

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 5, 1956.

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

QUESTIONS.**MURRAY RIVER FLOOD.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Following on the Premier's visit yesterday to the flooded areas on the River Murray, particularly the Renmark area, has he any information to give the House on the calamity and the steps to be taken to minimize its effect? Are the arrangements for the immediate relief of personal hardship functioning satisfactorily?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As to the second question, Sir Kingsley Paine was appointed about a fortnight ago with full authority to act. Officers of a State Government department have been in the district, and as far as I know, all possible steps are being taken to meet the needs of urgent cases very promptly. In fact, yesterday no case was brought to me for immediate consideration and everyone expressed much satisfaction at the assistance being rendered by every class in South Australia to alleviate the effects of this great calamity. Two things must impress a visitor to the district: firstly, the amount of work being done by the people of the district themselves to prevent or alleviate damage to their properties and to overcome difficulties as much as possible. That applies to all sections of the community; women as well as men have fought the flood. Secondly, no-one can yet assess the damage because of the tremendous seepage problem and the ultimate result of seepage on properties is something of which we have had no previous experience. The best method of overcoming seepage is a question to which no-one seems to have a satisfactory answer. Personally, I believe the damage will be much greater and much more lasting than is at present apparent and that in the rehabilitation of these areas we are confronted with a major problem.

Mr. JENKINS—Can the Minister of Lands inform me whether there is any justification for the rumour that men and machinery used at Jervois for flood protection may be withdrawn this week?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have not had any information nor have I given any instructions that men and machines will be withdrawn from Jervois this week, but the engineer in charge, Mr. Poole, has suggested that there is

no need for any great influx of volunteers. The men and machinery are there to handle the position as it is at present.

AGISTMENT OF DAIRY HERDS.

Mr. HARDING—Can accommodation be provided on the Kybybolite experimental farm and the Struan farm for the agistment of dairy herds from flooded areas, and, if so, can accommodation also be found for the dairymen and families concerned?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not in a position to give a complete answer. At present the officer in charge of the station is absent in Adelaide for the Show and I have not yet been able to get in touch with him. I believe that we will be able to give assistance as the honourable member desires. Generally speaking, the agistment position is very good and the dairy farmers at the moment are not keen to go as far afield as the area mentioned because they are able to obtain accommodation nearer at hand. No doubt later they will want to seek more distant fields and by that time I am hopeful that the department will be able to assist in the way the honourable member suggests.

MURRAY AREA ELECTRICITY CHARGES.

Mr. BYWATERS—Over the last year or two dairymen in the reclaimed swamp areas have had electricity installed and the Electricity Trust has adopted the policy of having an estimate made of the quantity of electricity to be used, basing the surcharges on that estimate. Failing their using that quantity their surcharges are increased, but if they use more they are reduced. Many people have left the areas and most of their milking plants and so on are not in operation, and for the next few months the use of electrical appliances, motors, etc., will be greatly reduced. Will the Treasurer take up this matter with the trust with a view to having the policy temporarily suspended?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Minister of Lands has already discussed this question with the chairman of the Electricity Trust and the reply is that each case will be dealt with on its merits.

EYRE HIGHWAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Lands representing the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of some months ago regarding the Eyre Highway?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The following report has been received from the Commissioner of Highways:—

The following grants have been approved for the maintenance of Eyre Highway during 1956-57.—District council of Kimba, £2,000; district council of LeHunte £11,000; district council of Murat Bay, £6,200, and district council of Streaky Bay, £5,000.

GARDEN SUBURB COMMISSIONER.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of yesterday regarding the appointment of a Garden Suburb Commissioner?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following reply from the Minister of Local Government:—

Applications have not yet been called for the position of Garden Suburb Commissioner, following representations made by a deputation which waited upon the Minister of Local Government urging that steps be taken to amalgamate the Garden Suburb with the Mitcham Corporation. It is understood that a committee representing the Garden Suburb and the Mitcham Corporation is now conferring on the matter. In the meantime, the services of Mr. T. C. Stephens are being retained in the position.

INDUSTRIES FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. DUNNAGE—A report that appeared in the *Advertiser* last week stated that Mr. Bolte, the Victorian Premier, had been overseas looking for investments in his State. It also stated that overseas firms would invest £12,000,000 in Victoria and employ 5,000 people, and that scores of overseas firms were interested in investing in Victoria. Can the Premier say whether South Australia is encouraging overseas firms to start here and, if not, will it be possible for Sir Lyell McEwin, when abroad, to make investigations in America and England?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—America is probably not included in Sir Lyell's itinerary. He will go abroad to study two aspects in connection with the administration of this State, but when in London he will be available to meet any industry desiring to come here. Numerous inquiries from overseas firms have been and are being received, and statistics prove that a fair percentage are coming to South Australia; in fact, our industrial growth has probably been higher than even that of the industrialized States of Victoria and New South Wales. Every possible step is being taken to see whether we can get suitable industries to come here.

B.H.P. COMPANY'S EXPANSION PROGRAMME.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In view of the report of the chairman of directors of the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Limited that company installations now planned costing £100,000,000 include attention to the development of low-grade hematite quartzite deposits in Australia, will the Premier ascertain (1) which deposits of ore are referred to and whether they are in South Australia; (2) whether the pilot plant for beneficiation of these ores will be established at Whyalla; and (3) does the company intend to install any further plant, such as blast furnaces or steel making equipment, at Whyalla in its £100,000,000 programme?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The types of ore that the chairman referred to are undoubtedly the taconite ores which occur in the Middle-back Range adjacent to Iron Monarch. The Mines Department has located enormous deposits of those ores running into thousands of millions of tons, and I have no doubt that the investigations mentioned were investigations into the use of those ores, which are in some instances now being used in America. Investigations are being carried out by the Mines Department's plant in the metropolitan area, and I believe very good results are being obtained.

HENLEY BEACH-GRANGE RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Since diesel engines have been substituted for steam trains on the Henley Beach-Grange line I have received a number of requests to make representations for more frequent running of trains to serve the people in the Seaton area. It seems that the residents have no complaints about the trains except that there is not enough room to carry all the passengers. Will the Minister of Education take up with the Minister of Railways the possibility of having a complete check made to see what extra trains are necessary, and the possibility of establishing an extra loop in order that there might be more frequent running of trains?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT HOUSES.

Mr. JENNINGS—Last week I asked a question relating to pending evictions of railway employees from railway-owned homes, and the Premier promised to investigate the matter. I asked him whether he would personally intervene in connection with the evictions. As I

believe he has now obtained a report, will he give the House the benefit of that report, and is he prepared to intervene?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have a full report from the Railways Commissioner that I am prepared to make available to the honourable member for his perusal. It states that the Railways Department has provided a number of cottages for emergency purposes for officers coming from the country in the course of promotion but who will be going back to the country, and who will be in the metropolitan area for only a short time, or to help those who find themselves in a difficult position when evicted from other houses. They are purely emergency homes, and the whole scheme would break down unless the occupation is for only a limited period. As the honourable member will see, if these houses are to be provided as emergency accommodation for railway staff, they are only effective as long as the turnover is fairly rapid.

NORTHERN ELECTRICITY CHARGES.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yesterday I asked why Stirling North received electricity at metropolitan rates, whereas Melrose did not. In his reply the Minister of Lands said:—

In July 1954, when the Port Augusta power station was first commenced, the trust adjusted tariffs for many northern areas on the basis of distance from the power station.

Can the Premier say whether it is the trust's policy to base all future tariff rates on the distance of a town from a power station—for example, Wilmington, which is without electricity, and Quorn, which is only 20 miles from the Port Augusta power station?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I should think not. Obviously the cost of installation and the number of persons who would be using electricity would have to be taken into account, quite apart from the mere question of distance. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD RELIEF.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning financial assistance to secondary industries which have suffered damage as a result of the flood?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Unless the claim concerned is for immediate personal hardship this fund, at present, is not meeting such claims. Any scheme to meet any claim for rehabilitation or reconstruction in any degree is yet to be evolved.

Mr. KING—Will the Treasurer make a statement outlining the principles to be followed by the Government and Sir Kingsley Paine in the allocation of flood relief funds, firstly, for the relief of distress and, secondly, on the question of rehabilitation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The position with regard to this matter will, to a certain extent, be covered by Commonwealth Government requirements. I hope that the Commonwealth Government will make a substantial sum available to assist in this matter. The position is not yet clear as to how it will allow its money to be used for rehabilitation, assuming that some of it will be available for that purpose. With regard to hardship, the difficulty is not so great because the Commonwealth Government is prepared to accept the recommendation of Sir Kingsley Paine in connection with those payments, and it has already indicated that it will subsidize the State Government's expenditure for the alleviation of hardship on a fifty-fifty basis. Rehabilitation will depend to a large extent on the total amount of damage done and the funds available for the purpose. Sir Kingsley Paine is at present preparing application forms to apply to personal hardship cases and they will be available as soon as possible. He will give prompt and sympathetic consideration to all cases.

Mr. STOTT—Unfortunately some people along the River Murray have had to vacate their homes because of the flood. I have received inquiries about their getting homes in Adelaide. Would the Treasurer take up with Sir Kingsley Paine the matter of the Housing Trust assisting by providing homes on a rental basis for some of these people?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have discussed the matter with Sir Kingsley Paine and the chairman of the Housing Trust. It was raised by Mr. King, the member for Chaffey, and it is now being further investigated by the Trust.

ALLIGATOR GORGE ROAD.

Mr. RICHES—A fortnight ago, at the invitation of the G.O.C. Central Command, I visited Alligator Gorge to ascertain whether proposed military operations in that area would adversely affect the use of the gorge by tourists or have an adverse effect upon the flora and fauna there. The military operations will be quite outside the gorge and, I think, not interfere to any appreciable extent. However, I was amazed at the deterioration in

the road there. I consider it to be in a dangerous state. People from various parts of the State come north in the spring to view the countryside when it is at its best and unless the road is improved the gorge should be temporarily closed to obviate the possibility of a tragedy. In view of the public interest in this tourist reserve will the Premier take up with the Tourist Bureau and the Highways Department the question of having that road graded, which is all that is necessary.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

SCHOOL MILK SUPPLIES.

Mr. COUMBE—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning the supply of milk to school children?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received a very long report from the Milk Supply Officer of the Education Department which I will endeavour to summarize. On behalf of the Commonwealth Government, the Education Department has undertaken the distribution of milk to children attending approved private schools, along with departmental primary schools, kindergartens, institutions, and aboriginal mission station schools. All private schools which have applied for inclusion have been approved to participate. No specially constructed storage facilities are provided at schools under the scheme. Jurisdiction over the shelter and handling of milk, after delivery by the vendor, is left to the discretion and good sense of the headmaster or teacher in charge of the schools.

What is particularly important in view of the honourable member's statement yesterday is that out of more than 400 schools participating only half a dozen complaints have been received during the last two years, and all of those complaints have been investigated and corrected. Any serious complaints are referred to the Central Board of Health for any necessary action. From the reports I have received it is obvious that a high degree of co-operation exists between the heads of schools and the milk vendors, and this has resulted in the smooth and successful operation of the schools milk scheme in this State. The Education Department has no jurisdiction over private schools, but the supply of milk could be withdrawn from any school which refuses to co-operate in handling and distributing milk in a satisfactory manner. I am pleased to state that it has not been necessary to withdraw the approval from any school.

MILLCENT-BEACHPORT RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding the closing of the Millicent-Beachport railway line?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I can tell the honourable member that the Government will shortly introduce a Bill on this matter for Parliament's consideration.

POTATO SUPPLIES.

Mr. TAPPING—It was reported in the press recently that the Western Australian Government plans to bring down legislation in the near future to regulate potato exports from that State. In view of the fact that each year we import from Western Australia about 2,000 tons of Delaware potatoes and as the legislation if enacted would have a big effect on our supplies, will the Minister of Agriculture say whether he has heard anything of the matter and, if not, will he make the necessary inquiries and tell the House the position as soon as possible?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have not seen the report. I think that under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution there would be a problem for the Western Australian Government in bringing down such legislation. The whole problem in this State has been the difficulty of preventing the movement of potatoes from South Australia to the more lucrative markets in the eastern States, and I would think the same position would apply to Western Australia. I will make inquiries about the report and let the honourable member know the position as soon as possible.

NUMBER PLATES ON VEHICLES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked the Minister of Lands on August 23 regarding number plates on vehicles?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The matter was referred to the Commissioner of Police who in turn is seeking advice from the Crown Solicitor. As soon as it is available I will see that the honourable member gets a copy of it.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Premier say when the Auditor-General's Report will be available for consideration by members?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I hope to bring down the Estimates for the consideration of members on September 18, on returning after the Show Week adjournment. I cannot say,

however, when the Auditor-General's Report will be available. I believe it is in the hands of the printer, but these documents are large documents and extreme care must be taken in their printing, therefore it may be a few days after that before the report is available for members' perusal. It will, however, probably be available, at the latest, before the consideration of the Estimates in detail.

