities to examine the proposition. The Federal Minister examined the area on one occasion, but no answer was given, although I do not know why. The Federal Government has a representative in South Australia and he is one of the few persons who has been against developing this land. I do not hold that against him personally, because he is a sound man, but each year the number of persons opposed to this development decreases. I think it is only a matter of time before the area is accepted and I hope it is soon.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 30, at 2 p.m.