

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, October 16, 1963.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****SITTINGS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: According to press announcements that I read with interest, a Commonwealth election will be held on November 30. Although I do not intend to be told that it is the Premier's responsibility to keep the House together while members are campaigning on any occasion, my colleagues and I want to take part in this election campaign. Will the Premier indicate the legislative programme, the period the House will be in session, and what time members can expect to have to take part in this campaign?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am sure members will accept my assurance that I had no influence whatever in the decision made about the momentous occasion referred to by the Leader. If what has taken place displeases him, he should not blame me, because I am not responsible for it. Regarding the second part of his question dealing with sittings of the House, some fairly urgent business still remains to be transacted, and the answer will depend to a certain extent on whether we can get the co-operation of the House and business is not unnecessarily delayed. When the time comes, I shall be prepared to confer with the Leader to try to make arrangements that are mutually satisfactory. I think that is the best answer I can give now. We are discussing something that is over a month ahead. How much business we get through between now and then, the urgency of the business still left on the Notice Paper, and whether it can be left over until after Christmas: all these are matters that will have to be considered. I suggest to the Leader that at an appropriate time I shall be happy to confer with him to discuss the proper procedure regarding sittings of the House. I assure members opposite that I do not want in any way to hinder their campaigning; we would all favour that. The purposes of democracy would probably be best served if they went out.

**NEW POLICE BUILDING.**

Mr. CUMBE: It was announced today that a fault had occurred in the new police building being erected in Victoria Square. Has the Minister of Works investigated this fault and, if so, has he any information on its nature

(whether it is slight or severe) and what steps are being taken to remedy it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: True, a mishap occurred in the construction of the police building. I do not know when it occurred or the full extent of the damage but, as honourable members know, the building is being constructed by the lift-slab method whereby the floors are cast at ground level and raised into position. This method has been used widely by contractors throughout Australia and has become accepted as a good method of dealing with multi-storey buildings. I am unable to indicate with certainty the nature of the fault, but apparently the upper floor had been raised part way towards its eventual position and held there temporarily by brackets fixed to the uprights. Some brackets appear to have come away under stress and allowed portions of the floor to sag and crack. I am informed by the Director of Public Buildings that the principals of the firm that handles this method of construction are on their way from Sydney to make an inspection. Until they have done so and reported I am unable to add anything. As far as I can ascertain only the upper floor section has been affected.

**CROSSING GUARD RAILS.**

Mr. CLARK: Recently a very thoughtful and, in my opinion, worthwhile suggestion was made to me by one of my constituents, a railway employee. It reads:

Railway level crossings in South Australia all have safety rails consisting of old railway lines fixed to short lengths of line and firmly bedded into the ground. These safety rails or fences can withstand considerable impacts and any vehicles that hit them are subject to serious damage. In many level crossing accidents damage to road vehicles from the actual impact is much greater as, in most cases, they are thrown against the safety rails and ground between them and the train. No estimate is possible of just how much more damage results, but it is safe to say that if it were not for the rails in many cases, particularly where the collision is not a head-on one, the road vehicle would be thrown clear with much less damage and consequential reduction in the injuries received by occupants. It is suggested that the rails be replaced with light tubular steel fences which would collapse on impact and prevent much of the injury and damage that now, invariably, results from such accidents. One-inch tubes of light-gauge steel would be of sufficient size to be easily seen and look strong enough to deter any driver from careless driving.

Will the Minister of Works refer this suggestion to his colleague, the Minister of Railways, with the object of having its practicability investigated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

**NARACOORTE SCHOOL BUILDINGS.**

Mr. HARDING: What is known as the old Naracoorte High School and the infants school premises in Rolland Street have recently been vacated and the students transferred to a new school at Naracoorte South. Can the Minister of Education say what the department intends to do with these old school buildings?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: In reply to a question from the honourable member on July 25, 1963, I stated that the old Naracoorte High School would become vacant when the new primary school at Naracoorte South was occupied and that I had therefore approved of the establishment of a Naracoorte adult education centre and the dedication of the old Naracoorte High School for this purpose. An officer of the Technical Schools Branch with an officer from the Public Buildings Department visited Naracoorte recently and inspected the building. Plans for painting and alterations to make it useful as an adult education centre have been prepared and forwarded to the Public Buildings Department. Applications have been called for the full-time position of Principal and are being considered at present. It is proposed that the actual appointment will not be made until the end of the present school year to save disruption of staff at some other school.

With the opening of the Naracoorte South Primary School on September 16 this year the infants school at Naracoorte was dis-established and the buildings vacated as from August 30. It is intended to remove the timber classrooms on the site, and present indications are that the department will have no further use for it. However, no decision has been made and the matter is still under consideration. I shall be pleased to keep the honourable member informed of developments in this matter.

**BURNING-OFF OPERATIONS.**

Mr. HUGHES: With the introduction of diesel locomotives on country rail services the hazard of grass fires has been lessened somewhat, but with the prolific growth fringing rail tracks the danger of fire is present, particularly as fires can be started in various ways by passing trains. Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain whether the Railways

Department intends to continue burning-off operations?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a statement from the Minister of Railways. I point out that the honourable member's statement is true of roadways as well as of railways, and there is an urgent need for all persons who have any responsibility in the matter to see that unnecessary hazards are reduced before the arrival of the dry season. I hope that we get State-wide support for Clean-Up Week, which opens on Friday and continues next week.

**DRIVING LICENCES.**

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 10 about whether driving licences could be issued for periods of one, two or three years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter was raised by way of resolution from the Liberal and Country League some time ago, and I forwarded a letter to Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of the L.C.L. about it. The letter probably sets out clearly the information the honourable member wants, so with the permission of the House I shall read that part of the letter which comprises a report from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, as follows:

The licensing of drivers for an optional period of up to three years presents difficulties as far as this department is concerned. One of the most important factors towards providing an efficient service and making best use of staff and equipment is the maintenance of an even spread of work throughout the year. This factor was a main consideration in the introduction of day to day licences and registrations. The department still suffers from the disability of having a large number of licences expiring at the end of June. Legislation was specially introduced to help ease this problem, and year by year the number of June licences is decreasing. We are already experiencing the advantage of day to day registrations in spreading the work.

If the proposal to grant licences optionally for up to three years were accepted, and many people availed themselves of this privilege, we would return to a situation which we are trying to avoid. It is impossible to forecast the extent to which the public would exercise the option for one, two or three years. The following examples illustrate the effect on the department, assuming that we commenced to give people the option as from the 1st January, 1964:

Proportion exercising 3-year option.	Number of licences to be renewed in—		
	1965.	1966.	1967.
100 per cent . . . . .	—	—	400,000
75 per cent . . . . .	100,000	100,000	400,000
50 per cent . . . . .	200,000	200,000	400,000
25 per cent . . . . .	300,000	300,000	400,000

If a large proportion exercised the option, the department's staff and substantial investment in equipment would be fully utilized in some years but not so in others. If only a small proportion took advantage of the facility, we could organize our procedure to cope with the situation satisfactorily, but either way there would inevitably be constant changes in attitudes by members of the public and fluctuations in expiry dates would cause difficulties. These difficulties are now experienced in our registration and punched card sections with registrations, because of optional periods of six or twelve months.