EYRE PENINSULA MAIL DELIVERIES.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to my recent question concerning the delay in mails on Eyre Peninsula during the wet season?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Through my colleague, I have received the following report from the Railways Commissioner:—

Mr. Bockelberg evidently refers to the disruption of the train services between Cummins and Minnipa in June and July, following abnormally heavy rains on Eyre Peninsula which caused flooding of both rail tracks and roads. The period during which operations were restricted extended from June 27, 1956, to July 20, 1956. The "up" Minnipa railcar was cancelled on June 27 and 29 and on July 5, and the "down" car on June 28 and 29 and on July 11. The closest daily liaison was maintained throughout with the postmaster, Port Lincoln, who was fully acquainted with our day-to-day services during this period, and as far as can be ascertained, the maximum advantage was taken by the Postmaster-General's Department in despatch of all mail matter. If, however, when the service was operating, any mail matter was not cleared, this of course, could not be attributable to this department. On the occasions when we were unable to maintain railway services Eyre Peninsula roads were also impassable, and we were unable to arrange delivery by road transport of perishable commodities. I should mention that the provision of alternative mail services (if possible), under the circumstances experienced, was a matter for the postal authorities.

MURRAY MOUTH DISCHARGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yesterday, in reply to my question, the Minister of Lands gave me an interesting answer on the discharge of flood waters at the Murray Mouth, stating that 125,000 cubic feet a second was now passing through the mouth by way of the Mundoo barrage. What is the total capacity of the Mount Bold reservoir and how long would it take to fill it from the output at the Mundoo barrage?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The honourable member indicated that he would ask this question and I have the following interesting

information:—The river has reached its peak at Waikerie now where the flow is 140,000 cusecs. This is equal to 875,000 gallons a second or 75,600,000,000 gallons a day. The capacity of Mount Bold is 6,662,000 gallons and at its present flow the Murray would fill this reservoir in two hours seven minutes.

INDUSTRIES FOR ELIZABETH.

Mr. DUNNAGE—When the new town of Elizabeth was established some time ago the Premier expressed the hope that many industries would go into that area and suggested that some French industries might go there. General Motors Holdens and one or two other industries are to establish plants there. Can the Premier now say whether any other Australian industries are likely to go to Elizabeth?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will get a list of the land purchased at Elizabeth by industries and let the honourable member have it in due course.

MARALINGA ATOMIC TESTS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Premier a reply to my question of yesterday concerning the effects of the tests to be held at Maralinga?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have a report from the Minister which is available for the honourable member, but it is too long to read.

WALKERVILLE BUS ROUTE.

Mr. COUMBE—Is the Minister representing the Minister of Roads aware that recently the Walkerville tramlines through North Adelaide were removed as part of the bus conversion scheme and that the reinstated portion has not yet been sealed? The recent bad weather has held up the completion of this work, but will the Minister see whether it can be completed as soon as possible? If this cannot be done could temporary repairs be effected to the section adjacent to the City Bridge in King William Road, which is now becoming a danger to traffic passing through the city?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague.

LAMB EXPORTS.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Noarlunga Meat Works has expanded its operations to the export of lambs? If so, has he any figures on the exports of that company, and can he say how they will affect the output of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will get that information if I can. At present I have none that would be useful, therefore I cannot express an opinion on the latter part of the question.

LONG FLAT SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS—Recently I read a press report that the Long Flat school was to be closed and the children transported to Murray Bridge. Has the Minister of Education a report on the closing of that school and on any other schools in the lower Murray district affected by the floods?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have a lengthy report on all the schools affected by the floods in the lower and upper river districts, but Long Flat school was not closed because of the flood. It is one of 16 small schools to which I referred in this House last week and which it was necessary for me to close because of the shortage of teachers. The children are being transported to Murray Bridge.

STATE BANK REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table of the House the report and balance sheet of the State Bank of South Australia for the year ended June 30, 1956.

Ordered to be printed.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1920-1955. Read a first time.

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

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

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.

(Continued from August 29. Page 437.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I understand that the honourable member seeks an approach by the States for representation on the committee set up in Canberra to consider the Federal Constitution, which committee, I believe, is functioning in a most haphazard manner.

Mr. O'Halloran—Is it functioning at all?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I very much doubt whether it is, but will be charitable and say it is functioning in a haphazard manner. If the motion were agreed to, in addition to the fairly large committee already established as between the Government and the Opposition there would be 12 more members, to be drawn from the six States. I think the honourable member's proposal is impracticable unless the Commonwealth Government is prepared to consider a very much more important set-up. I regard the proposals before the committee as merely an opportunity for the Government to discuss with the Opposition informally whether they can come to some compromise and arrive at a common ground whereby they can make up a case to collar and take over from the State Parliaments some of the powers they now exercise. I do not believe the Constitution is being seriously reviewed by the Commonwealth with the idea of determining which powers should logically be in the hands of the Commonwealth central Parliament and which should logically be exercised as a local function. Such questions as the deadlock which may take place in the Senate in the event of each side having 30 members are being considered rather than a complete review of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. O'Halloran—Would you agree that an amendment of the Constitution is desirable?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I believe that a large number of amendments are desirable, but would possibly disagree with the Leader as to their nature. If he and I were delegated to represent the State at such a conference we would probably put forward entirely opposite views.

Mr. O'Halloran—I would have such a good case that you would be bound to agree with me.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Let me deal with one or two of the matters which I think urgently require attention. The most crying necessity is a proper financial balance between the powers of the Commonwealth and those of the States so that both authorities may be able to carry out their functions effectively and have available to them a reasonable percentage of the revenues. I believe that is a question we should consider gravely, because, unless we do, slowly but surely the authority of the States will be strangled. The effectiveness of State organizations is being destroyed, and as a result the good government of the country generally is going into the discard. I contend that each authority should have certain rights in the taxing fields available to the

Governments. For instance, in America the central Government has the power of secondary taxation, such as sales tax and so on, but the States also have that power. In Australia the power over the sales tax and other indirect taxes is handed over to the Commonwealth and the States have no power of indirect taxation at all. In America both the States and the central authority have income taxation powers. Our States had those powers, but we saw them removed. Now the revenues available to us represent a very small group, such as fees or charges on public utilities. Our taxation powers are limited to land tax, succession duty, and one or two of the more minor revenue producing avenues. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there is a strong case for a review of the Constitution, and I know that every other State Government agrees with me that the effectiveness of State instrumentalities is being destroyed and they are coming more and more under the control of the central Government, and this is completely foreign to all ideas of Federation as we understood it when the States merged into the Commonwealth some 56 years ago.

Our arbitration laws should be examined, for they are becoming very complex, and as a result many industrial disputes have been fermented. Recently I listened to a broadcast of a Canberra debate and one speaker said that one application by employees had been before the Federal Court for not less than six years. I do not know whether that is correct, but our Federal arbitration system is unduly cumbersome, and instead of getting quick decisions small disputes are frequently delayed until they become big disputes. Often disputes that seem of small consequence grow into interstate disputes that tie up the industry and commerce of Australia. I believe our State industrial laws have something to offer to the Federal system. Under our wages board system representatives of employers and employees, under an independent chairman, discuss the issue informally instead of with all the formal paraphernalia that applies in the Federal sphere. Quick decisions are usually made, and that has much to commend it. As a result, South Australia has had infinitely fewer serious industrial disputes than occur under the much more elaborate machinery of the Federal arbitration system. I could give several other instances of why a review of the Australian Constitution is desirable. It was drawn up under quite different circumstances from those existing today.

Mr. O'Halloran—Section 92 should be examined.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There are numerous sections that, in the light of court interpretations, should be examined, for the court's interpretations of some sections would have surprised the originators of the Constitution. I am not saying that the Courts have decided wrongly.

Mr. O'Halloran—In one important case the court reversed its original decision.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I could quote cases where the court gave a decision, reversed it, and then almost swung back to its original opinion. I agree with the Leader that there is good reason for a review of the Constitution, but I fear that I shall now get somewhat into disgrace because I do not agree with him much further. The committee that has been appointed by the Federal Government will not consider questions that we are anxious to have considered, but questions of political expediency such as arise out of the deadlock in the Senate and which will arise in the future as a result of the system of voting that the Commonwealth Parliament has adopted for the election of senators. When proportional representation was adopted for the election of senators I examined what was likely to happen, and I found it was extremely unlikely that the Government of the day would have a clear majority in the Senate. The Commonwealth committee will merely attempt to get over the problem of a deadlocked Senate, but I think the attempt will be a dismal failure. I cannot imagine that the committee will bring down a recommendation acceptable to both sides of the House of Representatives. Moreover, I doubt very much indeed whether the authorities in Canberra would view the matter fundamentally from the same angle as we view it. Quite recently I have heard both sides of this topic, and Canberra's view of an alteration of the Constitution does not go any further than that the powers of the central Parliament should be enlarged.

Mr. Lawn—A good idea.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member's Leader said the same thing last night, but I differ. I believe we want an adjustment of powers but not an enlargement, because I think Federal powers are quite ample for their legitimate purposes. I would go so far as to say that some are too ample and that they go into fields that local organizations can deal with better from the viewpoint of the Australian people generally.

Mr. Riches—What would you say about road transport?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Today I gave notice of a Bill that will be debated in this House after the show week adjournment, an important measure that deals with road transport. I must not anticipate a debate on it but I am quite sure that whereas I disagree with the Opposition on this motion, I will be able to expect the support of the Opposition on this Bill.

Mr. Riches—Do you think the States have sufficient power in road transport matters?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think the Bill I have mentioned will demonstrate that; I do not think road transport is one of the problems. I would not be in favour of breaking down the present provision of interstate free trade. It is true that occasionally it might be a little inconvenient for us. For instance, if we have potatoes in this State but other States have not, it might be a little inconvenient that freedom of trade between the States is absolutely assured. Taking it by and large over the whole range of our economy, however, it is very much to the interest of this State that we should have the right to sell unrestrictedly on the markets of the Commonwealth, and I would not in any circumstances be a party to breaking down section 92 in any way, providing for the absolute freedom of trade between the States, because the welfare of this State will depend more and more on having the right to sell our commodities freely in other States. The principle is right. One cannot envisage a federation that does not have that as an inherent principle. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that a serious review of the Constitution is necessary and I also agree with the type of machinery that he is proposing as suitable, but I would not agree to become involved in a committee that I have every reason to believe is not considering that principle, but is merely considering a much more minor political problem that has arisen in Canberra.

Mr. O'Halloran—But the infusion of new blood on the committee could make a difference.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Assuming that this were agreed to, and we went to Canberra, I am sure that before we started to get to the vital principles we would come to a complete deadlock because we would find that a reallocation of powers would be one way traffic only. I am not prepared to go into a conference knowing before that the traffic will be one

way only. It would not be give and take—we would be purely on the giving end. Under those circumstances I do not propose to support the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I am sure that all members are appreciative of the Premier's support for this motion and look forward to his vote in favour, because he made out such an excellent case for it. I think what the motion asks is indeed very reasonable. We have a Commonwealth committee investigating the Constitution and we know that by enlarging the committee and having included on it representatives of the different political parties in each State some of the serious reviews that should be made in the near future will be brought before the notice of the committee. As it is now, they could be, although I do not agree with the Premier's interpretation of what this committee was set up to do. I am sure he was only imagining that because he could not have had any inside information.

It could be that the committee is considering such things as Senate deadlocks and expedient means by which political matters in Canberra can be facilitated. Even if that is so, however, could it not be that the operations of the committee could be completely changed by virtue of having representatives of the States added to it? I think we all agree that as it is the States that enjoy sovereign powers, they must be primarily responsible for any transfer of powers one way or the other. The Premier said it is a haphazard committee functioning in a haphazard way, and perhaps that is true. What we should be seeking to do is to ensure that it does not continue to function in a haphazard way but in a way that might make proper recommendations for the urgent changes that are needed in the Federal Constitution.

I believe that the proper constitution for Australia would be a single chamber national Parliament with sovereign powers, delegated powers to regional authorities, and not the States as we know them now, because surely everyone must agree that the States are not scientifically drawn up but are just lines on the map. If we had regional authorities drawing powers from the sovereign Parliament we could have those regions arranged in a way in which there would be general community interest of the people in them. Then all we would need for the proper functioning of that Constitutional set-up would be a written guarantee that an election had to be held every three years and that every citizen was to have a vote of equal value.

The rest would look after itself. We would have a sovereign Parliament instead of a completely hotch-potch mixture of powers that are in dispute. I think most members will agree that one of the main objectives of Commonwealth legislation in recent years has been to try, by some subterfuge, to get around the provisions of the Constitution. It is not in the best interests of the people to have to resort to those practices.

I do not agree with the Premier's view that section 92 is necessary. I admit that there must be free trade throughout Australia, but under a system with sovereign powers proposed in the Commonwealth Parliament that would automatically follow. Because of recent interpretations of section 92, in many important respects neither the Commonwealth nor the State Parliaments can do anything. Because road transport is an interstate matter the Parliaments cannot take requisite action for its control. Section 92 has been used as the answer to all Commonwealth legislation in recent years. It was raised in the nationalization of banking case and in the Communist Party dissolution case. The present method of interpreting section 92 can almost completely frustrate many of the powers vested in the Commonwealth by other sections of the Constitution. The position is most unsatisfactory. We are getting to the stage where no Parliament can legislate in the interests of the people.

I believe that an infusion of representatives of Opposition and Government parties from all States will result in a more effective committee which can proceed to a proper review of our outmoded and outdated Federal Constitution. As it is now the committee might only examine it from the Commonwealth viewpoint and confine its activities to unimportant matters of an expedient nature. The Opposition expected full support for this motion from both sides, but I am at a loss to know whether we will receive the support of Government members because although the Premier clearly supported the motion in his general remarks, at the conclusion of his comments, probably out of habit, he indicated he would not support it. However, I make it clear that I support it.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—Whilst agreeing in the main with the Premier's remarks, I consider there are one or two points requiring further examination. There are two major channels of thought in the field of Parliamentary government—the Liberal-Country Party and the Australian Labor Party.

