

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, February 6, 1957.

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

QUESTIONS.

STIRLING TO QUORN RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—About a month ago it was rumoured that the Commonwealth Railways Department intended to close the Stirling to Quorn railway, and on inquiring of the South Australian Railways Department I was informed that that line might soon be closed temporarily for certain relaying and that during the temporary closing road transport would be provided between Quorn and Port Augusta. As the rumours persist, can the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Railways, say whether the line is to be closed permanently or only temporarily?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will inquire and bring down a report tomorrow or early next week.

REFUSAL TO ACCEPT RENT.

Mr. TAPPING—During the past couple of months I have received a number of complaints concerning landlords that refuse to accept rent after giving tenants notice to quit, even though such notice has no legal value, not having the backing of the court. If a tenant is four weeks in arrears with his rent there is a case for eviction. Will the Premier ascertain whether the Housing Trust has received similar complaints in order that something may be done by amending the legislation to protect tenants in such circumstances?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined and get a report, but it may take some time.

RENTALS OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED HOUSES.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Premier a reply to my questions asked yesterday regarding rents paid by Government employees in Government-owned homes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have investigated the matter and find that a Cabinet decision was made on November 27, 1956, as follows:—

Approved as recommended. Adjustments to be made as from October 1, 1954, except where otherwise recommended.

The honourable member will see that the recommendation was approved by Cabinet and made retrospective to October 1, 1954, which

was approximately the time the matter first arose. My secretary made inquiries for me this morning on the honourable member's complaints and has reported to me as follows:—

The Public Service Board has not yet implemented Sir Kingsley Paine's report, but expects to do so in the near future. The matter has been held up awaiting a further report from the Housing Trust. The board considers that, as Sir Kingsley's assessments were as at October, 1954, there should be some adjustments since then, and referred the matter to the Housing Trust. The board feels that if reductions are to be made retrospective to 1954 some justifiable increases may also apply.

It is rather a serious matter that the Public Service Board has not carried out a Cabinet decision given many weeks ago and has in fact questioned Cabinet's decision. The matter will be taken up with the board and I have no doubt that the Cabinet decision will prevail.

WEST COAST IRON ORE DEPOSITS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I am given to understand that huge deposits of iron ore amounting to 1,000,000,000 tons have been discovered on the West Coast near the East-West railway line just north of Thevenard. Does the Premier know anything about it and, if so, can he give the House any information?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Loveday, member for the district, also approached me on this matter and I made inquiries. The Government Geologist informs me that samples of iron ore have been provided from an area somewhere near Commonwealth Hill, which I understand is about 400 miles north of the East-West railway line. The grade of the ore was quite high—about 60 per cent—but how substantial the deposit is and the nature of the ore are not known. An aerial survey will be made which may prove whether any substantial tonnage is available. From an economic point of view the deposit is badly placed as it is so far from a seaport and this would involve a costly road or rail haul to any port for shipment or to any place where it could be used. The matter will be investigated and a report obtained in due course.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD RELIEF.

Mr. STOTT—Under the heading "Bank liquidity up but credit tight" the following paragraph appeared in the press:—

The sharp seasonal upswing in reserves abroad and the usual seasonal increase in treasury bill issues, coupled with tight bank credit has resulted in a sharp rise in bank liquidity.

In view of that statement and the improved economic condition of the nation resulting from higher wool prices and the buoyancy of our financial reserves, coupled with the fact that the Queensland and New South Wales Governments have already approached the Commonwealth Government through the Loan Council for a further issue of treasury bills, and in view of the Premier's reply to me yesterday of the intention to make loans available to settlers affected by the Murray floods, will he now approach the Commonwealth Government to obtain further money by the issue of Treasury bills to flood victims, thus making available an additional source of revenue to those people in order to restore productivity in the important Murray Valley of this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—All moneys borrowed by the State have to be approved by the Loan Council. For a number of years the Commonwealth Bank has been prepared to make available to the State a small amount of Treasury bills, always on condition that they are repayable before June 30. If they are not repayable by that time they have to be funded under a long term account under the conditions of the financial agreement. The Treasury bills are not, as the honourable member expects, a good thing to have around one's neck; they are a bad thing because they represent a large amount of money which is liable for repayment at short demand.

Mr. Stott—They should be used in cases of emergency.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—They could be used to finance a lag of revenue of the State, but they have to be repaid before June 30, and that is in accordance with the Commonwealth Constitution. Obviously, that money could not be applied to the purpose the honourable member has in mind because settlers on the river would not be in a position to repay it before June 30. I promised him yesterday that I would set out the conditions under which the State Bank would make loans available to settlers affected by the flood. I have obtained the following report:—

(1) All references for finance to come to the State Bank from the chairman of the Lord Mayor's River Murray Flood Relief Fund (Sir Kingsley Paine). This will be done after the committee has considered the application for relief and decided upon the provision to be made from the relief fund.

(2) The bank's decision to be conveyed to the chairman of the fund, Sir Kingsley Paine.

(3) The loans to be repayable over periods not exceeding eight years.

(4) Current overdraft interest rates to be charged by the bank.

(5) Suitable security to be forthcoming in each case.

(6) The Government to guarantee the bank against loss in the case of these special loans either by legislation or by looking after any losses by the application of cancelled securities against bank debt to the Treasurer.

Mr. Stott—Would that be a 100 per cent guarantee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, for any losses that arose out of particular loans. The only matter that gives me any concern is the last paragraph, and at present I am looking at the legal position of the Treasurer with respect to giving the bank that guarantee. I am not sure whether I have the authority to give it or whether some approval by Parliament would be required before it could be given.

Mr. Stott—If you need special legislation will you bring it down during the present session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If it needs legislation I will undoubtedly take action along those lines, although I do not think it is necessary. I will take the precaution to see that it is in accordance with the Public Finance Act before taking a step in this direction. I have no doubt that if I came to Parliament asking for approval to guarantee these advances, Parliament would approve. It is not from that point of view that I am holding the matter up, but to see whether I have the authority to give the bank the necessary guarantee.