The option of taking a licence for one or two years was investigated in 1961, and it was found that difficulties outweighed any advantages to be gained. On the other hand, there are big advantages to be gained by extending the period of licences compulsorily to, say, three years, as is now being done in Victoria. This could be carried out over a period so as to maintain an even flow of work and still keep control over tests, restrictions, etc. There would be a very big gain to the department in that renewal procedures would be cut by two-thirds.

The Government has no intention of changing the present system to a compulsory three-year period.

#### PORT PIRIE DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. McKEE: Earlier this session the Premier said that the Government was concerned about the need to establish an industry at Port Pirie, and on October 1 he said that he was expecting a reply from the Prime Minister to a proposal put before the Commonwealth Government. Has the Premier received that reply? If not, does he think that, as a firm date has now been determined for the Commonwealth election, an early announcement is likely to be made about this industry?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think that all members opposite will know that the details of a major industry cannot be worked out in a brief period. When the Prime Minister's letter does reach me some important factors will still have to be tied up before a final decision can be made. I am somewhat disappointed that I have not received a reply from the Prime Minister before now. I had hoped to have it last week. On the other hand, I know from personal knowledge that certain information concerning Port Pirie has been obtained by Commonwealth officers who were appointed to supply the Prime Minister with information on Port Pirie. They have been undertaking work associated with their appointment, which leads me to believe that the Prime Minister is actively considering the matter. However, as I pointed out, although it is fairly easy to get a decision on a small matter, it takes much longer to get one on a

major matter, and major matters of principle were involved in the project I submitted to the Prime Minister. I do not wish to go into details now, but some precedents would be established and obviously they would have to be looked at. I assure the honourable member that I am just as anxious as he is to get an industry for Port Pirie. I recognize the necessity for it and, in fact, the project now being considered is one on which negotiations have proceeded fairly well because we realize that Port Pirie, because of changed circumstances, and particularly because of bulk handling on the seafloor, has a local problem regarding employment.

#### LITTLE PARA BRIDGE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, any details he can let me have regarding a new bridge which I understand the Highways Department is to erect over the Little Para River on the Port Wakefield Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague has handed me brief notes, which I will give the honourable member for his information. The department has approved the calling of tenders for construction of a bridge over the Little Para River on the main Yorke Peninsula road in the hundred of Yatala. The specifications are that the structure shall consist of three 30-ft. clear spans, and is to be 96ft. 8in. overall in length from the back faces of the abutment walls. The effective trafficable width of the deck is to be 28ft. between kerb faces, plus a 1ft. 6in. footway on one side. The complete width of the deck between the outer edges is to be 37ft. Those are the brief specifications, but I think they answer the honourable member's query in general terms.

#### WHYALLA SCHOOLS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Premier an answer to my recent question regarding another technical high school and a trade school at Whyalla?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister of Education reports that the need for a second secondary school in Whyalla (either a technical high school or a high school) in addition to the proposed trade school has been apparent for some time. Consideration is being given to the inclusion of one or both of these schools in the next design list for the 1964-65 building programme.

#### HOWARD MEMORIAL APPEAL.

Mr. SHANNON: My question of the Minister of Agriculture concerns the Howard Memorial Appeal now being promoted for the

benefit of agriculturists generally, particularly in the field of agricultural science research, and the scholarships to be provided from the fund to which this Government has contributed liberally. Can the Minister say whether or not the two main men in this State—Dr. Melville (of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute) and Professor Donald (Professor of Agriculture at the University of Adelaide), who are both experienced men—will see to it that this State gets at least its share of scholarships for pasture research, and that the successful applicants for such scholarships will return to South Australia for work in the field for which this fund will fit them? I do not know whether the Minister can tell me anything about this matter but, if he can, I think that his statement will encourage interest among some people who have not yet decided whether they will become donors to the fund. Some people might be encouraged if they knew that South Australia was to benefit in some way from the fund so established.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The spread of agronomy, given an impetus by the work of Amos Howard, has spread so far beyond the borders of South Australia that there is far more land under subterranean clover outside South Australia than there is inside it. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that this appeal is an Australia-wide appeal. Although the actual discoverer, so to speak, of the value of subterranean clover did his work in South Australia, it is hoped that the appeal will reach as far through the country as subterranean clover is appreciated. In order to do that, naturally one must ensure that the fund so collected is dealt with on a national basis, irrespective of State borders. The fact that Dr. Melville and Professor Donald are both leaders in this appeal and are both South Australians will ensure that South Australia is not forgotten in this matter. However, I think they would be unwilling to give any assurances of State allocations: they would probably much prefer to deal with the matter on a national basis. Those men probably would point out that the work done on agronomy somewhere in Australia might be just as valuable to South Australia as it would be were it done within the State. I could not give any special assurance to the honourable member. On the other hand, I should be happy to refer his question to the leaders of the Howard Memorial Appeal in order to get a considered statement from them. I should not like it to be thought that what I have said in reply to this question

is an official statement from the appeal committee, for I am not a member of it and I am giving only my own views. However, I still believe that the committee is anxious to make this a nation-wide appeal and that it would be rather against giving assurances of spending money in any one State or another.

#### PULPWOOD.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to a question I asked him yesterday regarding additional pulpwood supplies for Apcel Limited in the South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Under an Indenture Act passed by the House of Assembly, assented to on November 9, 1961, and amended on June 13, 1963, Harmac has until the end of the year to make a decision as to whether or not the firm will go ahead with the project. The Government has had no notice served upon it that the company will not go ahead. One of the partners of the company—MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River Limited—has signified to the Government that it is not proposing to continue its interest, but it is the belief of the Government that Harmac is negotiating to get other interests to take its place. Until a formal notification has been given to the Government that the contract with Harmac will not proceed, the Government is not in a position to enter into any further negotiations. If Harmac is not successful in attracting a suitable associate, the Government will confer with the private forest interests to determine a policy which will assure the continued development of both the Government and private forests.

#### NARRUNG ELECTRICITY EXTENSION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the General Manager of the Electricity Trust when work on the Narrung electricity extension is expected to be completed and connections given to consumers in that area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask the Chairman of the trust for a report.

#### IRRIGATION RATE PAYMENTS.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Lands indicate the due dates for payment of water rates in the irrigation settlements of Waikerie, Loxton, Barmera, Berri and the Ral Ral Division?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Due dates for payment of water rates in irrigation areas are as follows: Waikerie, Cobdogla (Loveday, Nookamka and Cobdogla Divisions), Moorook,

Kingston, Berri, and Chaffey (Ral Ral Division), May 1 in each year; and Loxton and Chaffey (Cooltong Division), July 1 in each year.

#### INSURANCE BROKERS.

Mr. BYWATERS: My attention has been drawn to the following public notice that appeared in the *Murray Valley Standard*:

We the undersigned wish to advise residents in the district that we understand that certain insurance representatives have been making approaches to residents and such residents have been asked to hand their existing insurance policies to the representatives in question for retention. We would like to advise the public that insurance policies are valuable documents and should not lightly be handed to any person for any purpose.