There is a fundamental difference in their outlooks. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) reiterated what has been said for many years by his Party—that it favours one Parliament for the Commonwealth. He did mention delegating some powers to some other groups, but he was not specific. I am totally opposed to a system of unification, with one Parliament for the Commonwealth. I have had 50 years' experience of central government, including almost 15 years when there has been a stranglehold on the purse-strings of all State Governments, and I believe it is high time responsible government was returned to the States so that they can keep government closer to the people. The further a Parliament is away from the people who will complain, the less likely it is to hear their squeals. I have no doubt that if government were centralized in Canberra the people in Broome would experience difficulty in being heard, as would the people on Cape York who have been agitating for a separate State. I believe unification would be a retrograde step. I can see no good in it, only harm to the people who even now are sufficiently far removed from their own State Parliaments. The difficulty that we experience here in holding the balance evenly between the less densely settled areas and the metropolitan area is frequently the cause of heated debate in this Chamber and complaints that one section is getting a bigger voice than another because it is nearer. That would be multiplied if we adopted unification, and it is a fundamental difference which would not be resolved by any sort of conference. The Labor Party must stand by its avowed policy, but we on this side of the political fence do not wish to see Canberra usurp the whole field.

The Premier and the member for Enfield think that the Commonwealth Committee of Inquiry might deal with the problem that has arisen as a result of the Labor Party's peculiar idea with regard to the election of senators. I point out to the House that we had no referendum to change the method of election of senators from the old system to the proportional system, or what I would prefer to call the contortional system. That was done by the Federal Parliament altering its electoral law. If it wishes to change that again no State Parliament has any voice in the method of electing senators or representatives to Parliament. The Commonwealth can change its electoral law without any conference or referendum or consultation with the States. That is a matter within the Commonwealth's own

sphere. If this supposedly Constitutional committee set up to inquire into the problems of Constitution is to confine itself to the deadlock possibilities arising from the present method of electing the Senate, it is wasting its time and it is not a Constitutional inquiry at all, but an inquiry that has no relation to anything other than what the Commonwealth Government is now empowered to do.

The Treasurer raised the point of finance. It appears to me that the Treasurer's fear that the States will be gradually squeezed for money is well founded. South Australia is styled as a mendicant State, and I suppose we will have to go to the Commonwealth Grants Commission for financial relief every year. That can, and probably will, grow as the years go by, and it is possible that some day our policy will be determined by the Federal authority saying that it will give us the money if we do so and so. The next step could well be its saying, "If you are a good boy you can have it, but if you are a bad boy you cannot." My friends opposite will probably agree that that is a wise power for the Commonwealth to have but I find that a very wicked power for the Commonwealth to have retained following the agreement entered into because of the conditions which prevailed during the war. It may have been a reasonable power to have while we were in dire straits for manpower, but to continue to hold that power is entirely wrong.

South Australia is now in the happy position where we could give our people a much better service for less cost in the way of personal tax if the income taxation field were returned to us. The reason we have not that field is that the Commonwealth wants to spend most of the money, and does in fact do so. It passes money back to the States which complain bitterly that they are not getting a fair deal in the redistribution of the tax collected by the Commonwealth authority. That applies whichever Party forms the Government in the various States and whichever Party is in power in the Commonwealth Parliament. That appears to me to be a fundamental problem and one which a conference of both Parties could well consider, and if the Commonwealth Committee is abortive because it does not deal with these fundamental things, my approach would be for the States to ignore the Commonwealth Government.

The Leader of the Opposition is now suggesting that we knock on the conference door

and ask to be allowed in. We could have been invited to that conference, but when it was suggested that the States should be represented on this Committee of Inquiry they were ignored. My approach to this problem is entirely different from that of the Leader of the Opposition. If the States have a legitimate grievance, and I believe they have with regard to the Parliamentary methods of governing Australia, the States themselves should take the lead in examining how we could re-arrange the Federal Constitution. The States through their own representatives in the Federal House, should see to it that something was done to make possible a referendum to give effect to any decision arrived at on this problem. That might achieve some result. I point out to the Leader that a referendum held as a result of a conference set up by the Commonwealth with only Commonwealth members upon it is very likely to come to nothing but a Party struggle. Dr. Evatt threw the ball into the ring when he asked the people of Australia to agree to some 14 changes in the Constitution, none of which, I believe, were carried. In fact, very few referendums have been successfully put before the people, and those few which have been carried have dealt with matters relating to finance and given the States some relief.

My own view is that we have not approached this problem from the angle that appears to me to be likely to achieve some constructive result. I would like to have the opportunity to look up one or two authorities on this subject and hope to be able to add something to the debate at a later stage.

Mr. O'Halloran—You might come a little bit more our way.

Mr. SHANNON—That is possible; I am always open to conviction. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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 investigation 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 29. Page 451.)

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—The motion seeks the appointment of a Select Committee to take evidence on matters affecting local government. We have heard much in this debate about improved and unimproved rentals, equipment, efficiency, aggregation of resources and ward expenditure, all with the idea of having one greater local government body. Should Parliament interfere with local government by saying what type should be in operation? Each of the 21 metropolitan councils concerned should have been approached and then we would know how many support the proposal. We would know also how many of them would benefit from amalgamation. Mr. Jennings said that this was part of the Labor Party's policy, but I am not concerned about that. My interest is in what Parliament thinks should be done. When I came here I decided to reserve to the people as much liberty as possible and I shall continue to work for that. The motion tells people outside what they should do. If the councils concerned had been approached the proposal would have been killed at its birth. The Opposition may have something when it says that amalgamation would lead to greater economy, but should we throw out what we have in favour of a more economical form of government? We hold dear our present form of democratic government. Local government holds the same view and is jealous of the powers granted to it, and I would be reluctant to interfere with the exercise of them. I could produce evidence supporting the suggestion that greater economy in local government is essential. There are illustrations in my district and no doubt the members for Stuart, Port Pirie and Gawler could cite cases where an improvement would be effected by the amalgamation of some councils.

Mr. John Clark—It applies all over the State.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, but would any member opposite suggest that Parliament wants them to amalgamate? I do not think any

member wants to inflict on these people something they do not want. Many councils would resent any suggestion of amalgamation or interference with their activities. I would like to know how many of the 21 metropolitan councils favour the proposal. From information I have received not one has sought the move and I cannot understand why the Opposition moved the motion, except that it is part of Labor's policy of unification of all forms of government. I do not oppose the motion on that ground, but because I believe in giving freedom to councils which know how to exercise their powers for the benefit of the ratepayers. Councils are conscientiously applying themselves to their work to a much greater degree than would be the case if there were an amalgamation. Because there is one body for the great city of New York it does not say that everything is all right. I could give an illustration where a small sum of money is handled by two men, who believe they are performing a just and honourable service for the ratepayers, but it would be quite simple for people to criticize their work. Is it our duty to interfere with the work of councils? There are simple ways and means whereby councils can amalgamate, but not one council wants to avail itself of them. Even if a Select Committee recommended a Greater Adelaide I would oppose it.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the motion. It is time that Mr. Hambour and others who have opposed the motion were reminded of its contents. Most of them have referred to matters not related to those in the motions. I draw the attention of members to its wording. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) moved it he did so in a statesman-like way and refused to dabble in Party politics. Further, he asked all members to refrain from introducing Party politics.

Mr. Hambour—I did not mention him, but the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings).

Mr. HUTCHENS—All members on this side are one in this matter, so I am not concerned about whom the honourable member accused. Mr. O'Halloran said:—

Parliament must rise above the petty prejudices and motives that have been allowed to stand in the way of progress.

Members on this side are concerned merely with progress, but it appears from the remarks of Government members who have opposed the motion that they are concerned merely with the retarding of progress and the retention of the present unsatisfactory system of local

government in the metropolitan area. Government members who have had experience in local government affairs and who have opposed the motion have admitted frankly that councils are in dire financial distress and cannot suggest ways in which those difficulties may be solved; yet they are anxious to retain the *status quo* and the present terrible position. Mr. O'Halloran went on to suggest that the proposed committee investigate matters thoroughly to see what could be done with a view to recommending appropriate reforms without fear or favour.

Mr. John Clark—Even then Parliament could turn down the recommendations.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes; Parliament is supreme. With their usual generous spirit members on this side concede that there would be a majority of Government members on the proposed committee. Surely nothing could be more liberal and just than that. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) delivered a logical address on the motion and he was ably supported by the members for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and Gawler (Mr. John Clark).

Mr. Hambour—Didn't Mr. Jennings say that it was the Labor Party's policy to do this?

Mr. HUTCHENS—When we are logical the honourable member complains!

Mr. Hambour—I am not complaining; you are denying it.

Mr. HUTCHENS—When I get a proof of my speech tomorrow I will let the honourable member have a copy of it in braille so that he will be able to read it; apparently he has been unable to read the speeches of other members on this side. Opposition members are sincere when they express a deep appreciation of the services rendered voluntarily by council members.

Mr. Frank Walsh—But they have a deeper appreciation of a Greater Adelaide.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. Many people living in residential districts use the roads in industrial districts during the day, and the unfortunate workers in the latter districts must find the extra money with which to maintain the roads as these are subject to undue wear and tear. No liaison or neighbourly spirit exists between districts because of the divisions in local government. This matter should be looked at and something done to solve these problems.

Metropolitan councils must make certain contributions to the Fire Brigades Board, and together with the members for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) and Port Adelaide (Mr.

Stephens) I have frequently pointed out the injustice of the levies imposed on councils in commercial and industrial areas for this purpose, although other people whose property is protected are relieved of this great imposition. No metropolitan council, whether large or small, is finding it easy today to meet its financial commitments and to implement a programme that will provide maximum convenience and comfort for its ratepayers. Every South Australian is proud of his fair city with its gardens and is always anxious to encourage people to come here from other States and other parts of the world to spend their money. However, the city has its faults. For instance, even in King William Street there are far more potholes than we like to see. If the Adelaide City Council is unable to get sufficient finance to keep its roads in order, it is evident that all other councils must be in a similar position. This is due largely to the rapid change in our methods of transport.

My Party contends that a committee should be appointed to investigate and report on ways and means of dealing with these problems. The lack of understanding and co-operation between metropolitan councils is colossal and costly, and even unneighbourly, and is building up parish pump prejudices where we have one council disliking its neighbour. In my district is the Woodville council, a most progressive body, and in order to maintain its roads and footpaths satisfactorily a proper drainage system is essential. However, the district is not much above sea level. The council has embarked upon a very costly drainage system and every penny of its cost is being borrowed, and thus it will create a tremendous debt which must be passed on to posterity. Years ago when talking to the council engineer I said I assumed that the council had negotiated with the Enfield and Hindmarsh councils regarding drainage and that complete agreement had been arrived at so that they could connect up with the Woodville scheme and thus drain their areas at the lowest cost, and also be in a position to reimburse Woodville some of the cost of the work it had undertaken. I was told that the council could not wait for the other councils but had to get on with the job.

In Hindmarsh, drainage is directed into large pugholes, but the time is not far distant when those pugholes will disappear and then a new drainage system must be evolved. The only place for Hindmarsh to drain is to the point where the Woodville council is draining.

It is almost unbelievable, but the Hindmarsh drain will have to overlay the Woodville drain, which will have cost more than £200,000, and the drain from Enfield will have to overlay the Hindmarsh and Woodville drains. Should not there be a committee appointed to make recommendations to save this colossal waste? That is all that the motion is asking for—the setting up of a committee to investigate not only the saving of money but the saving of plant to provide the greatest possible service at the lowest possible cost.

We have been told that there are 21 councils in the metropolitan area. Do those who oppose the motion realize that this involves the appointment of 21 town clerks who would receive, I imagine, about £2,000 a year on the average? There are also 21 mayoral allowances with all the associated costs. Then there are, of course, 21 engineers, that is if they can afford them, and also assistant engineers, and in addition 21 local boards of health with 21 health inspectors. Some of the councils are in such a parlous condition that they cannot afford qualified health inspectors, but appoint a person who is not competent, and thus the health of the people is neglected. The fact remains that there are 21 different bodies competing against one another, to say nothing of the cost involved in having 21 plants. Hundreds of thousands of pounds are involved in these plants, much of which stands idle for nine months of the year because it cannot be employed. In addition each council has varying methods of assessing and rating and this leads to confusion, and each has its own form of town planning, there being no co-ordination. One council may declare a residential area and the adjoining council may declare an industrial area right next to it. In the expectation of living in a residential area a man may pay a high price for a house, yet find that the adjoining council allows factories to be erected alongside him. I have given many examples of the complete failure of the system of local government in the metropolitan area.

The Premier opposed the motion, and then other members sitting behind him also opposed it. Every member of the Opposition who has supported it has quoted authorities in support of his contentions, but not one member opposing the motion has produced one authority to support his arguments. The Premier made much of centralization and decentralization, and I was amazed that he had the audacity to limit his argument to the metropolitan area. He tried to make political capital by

playing on the sentimental thinking of the parish pump outlook or the self-righteous, unneighbourly people who want to retain power to the economic disadvantage of the great community of Adelaide.