Mr. KING—Some time ago I discussed with His Honour Sir Kingsley Paine the possibility of assisting people whose homes had been badly damaged by the flood and who should perhaps be settled in localities above flood danger level. The question has been raised whether in such cases the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund could make a grant sufficient to pay a deposit on a type of house such people could afford to buy on reasonable terms. The persons concerned could use salvageable materials from their old houses to build part of their new homes or outbuildings. Can the Premier indicate whether such a scheme would be supported by the Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Earlier this afternoon I stated the terms of loans to Murray settlers, and the question raised by the honourable member was one of the matters considered when that programme

was designed. His proposal has the Government's support, for it believes that if a house has been badly damaged it is much better to place the structure, if possible, above the reach of any future flood so as not to have recurring damage.

Mr. JENKINS—In reply to my question yesterday the Minister of Lands said that pumps were discharging water at the rate of 700 acre feet every 24 hours from flooded lands. How long does he estimate it will take to dewater the Jervois swamps? As pumps become available, could they be used on Woods Point adjoining these swamps, and further, will every effort be made to apply any surplus pumping plants available either from Government departments or private enterprise?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I think I gave a fairly full story yesterday with regard to dewatering. An engineer is now stationed at Murray Bridge, and in fact two homes were purchased so that engineers could live there during the dewatering period and while the banks are being rebuilt, so there will always be engineers on the spot to deal with matters as they arise. Once dewatering is commenced the engineers intend to continue with it. It is hoped that they will be working on all swamps at one period. I made inquiries this morning and found that no hardship had been claimed by settlers on private swamp lands. If they have any claims they should make them immediately, because the committee will soon be deciding on a closing date. If the member has any case in mind and gives me the name of the settler I can promise speedy attention.

Mr. BYWATERS—A little over a week ago a deputation of private swamp owners met the Premier, and following that a reply was sent to their committee stating that their request had been put in writing at the request of the Premier and had been forwarded to the Minister of Lands. In view of that I was rather surprised at the reply given by the Minister that no case had been put by private swamp owners. Has this application been handed to him, or if not, what has happened to it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I received a deputation from private swamp owners asking for the Government to take action to restore private swamps in exactly the same way as it is restoring Government swamps, but I pointed out that in my opinion the matter could not be dealt with in that way. In the first place, funds were not available, so it would be necessary to make application to

the Lord Mayor's Relief Fund. The committee subsequently sent down to me some very general information covering the acreages of the respective swamps and the number of settlers on them, but there was nothing in the nature of an individual application. The Lord Mayors Relief Fund considered those matters, and in reply to a question yesterday I outlined the procedure laid down by the committee for these matters. That procedure should be examined by the swamp holders, who should make applications in accordance with it.

BURNING OFF BY RAILWAYS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. GOLDNEY—My question relates to burning off operations alongside railway lines. A few weeks ago when a fire started in the Redhill district it was first thought by some of the residents that it was caused by burning off operations along railway lines. Will the Minister of Works request the Minister of Railways to take up with the Commissioner of Railways the matter of whether, when there is prolific growth along railway lines, some arrangement could not be made between the department, owners of adjoining land and emergency fire fighting services for their assistance to make it safer to burn off along railway lines?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I think it is universally known that my colleague is an enthusiast in regard to fire fighting and fire prevention. If there is any man who is more intensely interested in the matter I have yet to meet him, so I would hesitate to think that he or the Commissioner has done anything to aggravate the danger of bush fires, but rather has done everything to prevent them. As a matter of fact, the only effective fire breaks I have seen are those made by the department. However, I will take up this matter with my colleague.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS.

Mr. STEPHENS—I have received the following letter dated January 29, from a school teacher:—

I heard in the news at midday today of the death of an eleven-year-old girl who with her mother and two other children were knocked down by a car passing a bus which had stopped to let them cross North Terrace. For a long time I have been grieved by this practice which I see carried on almost daily on the Port Road at the crossing from the Port Adelaide schools at one of which I am a teacher. So often have I seen others hesitate and have done so myself when a motorist stops and waves us across because another vehicle showing no sign of slowing down is approaching from the right

of the stationary vehicle. I have often wondered that more children have not been murdered by these mannerless brutes who disregard the rights of pedestrians; it is few enough who stop, and one sometimes sees their impatience when we do not cross for fear of other traffic, so that possibly some of those courteous drivers will not stop another time. I have written to the Port council about it, but it seems a law must be passed and policed before the roads are safe even at marked crossings. Can you bring this before the House?

Will the Premier refer this letter to the State Traffic Committee for any necessary action?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will investigate the matter and see whether it requires reference to the Traffic Committee.

MINERS' RIGHTS IN SUBDIVISION.

Mr. LAUCKE—I refer to what could well be described as a fantastic intrusion and absurd impediment to a desirable subdivision for building purposes at Teatree Gully. Approximately 32 acres of land adjacent to the Main North-East Road and Hancocks Road has been purchased by the Wakefield Land Company Proprietary Limited for subdivision. The subdivision has been approved by the Town Planner. Roads have been constructed by the company and, where necessary, the land has been levelled, resulting in excellent and valuable building sites. On January 30 miner's right No. 9097 was pegged in the heart of the subdivision, covering approximately 70 building blocks. Will the Premier have an immediate inquiry made to determine the validity of the miner's claim?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Without examining the matter I imagine that if the mining claim was not valid the peg would have been pulled out before this by the owners of the land. The mining laws of this State do, to some extent, impinge the Real Property Act and there is sometimes conflict between the two laws. I will have the matter examined.

PLANTING OF SHADE TREES.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is a common sight during the hot weather to see sheep and great stock endeavouring to huddle in the shade cast by the all too few trees on farms. The value of shade for stock is inestimable and too few of our country holdings are provided with belts of trees for the purpose. The panorama of vast areas of this State at this time of the year is depressing owing to the absence of trees. Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared, in the best interests of the State, to sponsor a tree planting programme and provide the

forestry experts who would be needed to give advice to those desiring to plant trees?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I fully appreciate the importance of the matter, but for a number of years active steps have been taken to encourage and assist the planting of trees, not only on agricultural properties, but in any places where they would be of advantage. The department has constantly advocated the provision of shade and shelter trees on farms and has published from time to time in the *Agricultural Journal*, and in other readily available pamphlets, lists of trees suitable for various localities; and the Forestry Department has provided from its nurseries trees for those who require them. These services are already established, and if people are not aware of them I would be glad if some publicity can be given them. I can assure the honourable member that both departments are very anxious to co-operate in this matter.

INTERSTATE RACING SERVICE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Premier take up with the appropriate authorities the question of providing an earlier betting service for those who attend race meetings and desire to bet on interstate races? I understand that up to six or eight months ago they had an earlier service, but the time has since been curtailed and now does not afford a reasonable opportunity for those who desire to make investments.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined.