This was signed by two leading insurance agents in the district. I have been told that a company known as the Oxford Insurance Brokers Company has salesmen operating in the Murray District contacting residents, offering advice as brokers, and soliciting them to surrender their insurance policies. The people in turn claim a refund, and are advised to insure with another company. This has applied to most of the recognized insurance companies operating in the locality. I have also been told that, on receipt from the company that has had the surrender, the cheques are cashed immediately and no policy is forthcoming for the client. I have also been told that people are given a receipt only and that they cannot ascertain the name of the company with which they are insured. Apparently the story is very convincing, because many people are taking the opportunity (if it can be called that) to hand in their policies and accept the advice of these brokers. This company was registered only in June of this year in the name of Kathleen M. Wilkinson. It has a private address and an office on North Terrace, Adelaide, but no occupant can be found when a visit is made to the office; it is always closed. I understand that the police have made certain investigations but, as no breach of any Act has yet been committed, the police are powerless to act. Because of the concern felt in this matter and the suspicious nature of the operations of this company, will the Minister of Education ask his colleague, the Attorney-General, to check its *bona fides*?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This is the first I have heard of this matter, but on the spur of the moment I express the opinion that the advice given in the advertisement to which the honourable member has referred is very sound, and I think it should be even more widely circulated than it has been.

I shall be pleased to ask the Attorney-General to make urgent inquiries into the matter.

#### PORT AUGUSTA SCHOOLS.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister of Education will remember having discussions at Port Augusta some time ago about the building programme of the Education Department in that centre. We have been promised progress on plans for an adult education building, a fourth primary school, and alterations to the central school, but I find no reference to any such buildings in this year's Loan Estimates. Will the Minister of Education obtain from the department a report on the building programme planned for Port Augusta?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to obtain a report.

#### HAMLEY BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister of Works inquire of his colleague, the Minister of Roads, whether he plans to rebuild the bridge over the River Gilbert, on the Balaklava road immediately north of Hamley Bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will seek a report from my colleague.

#### FLINDERS RANGES.

Mr. HARDING: My question, which is directed to the Premier, concerns the lack of accommodation for tourists in the Lower Flinders Ranges. Recently I revisited the Wilpena Pound and noticed that the chalet was completely over-taxed and tourists were being turned away. I also visited Blinman and found that accommodation there was insufficient to cater for requirements. Will the Premier say whether the Government can acquire or lease the Angorichina hostel, which has been used as a tuberculosis hostel, and have the rooms suitably fitted out to cater for the overflow from the Wilpena chalet?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have the matter investigated for the honourable member.

#### MIGRANT TRADESMEN.

Mr. CUMBE: Recently it was announced that there had been a big drop in unemployment, in this State in particular, and in the number of those seeking work, and that there was a record level of employment, which is a very good thing. Does the Premier agree that this has led to an acute shortage of skilled tradesmen, especially in the engineering industries, and will he say whether his Government

co-operates with the Commonwealth Department of Immigration in seeking migrants (especially from the United Kingdom, a large proportion of whose emigrants are skilled tradesmen) to come to South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The South Australian Government has taken steps to recruit and sponsor migrants in certain categories from the United Kingdom. Some migrants have purchased a house here before leaving the United Kingdom, and we have sponsored their early shipping passages to Australia to help relieve the shortage referred to by the honourable member. I would not like anything I am saying now to be regarded as derogatory of the Commonwealth Department of Immigration, because this Government receives extremely good co-operation from it. However, the large numbers of migrants seeking to come to South Australia today are presenting grave difficulties to us. A recent check showed that 526 sponsored migrants (that is, migrants with accommodation and work available) are still waiting in the United Kingdom for passages to be allotted to them. I have written to Mr. Downer (Commonwealth Minister for Immigration), seeking his assistance in this matter, and I have no doubt that, within the limits of the resources of his department, I shall receive it. Other States are in somewhat similar circumstances and there is general pressure on the Commonwealth department to hasten the arrival of these categories of migrant.

#### AREA SCHOOLS.

Mr. HALL: Recently, I was approached by a Brinkworth constituent who asked whether the Education Department could provide Leaving classes in three area schools—Snowtown, Brinkworth and Port Broughton—with teachers travelling between the three schools. Obviously, enrolments in the secondary portion of the schools would not warrant full-time teachers for Leaving classes. Will the Minister of Education ask his department to consider a system of travelling teachers for adjacent area schools so that the general teaching level of classes can be raised in those schools?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As far as I am aware the department has never considered such a suggestion. I will ask it to do so because it is a constructive suggestion which could apply not only to those particular area schools but to other schools similarly situated. I shall be pleased to give it my personal attention.

#### LATE SHOPPING NIGHT.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Some time ago I approached the Secretary to the Attorney-General (the Attorney-General being away from Adelaide) on the subject of the late shopping night intended to be proclaimed in the metropolitan area. I had understood that the Attorney-General had received representations from several chambers of commerce in various parts of the metropolitan area, some favouring a late shopping night on the Friday before Christmas and others favouring the late shopping night on Christmas Eve. From the consensus of opinion, the Attorney-General concluded that he should proclaim the late shopping night on the Friday. The Norwood Chamber of Commerce requested me to ask the Attorney-General to consider granting different late shopping nights for various districts; that is, to proclaim that only in certain areas the late shopping night would be Friday, and in other areas Tuesday, depending on the wishes of the local trading bodies. As yet I have not had a reply from the Attorney-General, and the Norwood chamber is anxious that he consider the matter to see whether he could not grant the wishes of those suburban chambers of commerce that want to have the late shopping night on Christmas Eve rather than on the Friday before Christmas. I emphasize that in making this approach, I am not suggesting that there should be a late shopping night as the policy of my Party is opposed to having late shopping nights; but, as one is going to be granted anyway by the Government, the Shop Assistants' Union has indicated that it has no particular preference one way or the other for Tuesday or Friday. From my district's point of view it would be preferable on the Tuesday. Will the Minister of Education take this matter up with the Attorney-General?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Dealing with the last part of the question, I was under the impression that employees overwhelmingly favoured Friday night rather than Christmas Eve. However, I shall be pleased to take up this question with my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

#### NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

## TOWN PLANNING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Frank Walsh:

(For wording of motion, see page 982.)

(Continued from October 9. Page 985.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I must confess that I have not had much time since the Leader moved this motion to study all its implications. Indeed, I go further and say that I am not sure what the Leader's motion does. I believe that what he is seeking to do is to give general support to the provisions of the Town Planning Committee's proposals without getting tied up with the details, and reserving to himself, his Party and every other honourable member, the right to agree or disagree with some provisions, or to move at some time or other to alter them. I think the Leader is trying to combine in this motion both the positive and negative aspects. It is not easy to give unqualified support without specifying what one is supporting and what one is opposing.

I realize the singular difficulties the committee had in preparing this plan, and do not underestimate the problem facing it. This plan was prepared for a city that was already fairly advanced in its development; it was not like the problem that its founder, Colonel Light, had to consider, although I do not underestimate what he did for this city. He did not have to consider any question of vested interest or of property rights or of costs: he merely carried out the simple process of saying, "Here is an area, and this is how we will plan it." The Town Planning Committee obviously had no such latitude, because there were so many established features of the city that could not be altered. I appreciate the problems that confronted the committee. However, when it comes to legislating to give effect to the committee's recommendations problems arise.