If we accept the Premier's arguments that we are adopting the wrong method under this motion we must concede that private enterprise also has adopted wrong methods and that, as a result, most firms are in a sound financial position. Does the Premier suggest that because the wool and stockbrokers of South Australia have a central office they are not doing effective work in advancing decentralization? I give wool and stockbrokers credit for having done much to develop the State. If the Broken Hill Proprietary Company followed the Premier's arguments it would establish small branches all over the State and would have no central control. Many private concerns have seen the wisdom of having centralized administration.

Although the Opposition does not say that the committee must favour centralization we do say that divided and petty administration should be examined. Even the great political Parties have found it necessary to have a central office and administration. Would the Premier say that as a result they are not near the people? He used many words in opposing the motion, but they contained not one iota of logic. He gave only one reason for not agreeing with it—that the subject was most controversial. Should we run away from a problem for that reason? I was amazed to hear him refer to a report that was 20 years old to try to establish his case, for only the day before, when the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) was speaking on another matter and went back two years to quote from the latest report available on the question, the Premier complained he was going back to ancient history. I listened intently to the speeches by the members for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). I was fascinated by their antics and although I read their speeches carefully I could find no logic in their arguments. The member for Torrens said:—

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.

However, he opposes any investigation to see how these problems can be solved. He admitted that even though his council possessed a genius like himself it could not overcome its difficulties, yet he opposed the motion. He became really excited and threw his arms at right angles to his body. He spoke so forcibly that the pigeons on the windowsills flew off like jet-propelled aircraft. I think he was briefed and had to make a case.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) complained that the Opposition did not bring in a Bill to remedy what he confessed was nothing more than a shocking mess. He said:—

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. 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.

He agrees that it is a shocking mess, yet he wants us to build on that shocking mess. We say that the system should be investigated, if necessary it should be wiped out, and reconstituted on new premises. Is that not a logical thing to do? The honourable member went on to say:—

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.

Does not Parliament represent the people, and have not the people rights and privileges? If a committee is set up the people will have the right and privilege to make known their feelings on this matter. It is amazing that the honourable member should become interested in the rights and privileges of the people. He went on to say:—

No reason has been given why there should be four members from this House and three from the other House.

This is an amazing statement to make after he had voiced his concern about rights and privileges. From his remarks it can be

assumed with every justification that he feels that a greater number should come from another House than from this House, yet that other House, because of its restricted franchise, denies rights and privileges to some people.

Mr. O'Halloran—He thinks those privileges should be the right of a select few.

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is the very point, and that is what he wants to retain while talking with his tongue in his cheek.

Mr. John Clark—He would not be in that privileged few.

Mr. HUTCHENS—No, he would be denying himself those privileges. He opposed the motion that would give to the people the right to express their views to a committee. Does the present Local Government Act acknowledge the rights and privileges of the people? It does so only to a certain section of the people. Police officers, clergymen and others who have important positions in the community are denied any voice in local government matters, yet Mr. Millhouse had the audacity to talk about rights and privileges. His excitement rose to an almost unimaginable degree. He slapped his arms over his chest and became red in the face when saying:—

I cannot understand why members opposite who have had local government experience should turn upon it in the way they so frequently do.

This was too much for the Premier, who interjected, "They do not believe in local government," to which Mr. Millhouse replied, "I do not think they do. The motion absolutely screams it, and I remember the same thing happened last year." Are not such utterances from uncontrolled imagination? How could anyone suggest that members on this side of the House do not believe in local government? The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) has served local government for 25 years and has given voice to its principles in such a manner that he has always been appreciated by the ratepayers, so much so that many people travelled hundreds of miles to urge him to serve in a higher sphere in this Chamber. The member for Port Pirie has had more than 30 years' experience in local government.

Mr. Hambour—Would he amalgamate the Pirie district council area with the Port Pirie Corporation?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I will come to that later. He has served as councillor and mayor and has converted a place that was once a mud bank into the fine town it is today. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has served his council for almost 30 years and has been mayor of

Port Augusta for a record term. The members for Gawler, Whyalla and Semaphore are all actively associated with council affairs.

Mr. Lawn—What about yourself?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I am a humble man and did not intend to refer to my own service. Collectively, Opposition members have given more than 100 years' service to local government; yet Mr. Millhouse suggests that we are not interested in local government. His implication is that we are not concerned with the welfare of people in our districts. While the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) is here, it can never be suggested that members opposite hide their lights under bushels. If the Australian comedian, George Wallace, is still living in another 10 years and from the stage, in a representation of "Thanks for the Memory," repeats Mr. Hambour's remarks of this afternoon, he will gain the greatest applause of his life. Mr. Hambour said that evidence should be taken about what is to be done to bring about an amalgamation, but that is precisely what the motion proposes. He said that councils should be consulted. The motion's purpose is to ensure that. He said that councils should have as much liberty as possible to make known their feelings in regard to this matter. Again, that is what the motion proposes. He said, in effect, that the amalgamation would lend itself to economies, but is not democratic. Does he suggest that the present system is democratic. He said, "I know that local government would resent it"—meaning the motion. If he knows that he must be Mandrake, because councils have not expressed any opinion.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) suggests that ratepayers are primarily concerned with a matter of this nature. In the *Advertiser* of Monday, July 9, immediately following the most recent municipal elections in South Australia, the following comments appeared:—

About 20 per cent of those eligible to vote went to the polls, compared with 12 per cent last year. Figures ranged from 4 per cent of the voters in one ward at Enfield, to more than 50 per cent in the mayoral election at Payneham. The secretary of the Municipal Association (Mr. A. B. Cox) said yesterday interest in the elections, although slightly higher than last year, was still "woeful."

Apparently as a result of complaints about the condition of roads in some of the newer suburbs, following the abnormally wet winter, more voters went to the polls than in previous years. However, the small percentage of votes cast at Enfield indicated that ratepayers were either satisfied that they were being represented adequately, or there was a remarkable apathy towards council affairs.

Mr. John Clark—People have given it up as a bad job.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. They know that no matter who is elected to council—even though motivated by the highest principles—he will be frustrated. Not one member opposite quoted an authority to substantiate the claim that the present system is adequate and that the motion is undesirable. However, I propose to quote from an article by Alan Davies, the acting Professor of Political Science at the University of Melbourne. He is one of the few political scientists in Australia who have specialized in a study of local government. Under the headings "What is Wrong with Local Government? Neighbourhood Basis Essential to Overcome Apathy," he states:—

... there have been constant complaints that councils are unable to manage on their current finances and their work is unappreciated. Complaints about apathy and finance are, of course, related through the crucial matter of municipal powers. Financial weakness is a barrier to greater powers; restricted powers bring growing apathy, showing itself in all sorts of ways from tiny attendances at public meetings, to lack of candidates in elections, to fantastic terms of office.

Apathy is a real problem: people are not to be blamed for taking no interest in what seems to them of no importance. Financial difficulties are not so real: councils are in the main merely cowardly in the rates they levy on their citizens. (Local property taxation in America runs at three times the Australian level). But councils are right to be very angry at the miserable grants they get from State governments. We have, in short, a local government system capable of engaging the interest of few besides estate agents and those camping in new housing around the fringes of our larger cities. On the other hand there are our fine and utterly managerial public utilities. We have reached this situation by taking too seriously the nineteenth century idea that politics was a kind of sub-department of business.

That is what we have been arguing. The honourable member for Torrens would give us the impression that no authority, and particularly no-one associated with the Local Government Association, would be interested in some action to bring us out of our difficulties.

Mr. A. Mainerd, secretary of the Local Government Association of New South Wales, under the heading "Obligations growing but share of revenue falling," has this to say:—

At a financial convention held in 1950 the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, said that he would urge the holding of a financial convention in which the Commonwealth, the States, and local government would participate to examine—for a prolonged period—the financial relationships of the three arms of government. That is a first essential to resolving the

local government financial impasse; but, notwithstanding the strongest appeals, the States will not co-operate in such an examination; nor will they agree to the appointment of expert committees to investigate local government finances in their respective States. Meanwhile, the position is deteriorating.

These are the findings and conclusions of those who have studied the local government system operating in Australia. The Opposition is conscious of the fact that deterioration must be the order of the day under the present system, and it has put this motion to give the ratepayers a greater interest and desire to serve civically in this community in the metropolitan area. I support the motion.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I have only a few short observations to make on this measure. Before doing so, I wish to comment on the manner in which the member for Hindmarsh referred to the member for Mitcham. The manner in which he threw his arms about suggested that he could very well lay claim to being a first-class contortionist. It would appear that this motion is the first step to implement a move towards central government, so strongly advocated by some Opposition members during the debate on the Loan Estimates. This encroaches on the activities of local government, and some of the recommendations proposed by the Opposition could well result in the complete abolition of local government in the metropolitan area. This would greatly weaken local government in the country areas. The Greater Adelaide scheme proposed would mean one central council in the metropolitan area instead of the 21, and it would be almost impossible for a ratepayer to have easy access to his councillor. There is at present a good liaison between the corporations of the country and the metropolitan area through the Municipal Associations and the Local Government Associations. Many problems come before them at their meetings, and certain of their motions come before this House as legislation to amend the Local Government Act. With one central body, such as proposed in the Greater Adelaide scheme, that liaison would be lost, to the detriment of country councils and metropolitan councils as a whole. Members opposite in one breath have eulogized the manner in which local governing bodies have carried out their work, but in the next have condemned them as being inefficient and incapable.

Mr. Davis—No, they have not.

Mr. JENKINS—The honourable member for Hindmarsh only a few moments ago said that the activities of local governing bodies

were a complete and utter failure. It would be a retrograde step to abolish the local governing bodies in the metropolitan area or anywhere else. In my town there is a very good council and a body of councillors who are most conscious of their duties to the ratepayers. Those councillors have a great sense of responsibility, and are always on call.

Mr. Davis—Where is that?

Mr. JENKINS—Victor Harbour.

Mr. Davis—There is no comparison between Victor Harbour and what is contained in this motion.

Mr. JENKINS—We have a town clerk who has had 19 years experience with the Adelaide City Council. He is doing a wonderful job there, and our council is working very smoothly and efficiently to the satisfaction of the ratepayers. There may have been some merit in a motion such as this 10 or 12 years ago. At that time councils had not foreseen the great increase in population and home building, or the necessity for roads and footpaths and such services. During the last few years the members of local governing bodies seem to have adopted a better approach to this problem and have a better realization of their taxing powers. Although it is a little late, they are taking some steps to rectify the position by increasing rates. This should have been done some years ago. If they had been prepared for the great development that has taken place they would have introduced higher rating to meet the needs. They are doing that now and there is some chance of them catching up eventually. Local governing bodies and ratepayers as a whole are totally opposed to this motion.

Mr. Riches—What are they opposed to?

Mr. JENKINS—I will read some extracts from an article in today's *News* headed "Greater Adelaide? No!":—

The plan of the Opposition Leader, Mr. O'Halloran, for a Greater Adelaide has few supporters in municipal circles. Not one councillor or official I spoke to this week favoured Labor's move for centralized local government.

There is quite a lot more which may be of interest to honourable members opposite, and I will read another passage from that report later. I do not believe for one moment that honourable members opposite have been at all optimistic about this motion being successful. They think that through the publicity it will receive they may be able to help the propaganda along a bit in the future, and probably we will hear something more of it at a later date.

The member for Hindmarsh said that members on this side of the House have no authority to support their arguments. I do not know whether we should have authority in support of our arguments or whether we should take the opinion and feeling of the ratepayers and members of municipal bodies as a guide to what we should do. I believe that we should respect the feelings of those people who are chiefly concerned. Another extract from the article in the *News* is as follows:—

Even Labor dominated councils in the metropolitan area have few supporters for Mr. O'Halloran's plan.

In face of the opposition by their own supporters in local government the Opposition has introduced a motion entirely distasteful to them. Probably by this time members opposite realize that I oppose it.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I was hopeful that Mr. Jenkins would address himself to the motion. As I understood his remarks, he was opposed to the idea of a Greater Adelaide and did not give one valid reason for opposing the motion. I support it as presented to the House and not necessarily because of what members opposite read into it. It appears necessary to remind members again of the wording. Mr. Millhouse said that the three recitals that prefaced the purport of the motion were sheer propaganda and that the Opposition was not prepared to introduce a Bill to give effect to the real desire of the Labor Party on this matter. The motion begins:—

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;

Mr. Millhouse said it was sheer propaganda but it is sheer hard fact because the problems are real. My quarrel with the motion is the inclusion of the last four words "in the metropolitan area," for the problems are found in all parts of the State. A change in our system of financing this work is long overdue. I have had a long association with local government and one important matter is drainage. On Monday night I had pointed out to me the difficulty Gawler has in dealing with its drainage problems. It wants a master plan and has asked the Minister to help by having a grant made to the town. All areas are faced with difficulties in rating and assessments because the cost of drainage and other services needed are beyond the capacities of the coun-

cils. I would like to see an inquiry into the financial set-up of all councils in the State but the motion confines the inquiry to the metropolitan area. I have read of progress associations and ratepayers' organizations being established to take an active part in council elections in an attempt to unseat councillors, not because of any lack of desire to do what is right but because of not giving the ratepayers the service to which they are entitled. When we say there should be the provision of drainage, the maintenance of roads and the control of transport we refer to real problems and it is not propaganda. The motion continues:—

That in view of—

- (b) the financial difficulties encountered by the metropolitan councils in their attempts to solve those problems; and
- (c) the untoward consequences of the existing system of local government now obtaining in the metropolitan area,

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

Mr. Jenkins said that the ratepayers had indicated to the representative of the *News* their opposition to Labor's proposal. He is mistaken for the report demonstrates that the opposition is to one of the matters that may be placed before the Select Committee—a Greater Adelaide scheme. There was no opposition to the motion. Mr. Millhouse said that it was submitted in its present form because the Labor Party would not take the trouble to prepare a Bill because if one were introduced it would have to be considered and defended clause by clause. The Opposition has never claimed in this debate that it has a complete answer to all the problems. Some members have said that a Greater Adelaide would solve some of them and that is something that could be considered by the committee. We want all problems investigated and as a result of the findings the all-Party committee could draft a Bill. Mr. Millhouse could see no reason why Parliament could not deal with the matter. The appointment of a committee would not in any way do away with the rights and privileges of Parliament but would be in conformity with the accepted practice of Parliamentary government. The Premier spoke of the Bean Commission that inquired chiefly into local government boundaries. That

commission conducted an exhaustive inquiry throughout the State. The Premier said that wherever it went the commission found general objection to the amalgamation of councils, and I admit that; but the Premier did not go on to say that its findings were to the effect that certain councils should be amalgamated, that as a result of those findings Parliament amalgamated certain districts, and that following such amalgamation those people previously opposed to it now supported it. Indeed, no one suggests that we should return to the diffusion of local government in any of those country council districts that were amalgamated in 1932.