FILMING OF PAVING THE WAY.

Mr. JENKINS—A motion picture company is at present filming *Robbery Under Arms* in this State, and there are indications that there is a future for the motion picture industry in South Australia. The book entitled *Paving the Way* by Simpson Newland, C.M.G., is a novel based on the early history of our South Coast and whaling activities in 1836-37. The story is wrapped around a young girl—

The SPEAKER—The honourable member cannot make a speech, but must ask his question.

Mr. JENKINS—Most of the scenery and topography in the locality is still unspoilt and should be quite suitable for a motion picture. Will the Premier, through the appropriate channels, have an approach made to the producers of *Robbery Under Arms* to induce them to examine the possibilities I have outlined?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member's request has already been

complied with. At the same time that I submitted to the company in question the book *Robbery Under Arms* as a possible medium for a picture I also submitted *Paving the Way*, pointing out that that book also contained a very interesting plot and some very good information on the early settlement of South Australia. That was done probably three or four years ago.

ALLOWANCES TO POLICE OFFICERS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—On December 11 I wrote to the Chief Secretary in reference to the reduction in the allowance for police officers using their own vehicles, particularly the reduction from 9½ to 8.4d. in the Kingoonya and Tarcoola areas. Has the Premier any information on the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will get it for the honourable member.

FOOTROT REGULATIONS AND FORMALIN PRICE.

Mr. HARDING—Will the Minister of Agriculture confer with a deputation of the South Australian Stockowners Association on the regulations now being considered in connection with footrot before the final draft is submitted to Cabinet? Has the Minister anything to report from the Prices Commissioner regarding the increase in the price of formalin?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Regarding the first part of the honourable member's question, only yesterday I approached the secretary of

the Stockowners Association on the matter and the honourable member will be glad to know that the association will be consulted before the regulations are approved. There has been a communication from the authorities regarding the supply of formalin, which I thought had been conveyed to the honourable member during the Christmas recess; offhand I cannot recall the details. I will look into the matter and make the information available to the honourable member.

COUNCIL CONTRIBUTIONS TO ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I have been advised by the West Torrens council that the council's contribution to the Royal Adelaide Hospital has been increased for the current year from £1,560 to £7,424, an increase of £5,864. On July 25 last the council wrote to the secretary of the Hospitals Department protesting against the increase in the contribution and challenging the basis upon which the contribution appears to have been calculated, indicating therein how completely unrealistic and inequitable was the basis. Since then the matter has been considered exhaustively by the Municipal Association and in the deputation which waited on the Minister of Health, and in subsequent correspondence, the reasons for the association's objection to the basis of calculation were made abundantly clear. The following table indicates how inequitable is this basis of calculation:—

Council.	Receivable rate revenue, 1956.	Population.	Contribution.
	£	£	£
Enfield	203,185	55,000	2,827
Woodville	224,688	70,000	4,802
Marion	162,952	38,000	5,409
West Torrens	156,727	38,000	7,424

The Municipal Association, of which the West Torrens council is a constituent member, has made out its own case in this matter, the submissions in connection with which the council is in complete accord. On the surface at least it will be agreed that there is injustice and discrimination between councils, particularly as it applies to the West Torrens council. Has the Hospitals Department considered the proposals of the Municipal Association regarding councils' contributions to the maintenance of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and what is the decision? If not, will the matter be reviewed in view of the strong representations of the Municipal Association?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A deputation waited on me in connection with this matter, and it has also been the subject of discussions with the Minister of Health. The Municipal Association has stated that it is not opposed to the gross amount to be collected which, speaking from memory, is about £70,000; it does not consider that to be an unfair allocation, taking into account the amount that is collected by rating of the various country hospitals. The argument involves how much each district shall pay. The Municipal Association carried a resolution in connection with this matter, but before the resolution had actually reached the Government

objection had been forwarded from individual councils, who stated that under no circumstances would they support the resolutions of the Municipal Association. This is a matter which is very fiercely contested between the various councils. The method of contribution is very similar to that used by the councils themselves when they contributed to the Infectious Diseases Hospital. I informed the deputation that if the Municipal Association made recommendations for alterations to the system, and those recommendations were supported by the constituent members, the Government would be prepared to consider such alterations.

Mr. Riches—Do these recommendations have to be unanimous?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, but they should at least have substantial support because it would involve a change in the system. Under no circumstances will we accept a majority recommendation for a change based on the formula of population, which is what some councils are trying to bring in. If we based the amount to be paid upon a formula involving population, we would find that councils which were almost completely commercial and therefore the most wealthy would be paying by far the lowest amount compared with their wealth. Population is therefore not the best method of determining this matter. My own personal view is that the best method would be the adoption of the waterworks rating, which is applied uniformly throughout the metropolitan area and is not a rating which is either held down or puffed up for other purposes as some councils' rates are. The notices have already been issued for this year, and it is not possible to alter them. The Government is, however, prepared to consider recommendations next year, always providing that the recommendations do not involve a reduction in the total amount to be provided.

NEW ERA PRISON FARM.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Can the Premier say what progress has been made on the New Era prison farm and whether the preliminary work can be expedited so that plantings may be made this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government is anxious to proceed with this project, which has been reported on by the Public Works Committee and approved by Cabinet, and I believe it will be possible to do what the honourable member suggests.

PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE.

Mr. RICHES—Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the present state of the bridge at Port Augusta, its future, and whether the department intends to undertake repairs immediately?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Yes.

EMERGENCY HOUSING FOR MURRAY AREAS.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Irrigation a report on the transfer of temporary homes from Taperoo and the Police Barracks to centres in the Murray River districts, and can he say whether further houses will be made available soon?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—In November or December last the Government made available 19 temporary houses from Taperoo and eight from the Police Barracks. Investigations have been made by Housing Trust officers in various river centres, and at Berri, where originally it was stated that 15 were required, firm applications have now been received for only 11. At Barmera, where two were asked for originally, none is now required. The two that were earlier required at Cobdogla are not now required and at Kingston-on-Murray the one temporary trust home originally requested is not now required. At Moorook the original application for one temporary house and at Mypolonga the application for four temporary houses have been confirmed. At Mypolonga no land is available on which these homes could be built and the department has undertaken the subdivision of an area adjoining the town into 17 allotments. The Housing Trust has selected four of these as sites for the homes required and is ready to proceed with their erection when the land becomes available. Survey work is now in hand, materials for extensions of the domestic water service to the 17 allotments have been ordered and arrangements are being made for the laying of the services to commence as soon as they arrive. At Murray Bridge seven persons showed an interest in the temporary accommodation scheme originally, but only one firm application has been received by the trust. Of the 27 homes referred to, about seven are still available.