The Leader's motion is interesting, in that it attempts to clarify our views, but whether it is carried or not has no legal effect. It is merely an expression of opinion, and it cannot alter the established order of things. I do not want to shirk my responsibility of commenting on the plan. The Leader of the Opposition, in a forthright manner, said that he welcomed the plan which, overall, he thought was good. I realize that I am not using his exact words, and I do not want to put an improper construction on what he said, but I listened attentively to his speech because of the ambiguous nature of the motion, and I concluded that he

and his Party supported the principles of the plan but not necessarily its details. He wanted to approve of the plan without being tied specifically to all of the committee's recommendations. He regarded the plan as being of an interim nature—a plan that should be reviewed periodically. If that is accepted as a short summary of the Leader's views, members will realize that it is not easy to legislate in those circumstances.

I support the principles of the plan. I know that, in the long run, planning will save money and will provide for a city that is pleasant to live in and in which citizens will have an opportunity to enjoy the good things of life. However, when it comes to the specific details of the plan, I am completely at variance with some of the committee's proposals—not with the committee's desires, but with its methods. The Government has tried to gauge public opinion on some of the committee's proposals. Although it may be tedious, I should like to quote from a docket, the contents of which indicate that the Government has tried to reach a conclusion on one of the committee's recommendations. On September 27, after discussion and consideration by Cabinet, a letter was sent to various district councils that would be affected by the committee's proposals for recreation areas. The following letter was forwarded to the District Council of Willunga:

The Government has been giving consideration to the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee, one of the principal recommendations being: "that the Public Parks Act, 1943, be amended to provide for a Metropolitan Parks Authority and the means of financing the cost of land acquisition". For some time the Government has aided councils in acquiring land for public parks on the basis of the cost being shared equally between the Government and the council concerned. It is prepared to continue to provide money to the proposed authority upon this basis.

In other words, if the proposed authority were set up the Government would be prepared to provide half of the funds necessary to give effect to the committee's recommendation. The letter continues:

If the recommendation of the Town Planning Committee is to be fully implemented and the areas shown in the committee's report as being required for open spaces are to be obtained, councils and Government will be involved in a considerably increased expenditure. The Government is at present giving consideration to the necessary legislation to implement the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee, and it desires to have the views of your council with regard to the above matter.

It would particularly desire to know upon what basis the councils' contribution to the cost of any acquisition should be determined. Although the Town Planning Committee was requested to provide a developmental plan for the present metropolitan area, it stated in its report that the area likely to be affected by future development would include that part of the hundred of Willunga lying within the District Council of Willunga, and consequently I am forwarding this letter to you as well as to the present metropolitan council.

I have quoted this letter because members will appreciate that this council is not within the metropolitan area. Members will see that the Government has sought the views of the metropolitan councils upon the means of providing finance to give effect to the Town Planning Committee's proposals. As stated in the letter, the Government is still prepared to provide, as it has been doing in the past, half of the necessary finance. In the three weeks that have elapsed I have not received replies from all the councils, but I have had sufficient to indicate the division of opinion there is on the matter. Let me quote some letters to indicate the various points of view. The first I quote is from the Marion City Council and states:

I have for acknowledgment receipt of your letter of 27th ultimo addressed to His Worship the Mayor seeking the views of the council on the financing of the cost of land which may be acquired for open spaces. To enable the council to give full consideration to the matter it would assist the council if you would advise it the views of the Government on the matters raised by the council in my letters to you of August 27 and September 26, so far as they concern open space land. For example should the Government consider increasing the amount of land which a subdivider may be required to set aside as a reserve or the Government accept financial responsibility for the acquisition of the large area shown as open space at O'Halloran Hill, it could materially affect the views of the council on the project. Information such as this would enable the council to give a considered expression of views on the question raised in your letter of 27th ultimo. I do not know what the council meant by that letter, but I assume it meant that if the Government were to purchase the large area of land mentioned and set it aside as open space it would be prepared to call it a day, and that would be the end of its interest in the matter. I may be wrong, but if the Government said it would buy the land at the top of O'Halloran Hill and set it aside as an open space the council most likely would say, "We have enough breathing space so we are not further interested in the proposal." A letter came from the Salisbury council saying that consideration by the council would be given to

the matter at a meeting to be held on October 29. Apparently it is having a think about the matter. The Corporation of St. Peters has a different approach, and says:

Your letter addressed to His Worship the Mayor, dated September 27, was placed before this council at its meeting held on October 3. This council feels that suggestions from councils as to a desirable basis for financing the necessary legislation should be first fully discussed by the Municipal Association with a view to obtaining some uniformity. The council has therefore referred the matter to that association for discussion at its next meeting.

I do not know what that means. The Burnside City Council has another view. It says:

Your letter of September 26 inviting comment on the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee for the establishment of a metropolitan parks authority to levy local government for part cost of the acquisition of additional open spaces, has been placed before the council, when it was decided to re-affirm the previous resolution when the matter was under consideration—that the council could not support the establishment of such an authority to levy councils to acquire land in the areas and manner proposed and with no consideration for the acquisitions and purchases already made by councils. The council therefore has no recommendation for basis for council contribution under the proposals contained in the report. It is noted that the Government is prepared to continue to provide money for purchases under the present Public Parks Act and as this is a practicable and acceptable method of financing acquisition the council desires to urge that sufficient funds be provided to ensure that as opportunities present themselves to local government to acquire additional open spaces needed, that government support will be forthcoming under this Act. I take that to mean that it is not in favour of the proposal to set up an overall authority and make a contribution to it. I do not know whether this has been influenced by the fact that lately it has had a fairly desirable area of land provided for it by the Government but, be that as it may, if the letter means anything at all it means that the council does not want the proposals of the committee but wants the Government to continue with the present system, whereby the Government makes money available in a grant of up to 50 per cent of the Land Board valuation of the property concerned. The Kensington and Norwood City Council says:

I have been directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 27th ultimo requesting the views of the council on the recommendation of the Town Planning Committee for the provision of a metropolitan parks authority with means of financing the cost of land acquisition. In reply I have to advise that your letter has been considered by the council and it has decided to strongly oppose the proposal to form the authority and to contribute towards

the acquisition of land outside the council's area. The council does not consider it fair or equitable to be asked now, after having provided its own areas, to assist in providing areas in some outer council district. I have to point out that there is no vacant land in the council's area and therefore if it was compelled to contribute to the authority none of the finance would be expended in this city and in any case the areas purchased would be outside of the reach of residents of this city. The council is in favour and would support the retention of the present policy of the Government in assisting councils on a pound-for-pound basis in the purchase of recreational areas. It suggests that if any council is unable to provide the finance immediately for these areas the Government should purchase them and give the councils the opportunity of repaying half the cost over an extended period of time. This council is not prepared to make any contribution towards the cost of land outside this city.

That is a slightly different view from that put forward by the Burnside council, but in the main it supports the present method, which has been used effectively in the Norwood area. Some of the recreational land in that area has been purchased comparatively recently under the existing method.

Mr. Hutchens: It does not want other councils to have the same rights.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It says that the present method whereby the Government provides 50 per cent of the cost should be continued. It makes a slight reservation inasmuch as it says that the Government should be prepared to lend money to the councils. I do not believe very much is involved in that, because what has actually taken place in a number of instances is that when a council has desired to borrow the money that it requires for its part of the deal, and provided that it has the necessary authority under the Local Government Act, the Government has always been pleased to arrange a loan for it; although it does not actually provide the money, it arranges the loan for the council. That facility has been availed of by councils on many occasions in securing necessary land. Another letter, from the Campbelltown Corporation, states:

By direction of my council I am to reply to yours under date of the 26th ultimo in which you desire the views of this council regarding the recommendation contained in the Town Planning Committee's report . . . I have to advise that this council strongly opposes the establishment of such an authority as a levying authority.