When that commission inquired into council boundaries there was inevitably opposition from people who had special interests. In 1932 Port Augusta had three municipal councils and three mayors, and had it been left to the local people no amalgamation would have taken place, but the commission recommended the amalgamation of those three bodies and Parliament forced their amalgamation. Today in Port Augusta not even a single ratepayer would advocate the return to three corporations. The same thing happened in other places, and I agree with the statement of the Minister of Works, made when he was Minister of Local Government, that there should be a rearrangement of certain country council districts. For these reasons the statement that some people consulted by the Bean Commission in 1932 opposed amalgamation is completely irrelevant in this debate.

Mr. Millhouse asked why the Opposition submitted this motion for a committee of seven members instead of drafting a Bill, but one of the steps in a matter of this kind is to appoint a special committee to inquire and report back to Parliament. Further, an accepted custom is that the mover of the motion shall be the chairman of the Select Committee. The Labor Party wished to place the inquiry on the highest possible level and did not want to be open to the charge that it wanted the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) to be appointed chairman and to conduct the inquiry. The Labor Party wanted to play the game and have an honest investigation into metropolitan council administration. Mr. O'Halloran does not want to be chairman; indeed, he visualizes a committee on which the Government would have majority representation, and because any legislation necessary would have to be passed by both Houses, he broadened the concept of the committee to include also members of the Legisla-

tive Council. That seems a fair and reasonable way to deal with these problems if we face up to the fact that they exist.

Do Government members, however, acknowledge that they exist? The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) may be so far out of touch with local government matters that he really believes that statements that councils are facing tremendous problems, such as roads and drainage, are sheer propaganda. He may believe that, but nobody even remotely connected with council affairs believes that for it is wellknown that these are real problems. Some overhaul will have to be made at some time to relieve not only metropolitan councils but all councils throughout the State.

Other problems not enumerated in the motion may be automatically solved by a re-arrangement of council boundaries. I have been a member of the Municipal Association for some years and I have often heard complaints from Port Adelaide members of that body who say that the Fire Brigade in Adelaide is set up to answer any calls in the metropolitan area, but that Port Adelaide has to pay an inordinately large proportion of the Fire Brigade charges. I have heard discussions on this matter by council representatives, but they have been unable to agree and the charges remain out of all proportion to the services rendered. If the boundaries were re-adjusted such matters would tend to adjust themselves and many anomalies to disappear. The committee would be able to inquire into such problems, hear the views of the people affected, and exercise a completely independent judgment.

Mr. O'Halloran—A new anomaly is now developing on hospital rating.

Mr. RICHES—Yes. Some councils claim that they are getting differential treatment in their road grants, and this is another of the many inequalities the proposed inquiry could help smooth out. Government members have taken it for granted that if a committee were set up it would necessarily have to recommend some scheme in conformity with the greater Brisbane scheme; but it would not, although on the other hand it might. Recently, when visiting Brisbane, I did not find from conversations with the people I met the wholesale condemnation of the greater Brisbane scheme which the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and the Premier said a visitor to that city would find.

Mr. O'Halloran—The members of their Party who live in Queensland do not join in that condemnation.

Mr. RICHES—They are amongst the people I did not meet, but one person said to me, "How do you like our tram service? We think that it is the best and cheapest in Australia and we are proud of it." I said, "We have good trams in Adelaide too." They told me that the Brisbane City Council controlled trams, water supply and sewerage and that they are not a government responsibility. I thought that here was something quite different from what we are used to in South Australia. I suggest that the member for Torrens, when he looks at the increasing deficits of the Brisbane council and the fact that it has had to go on the loan market, should also consider the South Australian position. He will then find that the Municipal Tramways Trust has a huge deficit and that the Government has had to go on the loan market to get money for water supplies. I can remember seeing a big advertisement in the *Advertiser* which sought to induce people to subscribe to the Commonwealth Loan to provide South Australia with money for water supplies and other public undertakings, which in Queensland are carried out by the Brisbane Council. Let the Adelaide City Council carry the tramway losses, sewerage and water costs, and see what kind of a deficit it would have.

It is not my prerogative to defend the Greater Brisbane scheme. I was not there long enough to assess whether it was good or not, but there were things about Brisbane which impressed me and I thought that if local government could handle the undertakings mentioned we were hardly in a position here, where hospitals and abattoirs schemes had been handed back to the Government, to throw stones at a neighbouring State. I found the Brisbane people very proud of their town hall and they insisted that I have a look at it and from the roof view their city. I also found they were proud of their university, which they claimed was the largest in the southern hemisphere. It has a frontage of one-sixth of a mile and is a magnificent building.

I thought that Mr. Millhouse's remarks were quite irrelevant. If he wants a comparison, in my judgment the Brisbane scheme is to be preferred to ours. However, whether it would work here, or whether it would be desirable, as local government covers different functions here, I do not know. But I do know that the problems mentioned in the motion are very real. I frankly admit that my opinion may not be shared by other members of the Muni-

cipal Association, but my observation is that an inquiry would be a good thing. It could cover the problems of drainage, road construction, finance and council boundaries. Nothing but good could come from an inquiry as suggested, and therefore I give the motion my whole-hearted support.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I feel that the essence of local government is that it is local. There is no evidence of any desire on the part of any local government association for the proposed inquiry, and I feel that the crux of the whole matter is "Do we believe in remote and therefore indirect control, or do we believe in intimate and therefore direct control of local governing affairs?" The proposals in the motion emanate not from a desire of councils, but a furthering of the idea of unification, which is so keenly desired by our friends opposite. I have a deep regard for the remarkably good work done for the immediate local areas by councils over a period of 100 years, both in the city and in country areas, and contend that the efficiency arrived at by the local authorities is such that there is no immediate call for any alteration of the present system.

Mr. Riches—There is no criticism of the councils, but of the handicaps under which they have to work.

Mr. LAUCKE—I consider that the interests of an area are best served by those men resident in that area who know its immediate requirements and have intimate personal interests in the improvement of that area, and not by control by persons who are not in a position to know the requirements so clearly. Mr. Hutchens said that this is a most controversial matter, and I contend that the controversy lies only between councils and those who would foist on them the unification for which they have not expressed a desire. No good purpose would be achieved in setting up the suggested committee.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you quite happy about the present Local Government Act?

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes, because it has for many years proved to be an effective method for attending to local requirements.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you claim to understand the Act?

Mr. LAUCKE—I contend there should be no alteration until there is a firm request from those gentlemen engaged in directing the affairs of councils. To agree to the motion we would not be showing our appreciation of the work done by those taking part in civic

matters. My view is that the present Act is adequate for requirements.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you claim to understand it?

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes. I presume that the councils follow the Act, and as they have not sought any alteration of the present set up, I oppose the motion.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 29. Page 453.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I believe the provisions of the Bill are wider than the member for Edwinstown desires, in fact so wide that his purpose in introducing the measure would be defeated. In clause 3 he tries to ensure that no person shall conduct a lottery for personal gain. The relevant section states:—

A person shall not—

- (a) Knowingly apply any of the net proceeds of any lottery conducted pursuant to a permit under this section to any purpose other than a purpose, work or activity mentioned in subsection 1; or
- (b) accept any monetary or other remuneration for promoting, conducting or managing any such lottery, or for selling tickets or otherwise assisting in carrying out any such lottery; or
- (c) provide or distribute any money prizes in any such lottery.

Under that provision, a lottery will have to be non-profit-making and conducted for the purpose of assisting charitable or sporting activities, but it completely falls to the ground because of the next provision, which states:—

Any person who contravenes this section shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds.

What sort of protection does a trifling fine of £50 give when thousands of pounds are at stake? That provision is like trying to tie up a tractor with a piece of string.

Mr. Stephens—But you have small penalties in many Acts.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Not in any Act under which the distribution of many thousands of pounds may be involved. Another provision of the Bill is futile. It states:—

A person shall not . . . provide or distribute any money prizes in any such lottery. Of course, prizes do not have to be in cash to be valuable. In Tasmania the big prize in a lottery was a valuable hotel, and that could

apply in South Australia. Those who may conduct lotteries are set out in the following provision:—

An application may be made to the Chief Secretary for a permit to conduct a lottery in accordance with this section by any of the following bodies, namely:—

- (a) any club, the principal object of which is to carry on an outdoor sport or game and which makes no charge for admission to matches or contests, and does not derive any income from any such charge.
- (b) Any association or body of people carrying on any school or religious institution, hospital, or other institution to assist the sick, the infirm, the aged, or the needy, so that such institution is not carried on for gain or profit to the individual members thereof.
- (c) Any association which is not carried on for the purpose of profit or gain to the individual members thereof and which carries on some other work or activity which, in the Chief Secretary's opinion, is charitable.

Six people may form an association and ask the Chief Secretary for a permit to conduct a lottery. The Chief Secretary may find that they have not appeared in the Police Court and that it appears that they want to conduct a lottery for a charitable purpose, so he grants a permit. Unless I am mistaken, all of the protections afforded by the Lottery and Gaming Act are swept away by the following provision:—

A lottery conducted under this section shall not be an illegal lottery within the meaning of any provision of this Act relating to illegal lotteries.

People will be able to contravene the provisions of the Act if they are prepared to pay a trifling fine of £50.

Mr. Frank Walsh—That is an exaggeration.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. The honourable member's Bill is weakened greatly by an evidentiary provision which I do not understand. It states:—

A person shall not knowingly apply any of the net proceeds of any lottery conducted pursuant to a permit under this section to any purpose other than a purpose, work, or activity mentioned in subsection 1.

When the word "knowingly" is brought in, it has to be proved that the offender knew he was doing something wrong. That in itself makes it almost impossible to get a conviction, because knowledge has to be proved, and this is difficult. Under the general law a person has to know the law, and it is no excuse for him to say that he did not know that he was committing an offence, but in this Bill there is a clause that makes it obligatory to prove

that the offender knows that he has done wrong, which is difficult. Apart from this, having established that he has contravened these provisions in every possible way, and may have accepted a management for a fee of, say, £1,000 for promoting an illegal lottery, he would be liable to a fine of only £50. He could then get some of his friends to promote another lottery, and they would also be fined £50. That does not seem to be an adequate assurance.

If members refer to the Act they will see that it contains provisions against advertising and hundreds of other things, but this Bill is too wide. Clause 10, which provides that "a lottery conducted under this section shall not be an illegal lottery within the meaning of any provision under this Act relating to illegal lotteries," wipes out all the fundamental law designed to protect the public from this type of nuisance. What is given in its place? Only three or four provisions that are not adequately provided for by the penalty of £50. Such a penalty would not be a protection to the public because there is no limit on the size of the prizes that may be offered. A hotel might be offered.

Mr. Frank Walsh—They are not very good investments today, are they?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know about that, but they have proved a keen attraction for people to invest in lotteries in Tasmania.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Motor cars and blocks of flats are offered as prizes in New South Wales.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is so. I have an advertisement here for such a lottery. The first prize is £17,500, two homes and a Jaguar motor car for an investment of 10s. Such things might happen under this legislation, yet the only penalty provided in this Bill is of £50. Clause 10 takes away the protection given under the Act to ensure that these things, if they are to be conducted, will be conducted on proper terms and will not become a public nuisance.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Would this come under the present Act under "lotteries"?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know, but I believe I understand what the clause means. Assuming that the House accepts this Bill and a promoter deliberately breaks the terms of his permission by taking a fee or reward for management, he has put his hands on other people's money. In such cases, what have we done at common law? We have provided a penalty of gaol for such crimes, yet

this Bill provides a penalty of only £50. Anything could be done under this Bill provided the promoter is prepared to face up to this fine.

Mr. Stephens—The same thing applies to many other laws.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A lot of things apply to other laws, but we sought to provide what we thought would be a deterrent. A penalty of £50 would be negligible in the circumstances that could arise under this Bill. Section 5 of the principal Act provides:—

Every lottery is hereby declared to be a common nuisance and unlawful, and every sale or gift, disposal or distribution made by means or in pursuance thereof void.