LINCOLN HIGHWAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, say when work will be resumed on the Lincoln Highway between Port Neill and the junction with the Whyalla Road?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will get a reply from my colleague and bring it down as early as possible.

MILLICENT POLICE STATION.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Premier a further reply to my question of yesterday concerning the Millicent Police Station?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Commissioner of Police reports:—

No application has been made for any police building at Millicent and I doubt whether any application would, at the present juncture, be justified. I understand that the existing office accommodation meets the normal requirements of the public, but the needs of Millicent will be kept in mind and reviewed when submitting the next building programme for this department.

HUNGRY HILL WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS—During the recess I wrote to the Minister of Works, requesting an improved water supply for the Hungry Hill area near Murray Bridge and asking that work be commenced on the Pallamana scheme, which would considerably improve the Hungry Hill supply. Has the Minister a reply to my representations?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—Yes, and I believe it is entirely satisfactory. A large scheme has been approved, the first instalment being as far as Hungry Hill, and work will commence this financial year.

CONDITIONS IN SKIN STORES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In recent years a number of people trading as skin dealers in the country have set up stores for the purpose of packing, sorting and despatching, and I am reliably informed that in most of them facilities for washing hands and dining are not provided, with the result that workers sit on dead wool and go out carrying an offensive odour because they cannot wash themselves. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether any Act compels the provision of such facilities, and if so, which department polices it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know, no Act other than the Health Act covers an offensive trade, but I will have the matter investigated.

PORT AUGUSTA HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—Last session and during the recess I brought to the notice of the Minister of Education the need for additional classrooms at the Port Augusta High School before the commencement of the first term in 1957. The Minister informed me that the Architect-

in-Chief's Department would commence building new classrooms and have them completed towards the end of February so that they could be occupied, although not painted. Consequently, I was somewhat astounded yesterday to see that instead of additional classrooms being erected, two had been taken down and apparently were to be shifted to another part of the ground so that the additional classrooms could be erected. Unless these classrooms can be made ready for re-occupation between now and next Tuesday there will be worse confusion at the high school than had been expected. Will the Minister look into the situation to see that something is done to avoid what now appears to be a very difficult position?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have a large number of similarly difficult situations, which I am endeavouring to cope with. I shall see if it is possible to expedite the construction of these classrooms, but I cannot give any assurance that it will be done as soon as the honourable member desires. There are simply not enough classrooms available to provide all the needs in the given time.

ENFIELD—COLONEL LIGHT GARDENS BUS ROUTE.

Mr. COUMBE—I read in the press in the last few days of the conversion of tram services to bus services on the Kensington-Henley Beach route, and I understand that the conversion of the Enfield-Colonel Light Gardens route was to have commenced last year. Although the Prospect Corporation approved the scheme, some of the corporations in the southern areas held it up because they could not agree with the Municipal Tramways Trust as to certain road-making work. Will the Minister of Works ascertain when this conversion is likely to take place, as the tram tracks along the Main North Road and the road itself are in a very bad condition? This road carries most of the traffic which goes to the north of the city and is under the control of the Highways Department. Nothing can be done about its reconstruction until the tram tracks are removed. Will the Minister see if agreement can be reached with a view to the early introduction of bus services?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will get a full report from my colleague. The work has been held up not for want of attention by the Highways Department or the Minister, but because of the facts mentioned by the honourable member. To date the Unley Corporation has not been in agreement with what is proposed.

SOUTH ROAD IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On the Australia Day holiday much inconvenience was caused to many people because of the bottleneck on South Road, and a similar position arose 12 months previously. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from the Minister of Roads on what improvements could be made to the South Road to enable traffic to move without interruption, which might include its widening from what was known as the Lady MacDonnell Hotel to the top of Tapley's Hill?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will do as the honourable member suggests.

DEWATERING SWAMP AT WOODS POINT.

Mr. JENKINS—Mr. F. Gale, of Woods Point, spoke to me this morning regarding the dewatering of a private swamp there. The pumping plant is in good repair, but three lengths of the 24in. concrete delivery pipe have collapsed and are beyond repair by the settlers, and thus urgent dewatering work is held up. Will the Minister of Works consider helping these people by contacting Mr. Gale through his engineers with a view to repairing the main or helping the settlers to do so in order that they can get the water off the swamp?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will take up the matter immediately.

DEMOLITION OF HOMES FOR PETROL STATIONS.

Mr. TAPPING—I have received the following letter from the Town Clerk of Port Adelaide:—

At a meeting of the council on January 17, it was resolved that the council expresses its concern with respect to the activities of oil companies acquiring and demolishing good homes in particular areas and substitution with service stations considered unnecessary to public demand.

The council supports you in your approach to the Government with regard to this problem and urges you to make further representations to the Premier so that effective control may be instituted.

Three months ago a major oil company acquired and demolished a home at Largs Bay worth £8,000 and, about eight weeks ago two homes on Jetty Road, Largs Bay, were bought for £18,000 for demolition. The council thinks it is wrong to construct commercial buildings in a residential area. Will the Premier consider introducing legislation similar to that operating some years ago which gave a Minister of the Crown power to either reject or agree to such demolitions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No.

NEW PAYNEHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS—Can the Minister of Education say whether the new Payneham primary school will open on Tuesday next?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The main building has been constructed, but some desirable improvements in the amenities have not yet been completed. However, it has been decided to open the school on Tuesday, but teachers and the children will be subject to some inconvenience for the time being.

PRICE OF EGGS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of all the items affecting the family budget the price of eggs seems to be the most unstable, as changes are constantly taking place. I am not criticizing either the fall or the rise in prices, but I question the necessity for so many changes. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what method is used in arriving at these changes in prices and why is it necessary to have so many changes?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The honourable member is probably referring to comments by the Auditor-General in his recent report and in previous reports regarding the policy of the Egg Board. I have had several discussions with the chairman, who reports that prices are adjusted on the basis of the normal fluctuation of supply and demand. The question at issue is which is the better policy—to make a number of small adjustments or to make fewer but much larger adjustments in price. I am not competent to say which is the better; but we have two able authorities who are at variance on this matter.