Further, it would oppose any move which would prevent its deciding as to where its major or minor open spaces should be. My council notes and appreciates the gesture

referred to in your letter whereby the Government would continue to provide funds for the purposes of the proposed authority as it has done in the past in relation to open spaces, but it is noted that there is no reference in your letter that the new authority would not be a levying one. Hence I have to advise that this council would not be in favour of the suggested new authority.

That council goes further than any of the others, because it opposes not only the levying authority but the right of a central authority to decide where recreation areas should be. It points out that this is a matter peculiarly within its own province. That letter is a much more absolute rejection than any of the others I have previously mentioned, some of which have rejected the provision of a levy and others have asked that the present system be maintained. I repeat what the Campbelltown council said on this matter:

I have to advise that this council strongly opposes the establishment of such an authority as a levying authority. Further, it would oppose any move which would prevent its deciding as to where its major or minor open spaces should be.

In other words, it wants to continue to operate in complete authority under the Local Government Act as it is doing at present. The next letter is from the Payneham Corporation, which advised that it would discuss the matter at a meeting to be held on November 4. The views of the Enfield Corporation were as follows:

I am directed by the council to acknowledge your letter of September 26, 1963, in which you advise the Government's consideration of the recommendations contained in the report of the Town Planning Committee and in particular seeking the council's view regarding the suggested amendment of the Public Parks Act, 1943.

The matter was the subject of consideration at the meeting of the council held on the 7th instant and I am able to advise as follows:

The council is of the opinion that primarily the matter of acquisition of open spaces for the establishment of major recreation areas is one of Government responsibility and not something which should be financed by local governing bodies. Subject to the above, the council agrees that an authority of the type envisaged should be established for the purposes referred to in the report of the Town Planning Committee.

The council supports strongly the viewpoint that any authority so established should have representation as far as local government interests are concerned. It is further considered that the contribution made by the Government towards the cost of land acquired should exceed the subsidy of 50 per cent now operative as far as the Public Parks Act is concerned. Any additional funds required beyond the council's contribution should be shared amongst all metropolitan councils and

their actual areas and realize that the boundaries are artificial. In some instances the recommendations may not be departed from except to provide for a house that is already there. There is much inflexibility about it in many instances, although there is flexibility in others. In the rural zone and the hills face zone the minimum area upon which a house may be built is 10 acres. In both instances a minimum frontage of 300ft. is required; I presume this is to some road. In the country living zone an area of 20,000 sq. ft. is necessary; in the country township zone, 12,000 sq. ft. Why is it necessary to compel a person in a country township to have 12,000 sq. ft. of land on which to build a house when it is necessary in the metropolitan area to have only 7,500 sq. ft.?

Mr. Frank Walsh: It is down to 4,500 sq. ft.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I accept the correction. We are told frequently by overseas learned people who know all about these matters that one thing we must guard against is a city that is spread out.

Mr. Coumbe: The city sprawl.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I have some knowledge of country life. If I had carried out the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee in relation to my property I could not have built a house on it because I have not a frontage of 300ft. on any part of my block. What is the basis of any of this? At present, of course, I am outside the metropolitan area; it is an enlightened district that gets on well with its local member, who is an understanding sort of chap, so there is no problem. However, if we gave effect to this recommendation, the local member's life would not be worth living, because this would place all sorts of artificial restrictions on development.

Anyone with knowledge of the Adelaide Hills will know that there are large areas on which it is impracticable to build. It is not necessary to put reservations on Black Hill and such areas to stop people from building, because it is impracticable to build there anyway. Not much is achieved by saying that open spaces must be preserved in places where it is impracticable to build. However, some parts of the Adelaide Hills are intensely fertile and carry enormous populations. I invite any member to go to the Piccadilly swamps—one of the main sources of vegetable supplies for Adelaide in hot periods when vegetables cannot be produced in other parts of the State—and see the intense

development of housing on small areas. One area of less than 20 acres supports eight families permanently. If these people wanted to build a house for an employee, under this recommendation that would not be permitted. We would have the funny situation in which a farmer at Piccadilly could build a house on a certain area yet at Uraidla, a short distance away, a block four times as big would be necessary. This is not logical; the suggestion comes from a committee without qualifications for knowing the conditions applying in those areas. This House has dealt with the question of not permitting intense development unless it is practicable to provide a reasonable water and sewer service without undue cost to the community as a whole. If the committee had recommended (and I believe it did) that we should require a subdivider to put up cash for sewers and water supply—as has been done in numerous places, even in the metropolitan area, recently—that would have been a reasonable proposition. That is something that has worked and should be encouraged. It is a fair and reasonable proposition.

Mr. Casey: Who was responsible for setting up this committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It was set up by resolution of Parliament. Let me emphasize that I do not criticize the committee's recommendations for the metropolitan area. The committee was set up for the metropolitan area, and was selected by the Government, as a result of Parliament's action, to do a job in the metropolitan area. I believe that it was the most competent committee that could be found for this purpose.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It does not appear as if it were!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am speaking about the portion of the report that deals with the area outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The committee exceeded its function.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not criticize it for that. I said at the outset that, although the report went beyond the metropolitan area, I did not criticize the committee for that, nor do I criticize it for making those recommendations. I am at liberty equally with the honourable member to have views on a particular aspect of the recommendation.

Mr. Fred Walsh: We all are.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: All that is involved is that I do not agree with certain recommendations.

Mr. Casey: That is, those dealing with the area outside the metropolitan area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: More particularly those outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You told us that the first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I emphasize it. Honourable members opposite are trying to determine whether I have a general criticism of the report or whether I am dealing with a particular aspect. I am dealing with a particular aspect, and I am in the same position as the Leader. I agree with the report as a whole, but I do not agree with certain aspects of it, even in the metropolitan area. Some of its provisions should be further considered. For example, in one instance an industrial building will be sliced in two with one half to become residential if the proposal is accepted. I do not make trivial criticisms. Frankly, I do not know what the Leader's motion will achieve, but I agree with the views he expressed. I do not know that it achieves anything legally: I do not think it does. It can be carried, and I believe that it is desirable to carry it, because I would not want it to be thought by people outside this House that Parliament did not support town planning. If the motion is not carried that could indicate that Parliament does not support planning, and I do not hold that view. My view is that the Leader's motion should be supported; not that it achieves anything legally, but I believe that if it were not supported an impression would be given that Parliament had rejected the plan. I support the plan, but with reservations about certain recommendations, some of which are inconsistent with the existing state of affairs, and probably arose because the Government in appointing the committee did so having in mind a narrow view of the metropolitan area rather than the extended view the committee ultimately took.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I am grateful that the Premier at the end of his address apprised the House of his opinion, because until then I was completely at a loss to know whether he opposed or supported the motion. The Premier has said that he will support it, so I do not think I need detain the House for long. The reason for this motion was that as the Town Planning Act stands at present, we have no adequate provision for the consideration of objections to a town plan or to carry into effect a town plan. We have a strange provision in our Town Planning Act that provides

that an expensive plan should be drawn. In fact, it has been expensive and the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) elicited from the Government, by a series of questions, that it cost about £28,000 as far as I can ascertain from the figures given in the replies. Under the Act the plan has to be presented to Parliament and lie on the table for 28 sitting days after its presentation, and to be circulated to the various metropolitan councils. No provision is made in the Act for anything to happen after that, unless Parliament refers the plan back to the committee, in which case it could re-present the plan, and then apparently nothing further happens. No provision in the Act allows for the plan to have any effect upon South Australia. Indeed, after the plan's preparation, certain municipal councils made decisions that were manifestly inconsistent with the plan's intentions in the areas within the proposed metropolitan area. Let us contrast this situation with the town planning legislation in other States.