This is what previous Parliaments have done in this matter, and I quote it to show how views and times have changed. Although the Act declares that lotteries are a common nuisance, we could have under this Bill not one a year or even one a week, but perhaps one a day. It contains no rules about associations, which do not even have to be incorporated. The sponsor may say that the Chief Secretary, who is the Minister who will grant permits, would not grant a permit to a body that has no standing, but we should not give to the administration the determination of those to whom the law should apply, but should make clear the circumstances under which a permit should be issued.

Mr. Frank Walsh—How many things are done by regulation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member is Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and knows that a regulation has the force of law and that it has to be approved by Parliament. Any matters necessary or convenient may be prescribed by regulations, but that does not get over the fact that this Bill lays down, and not by regulation, what an association should be, and does so in the loosest possible terms. Under its provisions we do not have to lay down who these people are, but we will accept them so long as their ideas are beneficent. That is far too loose. All the provisions of this Bill are such that abuses could spring up. Apart from the fact that I do not believe lotteries are desirable, the provisions are so wide that they should be rejected by Parliament. Even if Parliament approves, it should instruct the sponsor to draft the Bill in such a manner that it will carry out the intentions he has placed before the House, and not lend itself to what I believe would very quickly become a series of public abuses and scandals.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—Before discussing the merits and demerits of the Bill I intend to comment on some of the Premier's statements. As usual, he has exaggerated his claims. Last Wednesday he referred to the Lotteries Commission, set up in 1936 under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Piper, which was unanimous in its rejection of lotteries in South Australia. In its conclusions the commission stated:—

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.

Whilst that contention may have been accurate in 1936, because of the change in economic conditions it would be unreliable now. I have no doubt that many councils would welcome a lottery as a means of overcoming their financial disabilities. The Premier also cited the commission's finding that:—

Hospital authorities in South Australia do not favour a system of finance through the medium of lotteries.

I suggest that if our hospitals—particularly community hospitals—were asked their opinion now, they would favour lotteries as a means of alleviating their financial embarrassments. Every community hospital in this State is battling to secure sufficient revenue to maintain its services. The LeFevre hospital in my district is working on overdrafts, but is able to charge reasonable fees. Even with sound administration it is finding it difficult to meet its commitments. Another finding quoted by the Premier was:—

The existence of a lottery does not solve the problem of hospital finance in the States which have lotteries.

I submit that lotteries have proved successful in other States. Their proceeds are devoted to hospitals, old folks' homes and similar organizations. They are serving a good purpose and will continue to do so. Although we do not condone a lottery in South Australia, I suggest that about £250,000 annually goes from this State to interstate lotteries. If one compares lotteries with investments on the Stock Exchange there is not much difference: they are both gambles. I believe that the people want a lottery here and if a referendum were held at least six out of every 10 persons would favour its establishment.

The Premier referred to an hotel valued at £450,000 being offered as a prize in a Tasmanian lottery, but he surely does not seriously suggest that such a prize would be offered in the type of lottery to be permitted under the

provisions of this Bill, which is designed to assist junior sporting organizations which do not charge admission to their fixtures. The National Football League, which does charge, would not be permitted to conduct a lottery. The member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke) interjected that motor cars might be offered as prizes, but what junior organization depending on financial assistance from patrons would be able to afford to offer a motor car?

The Premier has frequently told us he does not believe in lotteries, but most South Australians do. Before I was elected to this House I told my constituents that I believed a State lottery would be a means of assisting hospitals and similar services. Attempts have been made to introduce a State lottery, but always without success. The Honourable E. A. Oates made several attempts and last year the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Frank Walsh, introduced a similar measure. I believe that in time a lottery will be established here.

I am opposed to new section 9a (1) (a) which provides that an application to conduct a lottery may be made by:—

any club, the principal object of which is to carry on an outdoor sport or game and which makes no charge for admission to matches or contests and does not derive any income from any such charge.

This is too restrictive. As an example, the Woodville junior football club which uses the Woodville oval—and is required to pay the council a fee—charges its patrons 1s. to witness a match, but under this provision it would not be permitted to conduct a lottery. The Bill is aimed at assisting such organizations, but because of that limitation it will adversely affect some junior sporting bodies. I am also opposed to the provision which limits the number of lotteries to be conducted by any organization in one year. It may happen that a patron donates a £50 prize for a lottery and 1s. tickets are sold. The club may not recoup the cost of the prize, but, because of the limitation, it is not permitted to conduct another lottery for at least 12 months. I support the second reading, but if amendments I will suggest in Committee are not accepted will oppose the third reading. The Premier said that the proposed maximum fine of £50 was not sufficient. I claim that it would be sufficient, because if any club or organization contravened this section the Chief Secretary would have the right to refuse a permit in any subsequent application. No lottery is to be conducted under this proposed Bill unless the Chief Secretary gives a permit. The Chief

Secretary would find out if an organization were *bona fide*; he would want to find out about the people administering the lottery, and because of this I claim that a fine of £50 would be a sufficient deterrent in this regard.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition in expounding his case dealt with a letter which he received from the South Australian Olympic Council. We all know that that body is doing a marvellous job in the interests of amateur sport. I am convinced that Mr. Aitken and Mr. Wigley, two of the men who signed the letter, were not conversant with the Bill. I spoke to one of those gentlemen who stated that he had never seen the Bill, and when I told him that it was restricted to one permit a year he said that would change his attitude towards it. That provision would prevent the Olympic Council and other organizations from doing all they consider necessary in the interests of amateur sport.

I support the second reading of this Bill with the reservation that if it does pass I will move to increase the number of permits that can be allowed in a year.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I welcome the opportunity to express my sentiments on this question. I believe that the member for Edwardstown is quite sincere in his attempt to legalize what exists today and what it taken part in by probably 98 per cent of the community including members of this Chamber. These things are thrust upon us wherever we go, and I feel that if Parliament can make legal what we know is going on and has been going on for years, an attempt should be made to bring that about. Any law which is not observed by such a high percentage of the community is not a good law. Much has been said about lotteries, but I did not at any stage imagine that this was a Bill to introduce lotteries into this State. What I have seen of lotteries in other States makes me feel very disappointed in the governments of those States and the people who support those lotteries. Stalls selling lottery tickets are dotted all over the cities of those States, and I doubt if any merchandise is hawked more intensely than these lottery tickets. I consider that most undesirable. As an individual citizen of this State I would oppose lotteries because I think they are uneconomic and do not serve any great purpose. We can continue assisting charities in the same way that we are doing today.

The Bill as it stands is not acceptable to me, but I am prepared to vote for the second

reading because I feel it may be licked into shape in the Committee stages. The Premier has shot holes in it and shown what could and could not be done under this Bill. The question of penalty would not deter anybody from making an attempt at running a lottery on fairly big lines. In this State today we have raffles involving motor cars and the subterfuge that the winner—who is only decided by ticket—is taken to a platform and is asked to supply the answer to the simplest question which might even be something like “How old are you?” or “How many beans make five?” It has already been determined that he is going to win the quiz, and therefore it is not a quiz. I feel that that sort of thing should not continue, or if it is to be allowed to continue it should be legalized.

The position today is that the whole thing is decided by the Police Department and its officers. One police officer may be quite tolerant of what is going on, and I believe that 95 per cent of them are tolerant towards this sort of thing. The intention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition appears to be to legalize what is happening today.

Mr. Frank Walsh—That is quite correct.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The matter of prizes has been dealt with and criticized. I suggest that most of the prizes, with the exception of the motor car that I have mentioned, would be donated, and the mover of this Bill should insert a clause to the effect that prizes would have to be donated. In those circumstances it would be very difficult to offer a motor car or an hotel as a prize. Perhaps some generous people would donate prizes of £25 or £30 in value, but that would probably be the maximum. I heard only today that a lottery was being conducted to purchase an altar cloth, and surely that is not going to be stained? I do not think we should disallow this legislation on account of any moral issue, because we are all guilty. I think it could and should be controlled by making it compulsory for prizes to be donated. Members might ask how it is going to be policed. The question of the conduct and administration of these lotteries would have to be tightened up considerably; and the public would have to be aware of what the prize consisted of and who donated it.

It is provided in the Bill that a fee of £2 must be paid to the Chief Secretary for every application. I suggest that the permit should be obtainable from any Justice of the Peace, because I think that most raffles would not even raise the amount of the application fee.

Hundreds of raffles are conducted every week where the total profit would not exceed £2. The proposed application fee may be warranted in the case of a lottery designed to raise thousands of pounds, but I do not believe that that is the intention of the Bill.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The sum of £2 would not be much help to a sporting club.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I know of a football club which conducts a raffle every week and would be very happy to make that amount. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition dealt with the question of sporting functions for which no admission charge was made. At country football matches admission fees are charged, but these barely enable the club to carry on and they still conduct raffles. If my suggestion that a Justice of the Peace should grant a permit is not acceptable, provision could perhaps be made for a permit to be granted by two Justices or by a local court, but I do not think that would be necessary. The majority of raffles in the country would be for prizes valued at between £1 and £3, and the profit would be between £2 and £5.

I feel that the Bill is an attempt to legalize something that is indulged in by a majority of the people. If there is a moral issue should we not say whether it is right or wrong? If it is right, should we not make it legal and then enforce the law? The position as I know it is that the decision is left to the discretion of police officers. Various means are adopted to avoid detection or prosecution. It may be that there is a bottle of beans or peas. Unless I have my glasses I have to make a guess as to how many there are in the bottle. There are people who carefully scrutinize the bottle and then are only half right with their guess. That is breaking the law. I plead guilty to doing it, but I believe Parliamentary privilege allows me to do it.

Every honourable member will admit that he has been guilty of taking part in an illegal raffle. Surely there is enough ability in this Chamber to remould the Bill to make legal what we all indulge in at present. The difficulty with the Bill is to stipulate the necessary authority. I suggest that the signature of two justices be sufficient, because if it is made too difficult people will resort to the habit of running raffles on the sly, as at present. I support the second reading.

Mr. STEPHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 4. Page 530.)

State Bank, £1,056,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—According to the Treasurer the State Bank will receive £600,000 under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. Furthermore, during the last financial year it made a profit of £95,000. The Housing Trust is building and selling homes, but many purchasers have to avail themselves of second mortgage facilities. Cannot the State Bank build more homes under its group building scheme so that at least some of this £600,000 advance may be used under its credit foncier scheme to finance the purchase of such houses? This would have been preferable to spending £80,000 on remodelling some portions of the Bank premises, which I believe is being done at present without creating any extra departmental accommodation.

According to this morning's *Advertiser* the manager of the bank has said that the bank will not resume building houses under its group scheme, but I believe that attitude is wrong. Moreover, I understand that customers' overdrafts are to be cut by 10 per cent, which I assume will affect many primary producers and co-operative societies. Is such panic necessary? Under the arrangement operating between the State Bank and the Housing Trust is it necessary for the bank to advance money on at least eight Housing Trust homes each month? Is such a policy in the interests of such a well-established home building authority as the State Bank? The homes erected under the bank's group schemes were sold at a price lower than that of the Housing Trust homes. Why cannot the bank resume those activities?

In some cases the bank advances money to people building their own homes but many home builders find it difficult to comply with the regulations of the bank concerning inspection of homes in construction. First, an application must be made; secondly, the foundations must be inspected; and finally, another inspection is made when the walls are topped. At that stage the applicant is entitled to a further advance, but he may have to wait longer. In other words, the bank cannot guarantee that a loan will be available at that stage, the applicant being told only that he may be assisted.

If that is the position the bank should enunciate a policy and say to the home builder, "It will be necessary for you to apply and arrange for an inspection of the foundations and the topping of the walls, and when you

have topped the walls you will receive an advance forthwith." Even that policy, bad as it is, is better than that which seems to operate today. I do not know whether the Treasurer was told by the Federal authorities, "If you do not accept the terms and conditions of the housing agreement you will get nothing." Can he explain why the Government would not prevail on the State Bank to enter the field of building homes with its own contractors for people who desired to purchase them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member will appreciate that at any particular time there are a number of approvals being given by the bank for which the job has not been completed and upon which the bank has a further obligation. The bank approves of a loan and the home builder then commences building. Many of these loans are to home builders who are not only undertaking a substantial amount of work themselves, but have contracts with a builder, plumber or plasterer to do various classes of work. They do not usually build their homes very rapidly, so at the end of the year the bank has substantial commitments on outstanding obligations, and is financed up to the limit of approval for a fairly large number of houses. The £750,000 mentioned will enable the bank to continue to finance those homes for which approval has been given. I do not think it does much more than fulfil obligations to builders.