DUPLICATION OF MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN.

Mr. LOVEDAY—In view of the increasing demand on the Morgan-Whyalla main, can the Minister of Works say whether it is running to capacity and whether there are any definite proposals for duplicating the main?

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The Government and the department are always looking forward, but the time of duplication of this main will depend upon what other works have priority. It is more essential to take water to people with none than to bring extra water to those with sufficient or nearly sufficient. The duplication of the main must of necessity take a lower priority than other big works such as the Myponga reservoir and the duplication of the Warren trunk main. There is no definite scheme yet for the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main. Pumping for 24 hours a day should meet the demand

on that main for some years to come, but the question of its duplication is always under study, and when it becomes a matter of practical politics it will be carried out. The idea is not so much to duplicate the main as possibly to take another route. I think the honourable member need have no apprehensions that Whyalla will be short of water in the meantime.

NORTHERN WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In about 1925 there were proposals to build two reservoirs in the Melrose area, one at the back of Mount Remarkable and the other at Spring Creek, but after some investigations they were abandoned because the soil was considered unfavourable for the building of reservoirs. I have noticed recently in the press that there is an acute shortage of water at Booleroo Centre and there have been acute shortages at Quorn in recent years. As new methods of reservoir construction have been evolved since 1925 I ask the Minister of Works whether he will have his officers investigate these schemes again in order to provide water for Quorn and Booleroo Centre and intervening areas and also augment the supply to Whyalla and other places.

The Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—I will do that. I think that in 1927 there was an investigation of that country and that it was decided it was not suitable for reservoir construction but, as the honourable member says, new construction methods may make the proposals feasible. One of the most valuable reservoirs we have is Baroota, and I suppose if we had accepted the views of geologists in those days it would not have been built, but I hate to think what would have happened in the north without it. I will follow up the honourable member's question to see whether it is feasible to give a new look to the whole problem.

SOLDIER SETTLERS' FINANCIAL POSITION.

Mr. FLETCHER—Today's *Advertiser* reports that soldier settlers are prospering, and I would be very pleased if that were correct. Can the Minister of Repatriation state the position of settlers at Eight Mile Creek?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I assure the honourable member that, generally speaking, soldier settlers who have received their leases are prospering. During the last three years 93 per cent of them have met their commitments in full, and only about 1 per cent

to 1½ per cent are regarded as bad or doubtful debts. The other 5 per cent or 6 per cent have paid a considerable amount off their accounts, so the position generally of those with leases is very good. The honourable member asked a difficult question in regard to the settlers at Eight Mile Creek. I think I would be quite correct in saying that I have not had one single complaint about that area in the last 12 months.

DETERIORATION OF TRUST HOMES.

Mr. JENNINGS—My question concerns recent reports of alarming deterioration of Housing Trust homes in northern suburbs, particularly Clearview and Enfield Heights. Would the Premier inquire from the trust whether it is true that many of those homes are deteriorating rapidly; whether it is a fact, as has been alleged, that a large number of homes in those areas were built without reinforcing rods in the foundations; whether the consequent deterioration can be attributed to that or to some other constructional fault; and whether, if the reports are true, the trust proposes to reimburse the purchasers of those homes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the member will bring along a specific instance of these matters I will have it investigated.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—(Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill is introduced for the sole purpose of qualifying, to some degree, the provisions of section 55c enacted by the amending Act passed in 1956. In 1956, section 55c was amended to provide that the lessor of a dwelling-house may give six months' notice to quit to the lessee on the grounds that the possession of the house is required for the purpose of facilitating its sale. The notice to quit must be accompanied by a statutory declaration of the lessor stating that possession is required for this purpose. The intention of this provision is to enable an owner of a house, after giving his tenant six months' notice to quit, to secure possession of the house and thus to sell with vacant possession, so that the purchaser could then take possession and occupy the house.

However, it has come to the notice of the Government that, in the cases of some blocks of flats, notices to quit under section 55c have been given to the tenants on the ground that possession is required to facilitate the sale of the flats. If the tenants give up possession of their flats and the block of flats is sold with vacant possession, it is most likely that the flats will be let to new tenants but under one or other of the various provisions of the Act which enable a lease to be free from rent control, for example, under a lease in writing for a term of two years or more. It can also be expected that the rents under these leases will be substantially higher than those formerly paid for the flats. It could, of course, happen that, once the tenants have vacated, the owner may change his mind about selling and will re-let the flats at increased rents under leases outside rent control.

Thus, it is possible that the section may be used to substitute another lot of tenants for the present tenants at enhanced rents either after the sale of the premises or in the event of the premises not being sold, or that the section could be used to place pressure on the present tenants by means of the notice to quit for the purpose of forcing them to contract themselves out of the protection given to them by the Act and agreeing to new leases at increased rents. The purpose of the Bill is to prevent these practices whilst preserving the policy of the section to enable an owner of a tenanted dwelling to secure possession of the premises and then to sell with vacant possession to a purchaser who will occupy the premises.

Clause 3 therefore provides as follows:—If the lessor gives notice to quit under the section and the lessee, as a consequence, delivers up possession but the lessor does not sell the house within three months of possession being delivered up, he must give notice to the former lessee giving him the opportunity to re-occupy the dwelling at the same rent and under the same conditions as those under which he previously occupied it. Failure to give this notice will constitute an offence. If the former lessee does not wish to re-occupy the premises, it may be let to someone else but, if it is let to someone else, the rent and conditions must be the same as those obtaining under the former lessee's lease.

If the dwelling is sold by the lessor and if the purchaser lets it within 12 months of the purchase, the rent is to be that fixed by the Housing Trust. If the trust has not already fixed the rent, it is provided that it should do so as soon as may be. In order to inform the

purchaser of his obligation in this respect the lessor is required, at the time of the sale, to give him particulars in writing of the former rent. It will be an offence for a lessor who gives a notice to quit under section 55c to let the house contrary to the clause, and it is provided that any lease of the house entered into by the lessor or the purchaser contrary to the clause is to be construed in conformity with the clause.