In New South Wales the Local Government (Town and Country Planning) Amendment Act, 1945, enables local councils to prepare planning schemes. A council must appoint a planning committee, which has to include persons co-opted from outside the council, and it must appoint a duly qualified town planner. The Act established the Cumberland County Council to prepare a scheme for the Sydney area. The council consists of 10 local government representatives representing 41 local councils within the council's area. The county scheme came into effect under an ordinance incorporated in the Local Government (Amendment) Act, 1951, and all development other than the erection of dwelling houses in living areas must be the subject of an application for planning permission. The cost of buying land shown in the county scheme for open space is borne equally by the State Government and local government. Since the scheme came into operation, over 4,000 acres of open space has been acquired at a cost of nearly £2,500,000. After acquisition by the county council, the land is transferred to the local council. During the year, the Minister for Local Government announced proposals to create a State planning authority, the chief function of which would be to achieve proper co-ordination of local council planning schemes, and to encourage more orderly and economic use and development of land. The authority will replace the Cumberland County Council and other existing regional planning authorities, and will have some teeth and be able to do something.

In Victoria the Town and Country Planning Act enables local councils to prepare planning schemes. Before submitting a scheme to the Minister for Local Government for approval, a local council must place the scheme on public exhibition and consider any objections. Interim development orders may be made by councils regulating the use and development of land during preparation and pending approval of a scheme. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works is the authority responsible for the planning scheme for the metropolitan area, which affects 46 municipalities. The scheme has not yet been approved by the Minister, but the Board of Works controls development under an interim development order which was first approved in February, 1955. This authority, while drawing its plan, can ensure that no development will take place that would run counter to the ultimate plan. No such authority exists in our Town Planning Committee. It was in the original Bill introduced in this House, but it was taken out by Government members so that no teeth were left to the committee to give effect to its ultimate plan. The Melbourne Board of Works is empowered to levy an improvement rate within the metropolitan area. In fact, the scheme is published and is subject to objections before approval. So, once the scheme is published anyone can lodge an objection which can be heard, and a decision is ultimately made that can effect the people of Victoria. That scheme has some force.

In Western Australia the Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority was established in 1959 to prepare and administer a statutory planning scheme for the metropolitan region. The authority administers an interim development order. Again, it has some power to see to it that the plan is not completely torn up while it is being drawn. The metropolitan planning scheme is at present on public exhibition prior to statutory approval. Once it is statutorily approved then it has effect within the metropolitan area.

In Queensland the Greater Brisbane Planning Authority was established in 1959. The plan was completed in November, 1961, and placed on public exhibition. After consideration of the objections lodged, the plan will be submitted to the Minister for approval by the Governor. There again, an effective plan will be in force after objections have been submitted. Tasmania has a similar provision.

The Southern Metropolitan Master Planning Authority has prepared a plan for the metropolitan area of Hobart and for adjoining municipalities. The plan was placed on public exhibition before being submitted to the Commissioner.

In each case there was provision for the publication of a plan, the hearing of objections, the ultimate adoption of the plan and its carrying into force as law affecting future development. However, all we have in South Australia is a plan, and that is the end of it. It has been published, but there is no provision for the lodging of effective objections. It is not possible in this Parliament to lodge all the necessary objections. We should not have to lodge motion after motion here to enable some portion of the Town Planning Committee's report to be referred back. The debates would be endless. This is not an effective way of considering objections to the plan.

Mr. Shannon: How should objections be dealt with?

Mr. DUNSTAN: They should be lodged in writing and the Town Planning Committee should hear them.

Mr. Shannon: What authority would decide their validity?

Mr. DUNSTAN: In some States it is the authority itself which considers the objections, and in others the Commissioner or the Minister. Someone decides the objections one way or the other and recommends the plan after the objections have been lodged and determined.

Mr. Shannon: How are the objections dealt with?

Mr. DUNSTAN: In South Australia we could permit objections to be lodged before the Town Planning Committee, which could then accept or reject them but report to Parliament on the objections that are lodged.

Mr. Shannon: What would be the final authority?

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Opposition would be happy to make provision in the motion for that. Provision should be made for the lodging and consideration of objections. At the moment there is no such provision in South Australia. Once objections have been lodged and the plan adopted, there should be some authority for co-ordinating the work of councils and for carrying the plan into effect. This afternoon the Premier spoke at length about recreation areas. That is one problem upon which councils have written to the Premier, but it is not the only problem. The committee's report assumes at the outset that the suburban

sprawl now evident in South Australia is going to continue, and there is no adequate provision in the plan for high density redevelopment in the metropolitan area. Members of town planning authorities overseas and locally have urged the need for South Australia socially and economically to redevelop the inner metropolitan area. What is happening in areas like those represented by members for Hindmarsh and Unley and myself is that in due course they will become dead. They will have a steadily reducing population with the development of backyard industries. Where people should be living close to the centre of the city, with adequate provision for housing, transport and recreation facilities, we shall have a dead area. As one of Australia's leading architects said some years ago, "At the rate that Adelaide is going on we will not have a city and suburbs because there will not be any effective city—no living city—for the urbs to be sub."

What we need is a planning authority to oversee inner suburban redevelopment. The Kensington and Norwood Council has taken a decision not only opposed to the proposals of the Town Planning Committee about recreation areas and the financing of them, but a decision strongly in favour of redevelopment of the inner suburban areas, particularly of its own. A committee of town planners, engineers and architects prepared a most attractive plan for the redevelopment of Kensington to allow for the settlement of 4,000 people in place of the 1,200 living there now. Kensington is already adequately served with water, power and public transport, and there is no need for it to have through roads. It can be an excellent area for closer development. At present it is settled by people living on allotments which are, for the most part, far too large for them. As people get older—and, indeed, this applies to some people who like to think of themselves as still reasonably young—they find that the burden of the average suburban allotment is far too great: it takes far too much toil to keep the garden going.

It is undoubtedly going to be extremely costly for South Australia to continue with probably the most expensive method of housing our population—cottage development upon large allotments of land. That is what we are going in for at an enormous cost to us in the provision of water. How in the world Adelaide—one of the driest cities in Australia—is going to be able to continue to pour water on to suburban gardens which, as people get older, cannot be maintained, is beyond me.

Many cannot maintain their gardens now. This is apparent in Kensington. We should be able to settle people on smaller frontages in houses that back on to public recreation areas. By so doing there would be adequate public provision for gardens and recreation areas, and there would be only small private gardens, which could be adequately maintained. The plan prepared by the town planners and architects provided for just such development in Kensington. It provided for many types of housing—individual houses, flats and multi-storey flats. It provided for sufficient public facilities in the area to ensure that all the needs of the community were met. Provision was made for far more public recreation areas in Kensington than now exist. All of this can be done at a far lower cost than proceeding to spread cottage development on to land which, at the moment, is vital for our vegetable production.