Under the new Commonwealth-State Agreement the money made available to the State has been diverted to the bank and the conditions under which it receives the money provide that it must lend to people who desire to build new homes or purchase a home which has not previously been occupied. The bank has to take the first mortgage over it, which is made out as a security to the Treasurer, and it is responsible for the advance. All the money which the bank had last year was used. Actually the Housing Trust overspent the money advanced and the obligations coming forward now are substantially heavier than ordinarily, because some institutions are not financing long-term building, or have slackened up in this kind of advance, so that it will be seen that it is not possible to increase the amount. If we were to ask the bank to alter its policy it could only be at the expense of those to whom it has already made commitments and who are in the course of constructing their houses. The bank could not undertake group building schemes except at a great disadvantage to a considerable number who are relying on it to finance their home building. Under the new

agreement we have to provide part of the money to building societies and they will operate on precisely the same terms as the bank, the amount of advance, the security and rate of interest being the same.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Treasurer say whether it is true that the State Bank has issued instructions to customers that their overdrafts must be reduced by 10 per cent, and will this affect people suffering from the effects of the Murray flood who come under the bank's jurisdiction?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I know of no suggestion of the bank giving a general instruction for such a reduction in overdrafts. I have heard of no alteration in its policy, but know that it is one of the institutions which is continuing to make advances. I am speaking of the general banking business. Immediately after the war, when the bank's accommodation was very congested because of the number of tenants a plan was prepared for extensions, but as far as I know it has not been proceeded with and I have heard nothing of it during the last two years. So, if there is anything of that nature in hand, the board has not discussed it with me.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Treasurer undertake to consult the bank board to ascertain whether the £80,000 is to be expended? Already some solid construction work is going on in the bank and when it is completed, will provision be made for a boardroom and other accommodation for the bank? Will the Treasurer also ascertain whether the bank has issued instructions to any of its customers relating to a 10 per cent reduction of overdrafts?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I suggest to the honourable member that both those questions are outside my duty as Treasurer. The State Bank Board has the duty of carrying on a general banking business and it does not take instructions from me or consult me in any way in that regard. If it did I would have all and sundry coming to me for advances instead of going to the bank, and that would be wrong. If the bank advances money to anyone at the request of the Government it is only done after the Government has submitted the matter to the Industries Development Committee and after a document has been drawn up under which the Government guarantees the overdraft. The general banking of the State Bank does not come within the scope of the Loan Estimates.

Line passed.

Highways and Local Government Department, £10,000.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), when speaking on the first line, made some statements about roads that should be corrected, for he laid the blame for poor roads at the door of the roadmaker, whether the Highways Department or councils. Some damage has been caused by landholders endeavouring to store water through diverting it into a dam and sometimes water banks up and flows back on to the road. I do not know whether the member for Burra knows that finance for work on main roads is found by the Highways Department, but it is generally accepted that the department has been liberal in its grants. The cost of maintaining unsurfaced main roads has been assessed by the Highways Department at £80 a mile annually.

Mr. O'Halloran—How many miles of road will this £10,000 provide?

The Hon. T. Playford—This £10,000 is for the preparation of plans for a new bridge at Port Adelaide.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Then, Mr. Chairman, am I out of order?

The CHAIRMAN—It has been brought to my notice that the £10,000 provided is for preliminary work in connection with the construction of a new Jervois Bridge. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to that topic.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I have no remarks to make on that.

Line passed.

Lands, £107,000; Irrigation and Drainage, £596,000; Woods and Forests, £910,000—passed.

Railways, £2,320,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The sum of £4,000 is provided for completing the duplication of the Goodwood to Marino line. The House was told, in answer to a question recently, that the Railways Commissioner did not intend to continue the duplication of the line from Brighton to Marino. If that is so, why has Parliament been asked to vote so much money for the completion of this line? When inquiring into this question the Public Works Committee took evidence from the Railways Commissioner, Mr. Fargher, who said:—

By duplicating the line from Goodwood to Marino it will be possible to increase the frequency of the service at the peak periods consistent with the capacity of the terminal station at Adelaide to cope with such increase. Moreover, as the movement of each train will be unhampered by opposing train movements, it will be possible to operate the service punctually. It will also be possible to provide a time table which will ensure that arrival and

departure times of trains will best suit the needs of the travelling public. The duplication of the Goodwood to Marino line is an urgent necessity whether the line is to be electrified or not. With single line working it is not possible to provide a satisfactory service with the present steam locomotives and it will also not be practicable with electric traction.

I think that so far we have voted about £300,000 for work on this line, yet according to the latest report the duplication will not be carried out beyond Brighton. Despite this fact, this amount appears on the Estimates. As we have approved of the expenditure, someone must be at fault. Does the appearance of this item indicate that there has been an under estimate, or is there still work to the value of £4,000 still to be completed? Is this amount necessary to construct warning devices, or is it a belated attempt to indicate that the railway will be continued to Marino?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did not see the report referred to, but I presume the honourable member was referring to an answer to a question given in another place by the Minister of Railways to the Honourable E. Anthony. If that is so, I will read the question and answer, from which the honourable member will see that it refers to something entirely different to what he has mentioned. Yesterday in the Legislative Council the Honourable E. Anthony asked on notice:—

1. What progress is being made with the deviation of the railway to Tonsley Park?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the line to Marino?

To this the Minister of Railways replied:—

1. Most of the land required for the spur railway to Tonsley has been obtained and negotiations are in hand for the acquisition of the remainder. The construction of the railway itself will be undertaken to suit the requirements of Chrysler Australia Limited.

2. It is not intended to continue the line to Marino.

That question did not deal with the Goodwood to Marino duplication but with the continuation of the line that was proposed at one time, and even inquired into in a preliminary way by the Public Works Committee, in connection with the Tonsley spur line. It referred to the continuation of the line from Tonsley to Marino in order to make a circuit and considerably shorten the present route. It is not the intention of the Government at present to continue the line from Tonsley Park to Marino.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Although I accept that statement, I ask the Premier to ascertain

whether it is intended that the line will proceed beyond Brighton to Marino within a reasonable time?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will obtain a report from the Railways Commissioner on precisely what this amount will do. Quite obviously it is not intended for duplicating the line from Tonsley to Brighton, because it is only a small amount.

Mr. TAPPING—An amount of £596,000 is provided for 42 suburban diesel railcars and six spare bogies. Does this indicate that the Government intends to do away with steam trains?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The cost of eliminating steam trains from a capital point of view would be very great at present. It would be beyond the State's resources. It is doubtful whether it would be advisable to provide diesels on some lines where the traffic is light, but it is the Government's intention to purchase diesel locomotives to the fullest extent of its resources. I think the salvation of the railways rests largely in the use of these locomotives because of their effectiveness at a reduced cost.

Mr. HEASLIP—An amount of £216,000 is provided for 14 diesel mechanical railcars. The Treasurer intimated that these were for the improvement of country services. Can he say whether the Adelaide-Wilmington-Gladstone service, which is worse now than it was 30 years ago, will be improved as a result of that expenditure?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will bring the honourable member's representations before the Railways Commissioner and obtain a report as to what can be done to improve that service.

Mr. STOTT—Karoonda and adjacent areas have passenger services only on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and consequently the mail is only delivered thrice weekly. With modern farm practice it is frequently necessary for spare parts to be delivered urgently, but unless the local garages can arrange for them to be at the Adelaide station by 3 o'clock on the preceding afternoon the parts are not despatched on the next morning's train. The farmers, rather than wait, frequently travel to Mannum for the spare parts and local business people suffer loss of trade. It seems wrong that in these days areas within 100 miles of Adelaide should only have mail deliveries thrice weekly. Will the Treasurer ascertain whether a more adequate service can be provided?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will ask the Railways Commissioner to investigate this matter.

Line passed.

Harbors Board, £1,050,000.

Mr. TAPPING—An amount of £100,000 is provided for land purchases. For many years Parliament has approved of expenditure for the acquisition of land at Port Adelaide and on LeFevre Peninsula. Can the Treasurer intimate whether the board has secured all the land it requires or is it proposed to make more acquisitions?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—All the land required for the scheme has not yet been purchased. We are not in a position to make more money available at the moment. Had certain unavoidable commitments not been entered into this amount would not have appeared on the Estimates. With one or two exceptions the land required for the most immediate improvements has been acquired. I doubt whether we will be able to continue acquiring land for some time because long range investments absorb money required more urgently for other activities.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, £6,500,000.

Mr. HEASLIP—The sum of £23,000 is provided for the Booleroo Centre tank. At present Booleroo Centre tank is served by an underground supply of inferior water. It is stock water and is so poor it will not grow lawns. With regard to that £23,000, is it expected that some improvement will be provided? It seems to me that £23,000 spent for this type of water storage is unnecessary unless something is done in the future.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not very conversant with the details of this item, but I can assure the honourable member that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is extremely good in its future planning, and I presume that if a permanent water supply is piped into the district this tank will still be required as a service tank. I will obtain a report on that for the honourable member.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I rise merely with a desire to assist the member for Rocky River and those very good people in that area which formerly had the honour of being represented by myself. Many years ago when I represented the old district of Burra Burra there was a scheme known as the Spring Creek and Mount Remarkable reservoir scheme. The idea was to build a high level reservoir at the back of Mount Remarkable and a lower

level reservoir on Spring Creek. This matter was investigated by what was then known as the Hydraulic Engineers Department, which decided that because of the broken nature of the country it would be impossible to build successful storages in those areas. Records kept over a period of years at the back of Mount Remarkable show a 26in. average yearly rainfall, and on the catchment area of Spring Creek a 24in. average yearly rainfall. With the more modern idea of constructing dams, particularly the earth-filled clay core type of dam, I have often wondered since whether something could be done to use that very large quantity of water. This is a matter which the member for Rocky River could take up with the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether some use could now be made of the very valuable quantity of water available in those areas. In this way not only could water be supplied to Booleroo Centre and the other rather difficult adjacent areas, but possibly could also reduce the tension on the Morgan-Whyalla scheme by serving places like Port Pirie, Port Augusta, and Whyalla. I offer that suggestion to the honourable member because I think it is well worth taking up with the Engineer-in-Chief.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—In introducing the Estimates the Treasurer gave quite a long list of metropolitan areas in which sewers are contemplated. I was very disappointed to find that Belair, Blackwood and Eden Hills were not included on that list. That area of my electorate which is entirely unsewered is an area where the population has expanded very rapidly over the last few years and is still expanding. On becoming a member of this House one of the first matters with which I had to deal concerned the question of sewerage the Hills area. On May 25, 1955, the Premier informed me that an aerial survey of that area had been made and that contour plans had been prepared by the Photogrammetric Section of the Department of Lands and that a sewerage scheme was being designed. I had the same information some few months later, and in the intervening period a petition signed by 743 residents of the area had been prepared and presented to the Minister of Works. From that day there has been what one might describe as a completely deathly silence on the question of sewerage these areas. In view of the fact that these areas have not been mentioned in the Loan Estimates, and the information supplied to me last year, can the Treasurer tell me whether there are any plans to implement sewerage in these areas?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As Treasurer I cannot bring any Estimates into this House unless there has been a certificate that the works have been inquired into by the Public Works Standing Committee and a report furnished by that committee. As far as I know, work has been proceeding upon those plans and I believe the Public Works Standing Committee is beginning to investigate both the water and sewerage problems of that area. I know that preliminary investigations disclosed that the sewerage would be extremely expensive.

Mr. Shannon—I can tell the honourable the Treasurer that the committee has nothing before it on the question of sewerage.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Work has been proceeding upon those plans. Water and sewerage must necessarily go hand in hand, because there cannot be sewers unless there is an adequate supply of water. I understand that £1,300,000 is the latest estimated cost for sewerage this locality. I know that the development in the district is considerable but it is of a scattered nature and the terrain is rather difficult for the introduction of these particular schemes. I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. STOTT—There is no provision in these Estimates dealing with the River Murray flood.

The Hon. T. Playford—That is a matter which comes under the revenue Estimates.

Mr. STOTT—The Government should appoint a committee of inquiry to make an overall survey—

Mr. SHANNON—Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Are we to open the door to all sorts of matters which might or might not be considered by the Government, and which are not included in the Loan Estimates? We are dealing with the individual lines now.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member would be in order in speaking about River Murray weirs, dams and locks. I think he is in order.

The Hon. T. Playford—If the honourable member asks a question about River Murray weirs and locks he will get an answer, but he is not dealing with that matter.

The CHAIRMAN—I take it he intends to do so.

Mr. STOTT—Provision will have to be made to deal with the weirs and locks and there should be a proper inquiry into the matter. Unless it is done soon there will be no line on the Loan Estimates next year. The department is now doing an excellent job but it has a tremendous task ahead of it. Some years

ago Queensland had a flood problem connected with the Brisbane River and the Government appointed a committee to investigate how best to deal with it. Finally a solution was found.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member is out of order in referring to the Brisbane River. He should deal with a line on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. STOTT—I am linking up my remarks. Since the inquiry there has been no serious flooding in the river, notwithstanding that this year the rainfall was much above average. Our department should consider diverting some of the water in the Darling River catchment area before it reaches Wentworth and links up with the snow waters from the mountains. The Snowy River Commission has been planting trees in areas that have been denuded and this is a move the River Murray Commission should seriously consider. It should inspect all the locks and weirs along the river from its source to the sea. The work to be done would involve much expenditure but our Treasurer should consider the proposal. The matter of banks and levees will be dealt with under the revenue Estimates and I will refer to it then. The installation of locks and weirs will not alone deal with flood problems and the department should investigate what best to do so that provision can be made.

Mr. JENKINS—The sum of £405,000 is to be spent in country water districts, £3,000 of which is for a water supply for Goolwa and Middleton. I understand that investigations have been made into a site for a new reservoir at "The Glen" near Victor Harbour and recently the Minister said further enquiries would be made into the pipeline from Goolwa to link at the back of Port Elliot. Does this amount include the cost of preliminary investigations into this scheme?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. My last information was that the scheme was to connect with the pipeline for Goolwa and I would think the sum represented only the preliminary costs associated with the scheme. Concerning the suggestion that the Engineer-in-Chief investigate the River Murray catchment areas I point out that this Parliament has no authority outside this State's boundaries. Furthermore, the jurisdiction of the River Murray Commission is confined to the River Murray and does not extend to its tributaries. Neither the Engineer-in-Chief nor the commission, therefore, can take the action suggested. True, other State Governments have had this matter brought to their attention by the Federal Government and to some extent the question

of the catchment is receiving consideration, but the amount of £475,000 set aside this year is South Australia's share toward the cost of enlarging the Hume Reservoir.