Thus the effect of the Bill is to provide that, if a tenant is dispossessed to make way for another tenant as a consequence of a notice to quit to facilitate the sale of the premises then, whether the premises are sold or not, there can be no increase in rent unless, in the case of a lease after sale, the rent is fixed by the Housing Trust. Therefore there will be no inducement for a lessor to attempt to use section 55c in order to secure increased rents. However, the Bill makes no change to the policy of the section in so far as it facilitates the sale of a house to a purchaser who, after purchase, occupies the house for his own purposes. The provision inserted in the legislation last year was seriously debated and the Government has closely scrutinized its operation since. This Bill is designed to make it quite clear that the concession granted last year will not be misused.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why wasn't this provision inserted last year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Legislation frequently has to be amended: that is a reason for the existence of Parliament. It is not always possible to foresee every contingency.

Mr. John Clark—It is possible when you are told about it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Last year the debate was not concerned with flats. The question of flats has arisen since. The Government has endeavoured to ensure that both sides receive a fair deal—that the tenant is not exploited and that the owner receives a reasonable return for his premises.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time. It provides for increases in the salaries of some public officers whose remuneration is fixed by Act of Parliament. Honourable

members are aware that on August 21 last year the Public Service Board made an award applying to public service salaries from £1,126 to £3,526, and prescribing a scale of general increases ranging from £10 to £350. The Government did not agree with the award and, as allowed by the Public Service Act, referred it back to the board for further consideration. The board, however, by a majority adhered to its previous decision and, in due course, the Government gazetted the award and is now paying the rates which it prescribes. There are, however, four officers whose salaries are fixed by Statute and who cannot share in the general increase until the relevant Acts of Parliament are amended. These officers are the Agent-General, the Auditor-General, the Public Service Commissioner and the Commissioner of Police. Their salaries were last fixed in 1955. Since then there have been cost of living increases amounting to £26 a year and the general increases of last year which, in the case of the salaries of these officers, would amount to £350 a year—a total of £376. It is accordingly proposed in this Bill to increase the salaries of the officers whom I have named by £376 a year each, as from July 1, 1956. Thus they will receive substantially similar treatment to that accorded to public servants who are governed by the board's award.

The Bill also contains a provision relating to the salaries of the Commissioner of Highways, the Railways Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner of Police. The salaries of these officers are by law required to be fixed by the Governor and not the Public Service Board. The Government considers it just that they should now receive increases based on the last scale laid down by the board, with retrospective effect to July 1 last. In order to carry this proposal into effect, it is necessary to include in the Bill a special provision empowering the Governor to make retrospective alterations of these salaries. This provision is in clause 7. An appropriation of money for payment of arrears of salary under the Bill is made by clause 8.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 991.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—The Opposition generally favours the

introduction of parking meters. I have had some experience of their effect on traffic problems in Australia and overseas, and whilst there are some valid objections in certain instances, on balance I think the benefit to the public outweighs the disadvantages. We support the Bill and the general principle it seeks to implement, but when we come to consider the whole aspect of traffic and parking problems, we believe that the Bill is not adequate because it deals with only one aspect of these problems, namely, the provision of parking meters or parking places. It leaves unsolved the greater problem of traffic congestion and the difficulties accruing from it, which will have to be tackled by this Parliament sooner or later. As to the immediate problem which is proposed to be solved by the Bill, I see no reason whatever why this Bill should have been introduced, for the Local Government Act contains very adequate provisions which enable local authorities to make by-laws on all manner of subjects. Section 667 of the principal Act permits councils to make a by-law relating to the parking or standing of vehicles in any street or thoroughfare and the conditions under which they may be permitted to park or stand in such street or thoroughfare, and I submit that the provision could have been availed of thereby eliminating the necessity for this Bill.

It seems to me that the Bill was wished on to the Government by some outside authority—possibly the Adelaide City Council—because having studied the debates in another place, I thought I saw wafting across the scene some views which might well have been attributed to that august body. Apparently the Bill was drafted by the Adelaide city council and accepted by the Government as one of those sops to service that we frequently notice as part of the handiwork of this Government, but the Opposition is not happy about where it is likely to lead us. If it were necessary to include amongst the many subjects on which local governing authorities have power to make by-laws the establishment of parking meters and parking places, etc., it could have been done by a very simple amendment of the Local Government Act, adding to the manifold responsibilities enumerated in section 667 that of providing parking meters, parking places, and so forth.

Be that as it may, this Bill provides that the by-law which has to be made by the local authorities in order to implement the establishment of parking meters is not to be subjected to the usual form of disallowance to

which ordinary by-laws are subjected. For instance, a by-law made on any one of that large number of subjects on which councils are capable of making by-laws has to run the gamut of investigation by the Sub Legislation Committee and then to lie upon the Table of Parliament for the prescribed time, during which any member may move for its disallowance. That is the time-honoured procedure and it is a good one for it retains the supremacy of Parliament over bodies which Parliament itself has created to carry out the more local duties of Government.

I know that it is a long-standing fact that local government in the form of private laws preceded Parliamentary government, but I do not think for one moment that any person in these enlightened days would wish to return to tribal law—the law of the jungle, which is what tribal law means; if one could obtain enough stone axes and enough people to wield them one's will prevailed but as time went on and we had a responsible Government conferred upon us throughout the British Commonwealth and gradually perfected that system of responsible Government along democratic lines—not that we have succeeded to any great extent in South Australia as regards the democratic lines—responsible Government created local government and gave to the local authorities thus created a charter under the Local Government Act. It gave them the right to make specific by-laws to deal with local conditions, but reserved to Parliament the right to say whether those by-laws should become law or not.

This proposed by-law making provision is not to be subject to the ordinary processes prescribed in section 675, but is to be exempt as provided in new section 475b, which states that a by-law made by a municipal authority for the purpose of implementing the powers conferred in this Bill may become operative immediately it is approved by the Governor, subject to the usual inquiry as to its validity under the Act. Thus if Parliament is out of session, it may be many months before an opportunity to disallow it will present itself. We of the Opposition believe that this is entirely wrong and completely unnecessary. Consider the first of the excuses that have been given, namely, that councils would want to be able to establish parking areas quickly, or to repeal resolutions dealing with the establishing of parking areas if they so desire. They are given that power under new sections 475a and 475c, but

the Bill could easily be amended to give councils the power to pass resolutions to establish parking areas or parking meters and rescind those resolutions. However, new section 475a goes a great deal further than that as it gives municipal councils the power to fix the charges to be paid by people using parking meters, and to fix penalties not exceeding £20 for any breach of such by-law. I object to all the provisions of section 475a being immune from the ordinary methods of Parliamentary approval of by-laws. I do not object to the principles embodied in the section, only to the method to be adopted. I particularly object to councils having the power to impose charges on people under certain circumstances and to impose a penalty, certainly with a maximum, for non-observance of the conditions.

The Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh—You have no amendment on the file.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No. I shall move for the deletion of section 475b, which grants the immunity. If the Government can find a better way to solve the problem I shall be happy to listen, but my proposal will not present any difficulties to those who administer the law. A number of matters may need to be tidied up as time goes on, and in that respect I have no objection now to councils having the ordinary power by resolution to fix or decontrol areas. Parking meters in one locality may be monopolized by certain people to the detriment of the public generally. It may be easier for them to pay the prescribed fee and park their cars all day without having to remove them to another area. This sort of thing could lead to areas being decontrolled. I do not object to councils having power to deal with such a situation but I violently object to their having the right to make by-laws not subject to the ordinary processes of approval or disapproval by Parliament.

Revenue received from any parking charges imposed should be paid into a fund to be used for providing off-kerb parking facilities, which provide the ultimate solution of the parking section of our metropolitan transport problems. Wherever the meters may be situated, or whatever charges may be imposed, some portion of our carriage ways will be obstructed. The greater the number of meters the greater the obstruction. The effective solution is to be found in off-kerb parking, which has been adequately provided in other parts of the world. In San Francisco under Union Square there is a parking area controlled by the city authorities. About 2,300 vehicles can park there. The existence of this parking area does not interfere

to any extent with its public use. It is still possible to sit in the square and feed or dodge the many pigeons, as sometimes becomes necessary. It provides a breathing space for the people in the heat of the day, but it is not to be compared in size with our Victoria Square. We could adopt a forward policy with a view to parking a large number of vehicles under Victoria Square without in any way interfering with its use. The other squares in the city could also be used to help provide this effective way of solving the parking problem.

In another place there was some discussion about using a portion of the parklands as a parking area and it was agreed that this could be done subject to there being no permanent structures and no enclosure of the area. It was felt that the public should have access at all times to that part of the parklands. I have no objection to the temporary use of portions of the parklands for parking purposes. When the Bill was first introduced in the other place it did not contain the safeguard. It was included only as the result of a move by Opposition members, and it could prove satisfactory to all concerned.

I have stated the opinion of the Opposition on this matter. It believes in the principle established by the Bill, but not in the machinery which it introduces, particularly with regard to the disallowance of regulations, and in Committee I will move for the deletion of that clause. With those reservations, I support the second reading.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—I am a little diffident about the installation of parking meters. Like the Leader, I have seen them operating in other States and overseas. I feel that in certain circumstances they may be a necessary evil, for people have certain rights with regard to the use of the streets and the imposition of charges for the occupation of any part of them is not right and should be avoided wherever possible. I am certainly not in favour of meters being installed indiscriminately merely to satisfy the whim of any council desiring to increase its revenue. That is something which we shall have to guard against because councils, like most other authoritative bodies, have a penchant for exploiting every possible opportunity to increase their revenue.

Parking meters should be installed in areas that could properly be deemed to be shopping and commercial centres. Some of the streets that councils have set aside to be banned are streets that in my opinion should not be used

for the installation of parking meters, which bears out what I have said with regard to exploitation of the people for the purpose of revenue. Members need go only as far as Melbourne to see parking meters, where they are so numerous that they resemble a white picket fence. It is difficult to know just what they are until one gets close.

One of the problems created by the installation of parking meters is that certain areas which are set aside for motor cars and trucks are occupied by motor cycles on payment of the same fee. The parking area of that particular locality is thereby further reduced, because there may be half a dozen motor cycles parked in a short street and taking up the space of half a dozen motor cars. It is obvious that in normal circumstances motor cycles would be parked closer together. That is one objection I can see, but I cannot offer any solution, unless certain areas are set aside for the parking of motor cycles, which would be most difficult.

The Leader referred to off-street parking, and this is something that sooner or later must be given considerable attention by the municipal authorities. I refer particularly to the City Council, because I do not think any suburban council will be much affected for a long time. Those councils have many side streets adjacent to the shopping and commercial centres that can be used for parking. City businesses have a responsibility with regard to off-street parking, because they benefit most through people from the suburban and outer areas coming to the city to do their business. Big departmental stores gain considerably; therefore the responsibility is on them to assist in the provision of parking space for the people who come to the city to do their shopping and thus interfere, to some extent, with the rights of people who have other normal business.

The matter of off-street parking can be approached in various ways, namely, by the roof system, the building system, and the underground system. The Leader referred to the parking station under Union Square in San Francisco which I have had the opportunity to see and inspect, and he said that Union Square is not very large. I would estimate it to be about one-quarter the size of Victoria Square, and when I saw it it had four different levels which were approached by ramps. One can envisage the number of cars that could be parked under an area the size of Victoria Square. I am very interested in the plan to build an overhead parking

station at the Central Market, which I think would be a very wise move and a valuable provision for the parking of cars, particularly on market days when it is not possible for the ordinary person to park in streets near the market. The plan has been suggested by private enterprise, and if gone on with, could become a profitable concern.

Multi-storied buildings for the parking of cars are being widely used in the United States. In some cases the ground floor is used for shopping, but the other floors of buildings from four to six storeys high are used solely for the parking of cars. They have a system in Chicago and Baltimore—and I think Washington—whereby a person drives his car on to a track; a button is pressed, his car goes on to an elevator which takes it to the required floor, and then into the parking space on that floor, without being handled by anyone. That might even be termed automation. Sooner or later such a building may be built in Melbourne or Sydney and eventually, because of the limited space in Adelaide, one may be constructed here.

I do not know the attitude of Adelaide business people to the use of parking meters, but I have heard no public outcry against it. On the other hand, however, I remember their complaint about last year's parking ban in Rundle Street and the suggestion that only one-way traffic be allowed in Hindley and Rundle Streets. Surely, because of the volume of traffic, one-way traffic restrictions must eventually be imposed in those streets. One can appreciate the objections of Myers, John Martins, Charles Birks and the other big departmental stores in Rundle Street against such an arrangement as it will tend to drive shoppers away from that area but, on the other hand, Pirie and Waymouth Streets could be built up as big shopping centres, shopping traffic decentralized and the present congestion in Rundle Street prevented.