The town plan proposed at present will wipe out many acres of valuable market gardening land that we should preserve for the people. The proposal will be costly. Expensive free-ways will have to be provided. Many traffic problems will confront us. We shall have to meet the costs of water, sewer and electricity supplies and to extend our public transport system to an utterly uneconomic extent. If the inner areas were more closely developed public transport at present operating in these areas would give a much better return than it does now, because the ratio of running costs to the passenger-distance would be much lower for each passenger. It would be much simpler for people to use public transport and they would be more likely to do so than if they were living in outer areas where, in most cases, they feel that they must have some form of private transport. If they reside in the more closely settled inner areas it is more feasible for them to use public transport regularly. More people residing in the inner areas would result in a vast saving in transport costs.

This is a better proposition socially, as well. As the honourable member for Gawler will testify, many social problems arise in new housing areas such as Elizabeth where people do not know one another and are settled *en masse* in cottage development. They get into a suburban rut, which is apparent in the present development of our mass society; half the time they do not know people living three doors away from them. It is difficult in such new areas to develop the necessary community spirit and the community organization and activity that are found in older communities.

Mr. Clark: It is pretty costly, too.

council, with others, has been alive to the desirability of obtaining land for reserves and has taken practical steps in this regard.

Enlightened legislation permits the Government to subsidize councils in the purchase of land and furthermore, the Government has shown on various occasions that it is prepared to purchase large areas referred to the committee as "regional open spaces". There is considerable finance involved in the proposals of the committee and, as a body responsible for the administering of public funds, we consider that it is of paramount importance that, to be acceptable, an idea must be a practicable possibility.

So again the present views of the West Torrens City Council, which can be amplified later, are, in broad terms, that it is opposed to the proposal of the Town Planning Committee. The Prospect City Council says:

I am directed to advise that this council is of the opinion that it is preferable for it to continue to operate under the provisions of the Public Parks Act as it now exists to add to open spaces as opportunities arise within the district. It is further of the opinion that in the event of any amendment to such Act whereby the present position is altered, any basis of contributions by councils should be related to existing open spaces or reserves which have been provided wholly at council's cost and in Prospect's case particular regard must be had to the use which residents enjoy of the northern parklands abutting the district.

The Unley City Council will consider the matter and advise us in due course. The Tea Tree Gully District Council has a different view altogether. It says:

Your letter of 27th ult. reference CDR : MCD, regarding certain recommendations of the Town Planning Committee was considered at the last meeting of Council held on Monday, 7th inst. Because of the future development of this area, my council has always been of the opinion that the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee in regard to the provision of open spaces should be implemented as soon as possible. With an anticipated population of over 100,000 people it is necessary to take early steps to acquire sufficient land necessary for open space and recreational facilities.

Unless this land is acquired now it will be lost either by subdivision or its cost will be prohibitive. However, the difficulty confronting council is that at this stage of its development, finance is required for other essential works and it is therefore considered that an authority such as the Metropolitan Public Parks Authority should be set up for this purpose.

We understand such an authority is in fact established in Western Australia and that it functions satisfactorily. It is suggested that the contributions from councils to the authority should be the same way as the Western Australian authority, namely, a fixed rate on the assessment.

So it is clear from those letters, to summarize the answers we have so far received, that Marion requests further information, Salisbury will consider the matter at its next meeting, and St. Peters has referred the matter to the Municipal Association. The City of Burnside does not support the establishment of a metropolitan parks authority and the City of Kensington and Norwood strongly opposes it. The City of Brighton has referred it to its next meeting, and the City of Campbelltown strongly opposes it. The Municipality of Payneham will consider it on November 4 while the City of Enfield agrees to the establishment of such an authority provided the Government's contribution is at least 80 per cent. The City of West Torrens opposes its setting up. The City of Prospect considers it preferable to continue under the present Public Parks Act. The City of Unley still has the matter under consideration, and the Tea Tree Gully District Council recommends the establishment of a metropolitan parks authority. If honourable members will consider those replies and analyse them, they will appreciate the variety of opinion displayed on this matter and will see that the great weight of opinion is opposed to the proposal. Several councils still have to give their views. This emphasizes the complexity of even that simple recommendation of the committee.

If I may, I will speak now about another matter that causes me considerable concern. I do not complain that the committee, which was asked to draft a development plan for the City of Adelaide, went far beyond the metropolitan area in its recommendations. However, on some aspects of planning outside the metropolitan area I do not believe the committee is as competent to speak as it is on the metropolitan area. The Government appointed the committee to prepare a metropolitan area plan, and many of the things it has said about areas outside the city seem to me to require much more consideration. The report deals largely with areas outside the metropolitan area. Much of the report deals with recommendations about various zones, and it shows by maps what the individual demarcations of the various areas would be.

Mr. Frank Walsh: There is a metropolitan Adelaide area.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The report deals with zones—rural zone, hills face zone, country living zone, country township zone and the metropolitan zone (the present metropolitan area). If members study the maps attached to these zones they will see

a system of long-term loans should be introduced thereby enabling the individual local governing bodies to adequately meet the responsibilities which will be incurred.

I am further directed to point out that this council has accepted responsibility in the matter of the provision of recreation grounds, and whilst it has not been possible to acquire land on a basis comparable with that desired in terms of the Town Planning Committee's report, purchases have been made consistent with the council's ability to finance this aspect. Of recent date the council has resolved to conclude the purchase of approximately 57 acres of land at Gilles Plains in conjunction with the Government under the terms of the Public Parks Act. Whilst this council feels that it has reasonably met the requirements of its ratepayers for recreation grounds, it is in agreement with the principle of all councils in the metropolitan area sharing the cost as referred to above, and it is felt that the Government's contribution should be at least 80 per cent, with the balance of 20 per cent to be met by local authorities.

The difference between that letter and the others is that it is much more generous to the Government, in as much as it says that the Government is responsible entirely for the major recreation areas and for 80 per cent of the minor ones. The other letters have not gone quite to that extent. It has been the Government's policy for a considerable time to finance entirely major recreation areas. For instance, the entire cost of the land purchased at West Beach was met by the Government. Speaking from memory, I think the cost was between £200,000 and £300,000. The Government, with the consent of Parliament, set up a trust and up to this year it has financed it in assisting in the development of the area. I am pleased to say that the trust has now developed the West Beach recreation area to the extent that probably it will not have to rely upon any further Government grant for its further development. The golf links and a number of other major works have been completed.

I have illustrated that to show that the Government has set aside major areas. The first area so set aside, many years before the present Government was in existence, was the National Park at Belair. We have established a beautiful area at Humbug Scrub and recently purchased more land to be added to it. We are providing the money to develop it.

I stress that the 80 per cent has no attraction whatsoever for my Government. We believe that local recreation areas are peculiarly something that the local people should have as a major contribution to them. I could not justify asking the people at Blyth, Balaklava or some other place to provide the

major contribution for a recreation area in the metropolitan area, where I am prepared to recommend that the Government provide half. We have been providing half over a long period but, beyond a half, I should not be prepared to make a recommendation. The Public Parks Act provides for half. That legislation was debated in this House and at that time was accepted as being quite a reasonable proposition. Many councils have worked under it and, as the letters have shown today, those who have worked under it have appreciated it and want it to be continued. I quoted a few minutes ago a letter from the Kensington and Norwood council in which it said it would not support a proposal to set up a central authority, and it claimed that it would like the present bodies to be maintained.