Mr. BYWATERS—The sum of £8,200 is provided for the electrification of the Murray Bridge pumping station, chlorination, etc. and extension of mains. I am pleased this amount is included in the Estimates for Murray Bridge is a rapidly growing town and the tank on White Hill which serves it has more and more consumers drawing off it, which means that the position is becoming more acute. Is it intended to duplicate the tank?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I believe it is unnecessary to duplicate the tank although it may be necessary to duplicate mains or increase the capacity of the pumping station for it is the volume that can be pumped rather than the storage capacity that is the limiting factor. Last year a new main was installed and I know of no proposal to increase the capacity of the storage tank. A number of reticulation services are included under this item.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) made representations for a water supply for Manoorra and Waterloo and I believe that he was promised an investigation. The people of Manoorra have been particularly tolerant in this matter; more than 70 families live about six miles from the pipeline, yet they are still without water. Can they be given some priority, if not this year then next year?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the matter investigated, ascertain the requirements of the district and discuss the matter with the honourable member.

Mr. LAUCKE—The sum of £23,800 is provided for mains, services, and minor works in the Warren water district. Does this include the provision of a water supply for the Maranga district, which has been seeking water for many years but has not been given a supply because the pressure in the pipes was not sufficient?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined for the honourable member and discuss it with him.

Mr. JENNINGS—The sum of £234,200 is provided for reticulation sewers in the Adelaide district. Does this include the cost of the extension of sewerage to Vale Park beyond North Walkerville?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will get the information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Architect-in-Chief, £6,396,000.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand that on the Loan Estimates two years ago an amount was provided for two prefabricated classrooms for the Peterborough high school, but nothing has been done yet. More recently, because of a change in education policy, the question of adult education has become very important in a number of country centres. I am pleased to know that the staff of the Peterborough high school has co-operated magnificently in popularizing adult education in the community. I believe it is one of the most important things which can be undertaken outside ordinary activities of the Education Department and will have the effect of taking the people off the streets, particularly those who have just left school, thus reducing juvenile delinquency. Attendance at the Peterborough high school is growing, and it would appear that in the next four years we can expect an increase of 60 per cent. Even at the moment the school is somewhat crowded. I understand that the two new classrooms referred to were to be used for dressmaking and drawing. I would now suggest that there should be three of the Nuriootpa type classrooms. This would enable a small theatre with stage and other facilities to be provided for working in association with the adult education group. It could be used for the normal services of the department also. If this matter is still not extant, can it be revived and proceeded with as soon as possible?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Provision is made for portable classrooms as required to the extent of £450,000. I will bring the honourable member's remarks under the notice of the Minister of Education.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I appreciate the increased amounts provided in recent years for technical schools, and suggest that even larger amounts be made available for this purpose because of our growing industrial expansion.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In view of the large number of children enrolled at the Forbes school could a priority be granted for the erection of an infants' school at this centre?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have that matter examined and see if this can be done.

Mr. TAPPING—An amount of £210,000 is provided for additional accommodation at the Northfield Mental Hospital. Will this be sufficient to take up the lag and provide for immediate future needs?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot give an assurance that it will. The number of new patients coming in is considerable, but we are slowly taking up the lag.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £9,190,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Provision is made for conversion expenses in connection with loans and also an amount of £14,412 is set aside for the purchase of land under the Public Parks Act. Will the Treasurer explain these items?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The first item the honourable member mentioned is in regard to the cost of floating public loans. Each State has to take its share of publicity costs, discounts and brokerage. The second matter he mentioned relates to the Public Parks Act under which the Government subsidizes the purchase of land by local authorities. Sometimes land is acquired for recreation purposes generally, and in many cases it is used by school children as playgrounds.

Mr. HEASLIP—The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board is being granted a loan for meat halls, chilling facilities, slaughtering accommodation, etc. The same amount appeared in the Loan Estimates last year, and I was told it was for chilling facilities. For how long will this line appear on the Loan Estimates, how much is involved, and is it to enlarge a monopoly that is already too big?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The amount voted last year was not taken up by the Abattoirs Board, but the amount this year is for miscellaneous works that the board considered necessary. This sum is not an expenditure by the Government, but an advance to the board, which is responsible for its repayment, with interest. I can probably get for the honourable member some details of the work to be carried out. The State advances the necessary loan moneys to the board to maintain and enlarge its facilities.

Mr. JENKINS—An amount of £260,000 is provided for the Electricity Trust for transmission lines. Does that cover the cost of taking over the Harbour Electricity Company at Victor Harbour?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It would be purely for transmission lines, but I will get details for the honourable member. It would not be for taking over any electricity undertaking.

Mr. BYWATERS—An amount is provided for the Electricity Trust for plant and appliances, such as ranges. Several people in my district have told me that there is a long wait—up to 12 months—for appliances on hire from the trust. What is the reason for that?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member's information is probably correct,

because the trust's prime consideration is the provision of electricity. To some extent it provides appliances, but if it financed all the hiring equipment required it would not have sufficient funds to erect power stations and transmission lines. Any additional money that can be provided for appliances will be made available.

Mr. JENNINGS—An amount of £30,000 is provided for the Tramways Trust for the restoration of roadways. The Enfield Council has told me it is concerned about the urgent need for the provision of properly constructed road pavements at bus stops to enable vehicles to draw into the side of the road so as to permit passengers to get on or off safely. Many such stopping places are required throughout the metropolitan area, and I know some councils have made representations to the trust only to be advised that it has not sufficient funds available for this purpose beyond its statutory obligation to contribute to the highways fund. Will the Government ask the trust to provide satisfactory stopping places?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The amount provided is for the restoration of roads after tramlines have been taken up. When a tramline is discontinued the trust must take up the track and remake the road.

Mr. TAPPING—An amount of £544,000 is provided for fuel buses for the Tramways Trust. For some years Parliament has allocated funds for the trust and I am worried about the progress it is making. Of course, it is now substituting buses for trams, which will cost much money. Can the Treasurer give the House some assurance about the trust's financial prospects?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This amount has not yet been spent, so obviously no benefit could be seen from it yet. The trust's report is before the House now, and members can see from it that it is making a substantial reduction in costs through its new policy. I believe that when that policy is fully implemented the trust will go a long way towards making itself much more self-supporting. We must recognize that every public transport service in the world is in difficulties today. If the trust is required to make itself completely self-supporting it is imperative that fares will have to be increased very steeply. However, that does not appeal to me as being a very good solution, because it is immediately reflected in the index figures of the cost of living as it quickly puts up wages; it is just like a dog chasing its tail.

Although in general probably very much objection can be raised to the granting of subsidies, fairly strong arguments can be used for them in the maintenance of a good transport service. This money is on loan to the trust, which is responsible for the payment of interest and for repayments in due course, and it is not involved in the working expenses at present. It is an advance similar to that made to the abattoirs.

Mr. COUMBE—The report of the trust for the year ended June 30 last was tabled today and showed the effect of monies voted in previous years. In the last three years the deficits have been progressively reduced. In 1953-54 it was £584,000, in 1954-55 it was reduced to £512,000, and last year to £430,000, so it would appear that its rehabilitation scheme will be successful. Last year 2,000,000 fewer passengers were carried, but the mileage travelled by buses and trams increased by 500,000 miles, and although the average passenger paid one penny a trip more than in the previous year the revenue for each traffic mile was increased by 2.154d. The trust appears to be reducing its working losses because of the advances made to it, and because it is avoiding the necessity for maintenance of costly tram tracks.

From August, 1955, the trust switched over from its own generator at Port Adelaide to the mains of the Electricity Trust, and this saved £30,000 a year. The Treasurer has indicated that the money to be voted for restoration of roadways will be used on those roads from which tram tracks have been removed. I have one criticism to make, which is that the buses go along roads never intended to be used by heavy vehicles, and as a result the councils are faced with enormous reconstruction programmes. I suggest that the trust should carefully investigate this matter before running buses along these roads, and that it should at least conduct a pavement test through the Highways Department. As this matter is important to many councils, I ask the Premier to bring it before the trust.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will be pleased to do that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Will the Treasurer indicate whether the trust is a government body and whether it is not possible for it to borrow its own money on the open market. I also ask who is responsible for the trust and who is it responsible to. As I think it is admitted the Loan moneys are insufficient, perhaps they could be spent directly on government instrumentalities.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The trust is appointed by the Government. It is a semi-governmental body and would undoubtedly have the greatest difficulty in borrowing on the open market. Semi-governmental bodies all over Australia are finding the greatest difficulty in borrowing. They can only borrow at a high rate of interest, and if they do so they lose the Commonwealth Sinking Fund payment.

Line passed.

Grand total, £28,135,000, passed, and resolution agreed to by the House.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend moneys for public works and purposes and to enact other provisions incidental thereto.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the expenditure of £28,135,000 and is based on the Loan Estimates which have been dealt with by this House. Clause 4 gives power to the Treasurer to arrange for the borrowing of £25,475,000 which, together with repayments to the Loan Fund estimated at £2,660,000, will provide the moneys necessary for the expenditure set out in the First Schedule.

Clause 5 provides for the issue of the amount of £28,135,000 from the Loan Fund, and gives the Treasurer authority to increase the amount for any line if the estimate is insufficient, provided that the total loan expenditure for the year shall not exceed £28,135,000. Clause 6 authorizes the Treasurer to arrange for the borrowing of £1,100,000 and to disburse that sum for the purposes set out in the Second Schedule. This authority is necessary to confirm the approval given by His Excellency the Governor, under the provisions of the Public Finance Act, for the expenditure during 1955-56 of £1,100,000 in excess of the amount authorized in the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1955.

Clause 7 authorizes the Treasurer to borrow, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Bill, the amount required for the payment of discounts, charges, and expenses incurred in

borrowing under this Bill. Clause 8 provides that if at any time insufficient moneys are in the Loan Fund for the purposes of the works set out in the First Schedule the Treasurer may use other moneys at his disposal, but any moneys used for this purpose shall be repaid from the Loan Fund as soon as there is sufficient money in that fund to make the repayment.

Clause 9 authorizes the Treasurer to borrow an amount not exceeding £7,000,000 in 1957-58 pending the passing of the Public Purposes Loan Act for that year. This authority is necessary because the moneys from the Loan Council are made available on a monthly basis, and unless the Treasurer is authorized to receive the amounts made available in the months of July, August and September, this State would be out of Loan Funds. Clause 11 authorizes the Treasurer to receive grants made by the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act and to open a special account to take credit for those grants, and to pay the moneys to the Minister of Local Government for the purposes specified in the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act.

Clause 12 authorizes the expenditure of £3,000 on the improvement of the Meyer Recreation Oval at Osborne. This authority is necessary if the work is to be carried out as the Harbors Board does not possess the authority under its own Act. Under Clause 13 the Public Purposes Loan Act shall commence on July 1, 1956. Honourable members will see that the Bill is in accordance with the Loan Estimates. It makes one or two necessary adjustments in our public finances to meet the circumstances under which the Loan Council now works. For instance unless I have authority next year to receive the moneys before the Estimates are approved in Parliament, this State will lose its Loan Council allocation because the Commonwealth is now making allocations on a monthly basis. The last item—the Meyer recreation field—concerns a playing field for Harbors Board employees. Under the Harbors Board Act the board, strictly speaking, has no power to spend money for recreation purposes. I am assured that this recreation ground is greatly appreciated, and for that reason special approval for it is sought by Parliament although it was not included in the Loan Estimates before the House.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I support the second reading. I agree that we should make provision for the expenditure of the Loan money next year, as explained

by the Treasurer, in accordance with the formula which has been developed between the State and the Commonwealth. I agree also with the extra provision of £3,000 for the Meyer recreation reserve which I think is a very worthy project. I have great admiration for Mr. Meyer, the general manager of the Harbors Board, because he is a very efficient officer. I think it is fitting that his services to the State should be recognized by the provision of this amount, and it will have the effect of assuring the multifarious employees of the Harbors Board that Parliament has complete confidence in Mr. Carl Meyer.

I wish particularly to mention the fact that on a previous occasion, after a very lengthy debate both sections of the press announced that Loan Estimates for a considerable amount were passed without very much discussion. The point I wish to make is that these Loan Estimates have been subject to a very meticulous discussion in this House. They were introduced by the Honourable the Treasurer with the best explanations that I have ever known. As Leader of the Opposition I have often asked the Treasurer to give a greater explanation of Loan Estimates. Last year he

acceded to our request to a considerable extent, and this year he has given us very lucid explanations. On behalf of the Opposition I thank the Treasurer, and I believe I can tell him that his action has been mainly responsible for the lines being passed tonight without very much discussion.

Honourable members have exercised their right to discuss lines in which their electorates were concerned, but the broad general principles of the Loan Estimates were so well explained and so well debated on the first line that we have been able to pass the Estimates in a comparatively short time. That does not indicate that members of Parliament are not cognizant of their duties in considering questions of Loan finance or other financial matters. These Loan Estimates have been very properly discussed and the two items mentioned by the Treasurer are worthy items, and I support the second reading of the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 18, at 2 p.m.