Perimeter parking has been suggested, and I believe that councils are keen on it. Indeed, parking on the parklands has been suggested, but I am one of those who has been called a "fanatic" by the *News* merely because I wish to conserve the parklands for their original purpose. I was born and reared in the city and have always boasted to my friends in other parts about our parklands. To see them desecrated by using them as car parks would be objectionable to me, although I realize that on important occasions, such as the Royal Adelaide Show, restricted parts must be used for this purpose. Perimeter parking can be carried

out by using the areas immediately outside the parklands fences.

I agree with the suggestions of the Leader of the Opposition and do not believe in final authority to fix the charges being vested in the councils, for it should be the prerogative of Parliament to have the right to approve or disapprove. True, Parliament may disapprove later, but if the charges are fixed during the recess they will have been collected for some time, whereas Parliament should have the power of disapproval before the charges are imposed.

Concerning proposed new section 475f, which contains an evidentiary provision, I point out that a man may sometimes leave his car in a parking area and expect to be back in a certain time, but because of the nature of his business and the delays occasioned, he may be unable to get back to the car, with the result that on his return he finds a sticker on his windscreen for over-staying the time paid for. With the advent of parking meters it should be possible for the owner of a vehicle to pay for extra time by inserting additional coins in the meter. With the reservations I have made I support the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I, too, support the Bill, which provides the necessary power to certain municipal councils to provide parking space and erect parking meters within their areas. I agree with most speakers that this will apply immediately only to the Adelaide City Council, but the Bill is so framed that any council may apply for the right to install parking meters within its area. For instance, if the Port Pirie Council wishes to introduce parking meters, it is covered by the Bill.

The legislation is a step in the right direction and will result in progress in the city. From my observation in other Australian cities and from the comments of interstate friends, I believe that more parking space is made available by the use of meters. I am not saying that a greater area is available, but the tendency is for a quicker rotation of cars. In some places in Adelaide one can leave a car all day, whereas in others it can remain for only an hour or half an hour. Traders are vitally concerned with this matter and welcome the move, because it provides an opportunity for more people to shop. Those who cause congestion in the streets are those who leave their cars there for an hour or more. Many of them willingly pay the fine imposed. Whereas a council will have the right to select the actual sites for parking meters, no alteration can be made in charges for the use

of these meters unless a by-law comes before Parliament. That is a very necessary and wise provision. Provision is also made whereby certain car parks and service stations for parking can be provided. Up to now councils have been restricted in the use of their money in the purchasing or leasing of properties for this type of service. It is clearly set out in the Bill that they will now have power to use ratepayers' money for the purchase or lease of land or buildings for car parks or service stations. As the Leader of the Opposition rightly says, off-kerb parking will not only come, but must come. That is why I am pleased to see in some of the larger buildings being erected in Sydney, for example, that provision is being made for ground and basement level parking. That will have to come to Adelaide, although it may involve an alteration of the Building Act.

The parklands have been mentioned as a possible site for parking cars. Almost half the parklands around Adelaide come within the electorate for which I am the member. I do not want to see the parklands desecrated in any way, but I feel that we must use them for other than sport. Parts could be used for private car parking. This would include certain parts around the edges, both inner and outer parklands, and certain sections which are not open to the view of the general public; for instance where there are undulations. There are sections which could, with discretion, be used as car parks. The parklands should not be kept as a barren waste. Although we should preserve them for the people, we should also make adequate use of them in a discreet way. I have the greatest pleasure in supporting the Bill and trust it will be carried.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I also support the second reading. I would not have spoken but for the final remarks of Mr. Coumbe. I agree that parking in the metropolitan area, and particularly in the city, is a growing problem. Many find the greatest difficulty in finding parking space in the city. Something must be done, and we on this side believe that the answer is off-kerb parking and the use of meters, which are a necessary evil and must be installed. The chief objection my Party has to the Bill is that it takes away from Parliament a power which it has long possessed and will allow a council to put into operation something which Parliament, after it had been in operation, will have the right to nullify. This is entirely wrong both from the point of view of the councils and Parliament.

No council or organization which has power under the existing law to make by-laws will be able to say that it has been unjustly treated, but a council may in its wisdom provide meters and do other things provided under the Bill and Parliament, after it has seen the law in operation, may consider it has proved a failure and say that it cannot continue. A council may have spent colossal sums and then find it has all been for nought. That is the wrong way to go about it. It would be far better to retain the machinery which has operated fairly well for so long; which allows a matter to go before the Subordinate Legislation Committee before it is finally approved by Parliament. Mr. Coumbe said that the parklands should be discreetly used for motor parking. I would emphasize that many thousands of people enjoy the use of the parklands, but if they were made motor parks many would be deprived of the use of land set aside for their benefit. If the parklands are used for motor car parks their use by the public will be restricted. I agree with the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) that the parklands should be developed for use by the public. Therefore, I hope that the foreshadowed amendment will be carried, and I am prepared to support the second reading for that purpose.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the second reading. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) have had considerable experience overseas and their remarks were most enlightening. The parking problem has become acute, and it will become worse in the future as more people own motor cars. As the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) said, those who desire to bring their cars to the city find it extremely difficult to get parking space. Many people who work in the centre of the city park their cars near the Adelaide oval or on the outskirts of the city and have to travel a considerable distance before getting to their employment.

I fear that the City Council may set aside too many streets for parking purposes. It may even decree that streets near the Adelaide oval shall be set aside for this purpose, so the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition on the unusual procedure taken under the Bill about by-laws were very pertinent. The by-laws may not be discussed by this House until after they have been in operation for some time, for the Bill says:—

Every by-law made under section 475a shall, after it has been certified as provided by section 674 . . . be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 14 days after such publication, if Parliament is in session, and if not, then within 14 days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament. Parliament may be reluctant to alter the by-law then. The usual procedure is for the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation to consider by-laws, and then Parliament has the right to say whether they should be disallowed. I believe the usual procedure should be followed under this Bill. Furthermore, any by-laws on motor parking would specify the fees to be charged and the penalties that may be imposed for offences. These fees and penalties may be too high, but Parliament may not be able to consider them for several months after they have been in operation. However, I think the parking meter system will be of benefit to the city and the State. If it works satisfactorily it will no doubt be adopted by suburban councils and those in the larger country towns.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. DAVIS moved—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House that it has power to consider a new clause relating to differential rating on individual allotments.

Motion carried.

Mr. O'HALLORAN moved on behalf of Mr. Dunstan—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House that it has power to consider a new clause relating to the erection of drive-in picture theatres.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 7, at 2 p.m.