The approach of the West Torrens council is not very different from that of some of the other authorities. Its letter reads:

I acknowledge your letter of September 27 and thank you for inviting comments on the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee in respect of a metropolitan parks authority. I am to advise that my council opposes the setting up of a metropolitan parks authority and also the proposal that councils be levied to provide finance for purchasing or developing "major open spaces". We believe that, generally speaking, funds of ratepayers should be spent within our own areas. We also think that councils are in a position to know where best to provide local reserves and, subject to my further comments below, councils have not failed in this regard. This council has availed itself of Government assistance under the Recreation Grounds (Joint Schemes) Act 1947 and this, with other legislation whereby the Government assists councils, and whereby the Government too has itself purchased large areas, seems to indicate that there is no reason why adequate reserves should not continue to be provided. In this connection I will mention that we have studied the report on the metropolitan area of Adelaide and we hope to be in a position to submit to you our views on various aspects thereof in the near future.

The report, in so far as open spaces is concerned, treats the figures supplied in table 58 thereof as being basic and in consequence, we feel that you should know that in our opinion the particulars pertaining to West Torrens are incorrect, whatever the definition of an open space may be. Furthermore, we have very definite views on the matter of recreation areas and these I would prefer to make the subject of a separate report. My council would agree that for quite a period the provision of reserves apparently received little support from all sections of the community, and this is witnessed by the paucity of reserves in the inner suburbs. However, I maintain that there is a completely different outlook today. In the more recent period of our development my

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. In the inner areas these facilities already exist and the City of Adelaide can be retained, in effect, as a city and not become merely a metropolitan shopping and business centre that is dead after six o'clock at night. However, if town planning proceeds in the way proposed, that is likely to happen. I believe that objections of this kind must be lodged and that some authority should be set up to do something effective about town planning and not merely attend to the zoning of areas and the purchase of recreation facilities. Such an authority should be able to take action to facilitate closer development of the inner suburban area. All this is necessary for town planning but, until there is some provision for it, all we can have before us is this most expensively drawn and beautifully produced plan, which has no effect on the lives of South Australians and no legislative force whatever. I hope that when this motion is carried, as I expect it will be as the Premier intends to support it, some effective action to implement it will be taken by the Government.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the motion. I rise to express the concern of some of my constituents, and particularly the concern of the Hindmarsh council. Although the council is prepared to support the plan in principle it is justifiably concerned about one or two aspects of it. The council believes the plan should be regarded as an interim plan to provide for changes as they occur. It is also considered that oversights have occurred. For instance, in the Bowden-Brompton area, in recent years, Gerard Industries Limited has spent a large sum in developing a substantial industry and erecting buildings. This area has been zoned in the plan as a commercial area, which gravely concerns the Hindmarsh council and Gerards. The matter has been discussed with representatives of the Town Planning Committee and they are certain that if the plan is adopted the difficulties can be overcome; but we want to be sure that they can be overcome.

I wrote to the Attorney-General and asked him to consider the matter of the Port Road frontage from King Street, Croydon, to Woodville Road, Woodville, which is zoned as a residential area but is interspersed with small blocks of industrial buildings. I am certain that no member of this Parliament would choose to build a house on the Port Road. People would not choose to live on the Port Road: it would be unsafe to raise children there because of the volume of traffic on the

road. Further, the area is noisy. However, it is ideally situated for commerce and industry, being near the heart of commerce and to the main seaport of the State. Companies and others, having purchased land in this area, have increased its value to such an extent that the council rating on unimproved land values can be as high as £83 a year. This rate must be paid by people who occupy houses in the area and unfortunately most of them are either superannuated persons or age pensioners. They cannot sell their houses at a price that would enable them to purchase houses elsewhere because the area is unsuitable residentially. This is one of the mistakes made in planning and, therefore, I believe this should be an interim report only, so that anomalies in it may be corrected.

I believe the principal concern on this side of the House is that the cost of preparing the plan was about £28,000. The Town Planner has not been given the necessary authority to put his plan into effect, whereas that authority has been given in other States. The Premier made a long statement about the attitudes of the various councils and the House is grateful to him for this. It is imperative that there be a central authority if development is to take place. If matters are left to the individual councils for decision no progress will be made because these bodies find it so difficult to agree on action. As an illustration, the councils of Enfield, Woodville and Hindmarsh are all in areas that require drainage to provide satisfactory living conditions. All these councils have agreed that they must have a drainage system but they have not been able to agree on the type of system. The Woodville council has spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on a drainage system.

Mr. Shannon: It told the Public Works Committee that over the years it had spent over £1,000,000.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I think that is correct. The Hindmarsh and Enfield councils will have to spend similar amounts. If the councils had come together with one major scheme it would have been much better, but because they cannot reach agreement on the matter there is additional expense. The time is ripe for authority to be given for the committee to commence operations. It is important for areas like Norwood, Unley and Hindmarsh, where the blight has set in. They have substandard houses, although water, electricity and sewers are there. If we follow the Town Planning Committee proposal we shall tax the

State beyond its capacity. We must have a proper system in order to economize. I hope the motion will be carried. I am glad of the support already given to it. We all favour town planning, but in the report there are some matters that need correcting. That is the idea behind the motion.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I must confess that when I first looked at the wording of the motion I had difficulty in knowing exactly what was aimed at, but I can now see that, overall, it is the seeking of co-ordination to ensure that the plan be a master plan for implementation from time to time as local conditions, finance and so on permit. In other words, I view the motion as one which would broadly accept the principles of the plan, but which realizes that physical and financial difficulties make it impossible to have it implemented overnight. It is a long-range plan to be reviewed in the light of local conditions. Finance is an important matter, and then there is the question of the physical ability to do the work in the time proposed. The plan is an excellent document and a guide for the future development of Adelaide and its environs. It is a plan that can be implemented gradually, so that the blank spots can be filled in over a long period. It gives us something basic to follow and I commend those gentlemen who drew up the plan. It is undoubtedly the result of wide and deep research. In connection with future development, it is the best plan that has come before the House.

Although conceding that it is a master plan for gradual implementation, there are some things which cannot be deferred unduly. Mainly, there is the matter of the provision of open spaces for recreational purposes. I am disappointed that there has not been an acceptance to a degree by more councils to the provision of the wherewithal to enable land to be purchased on the fringes of the metropolitan area and so ensure locations for the sons of those people who now object to being rated to provide recreational areas for later generations. The sons of these people have now the compact metropolitan area, but as their families grow they will have to move out to the fringe areas. By providing for open spaces now we shall be ensuring their retention.

Mr. Jennings: The present fringe areas are getting their own fringe areas.

Mr. LAUCKE: What was a fringe area years ago is now in the metropolitan area and new fringe areas are being developed.

The population needs facilities for recreational purposes. It is a short-sighted policy on the part of people to object now to subscribing to a proposal that will provide money to enable land to be purchased and be an asset for their children. They oppose having to pay a little extra rate.

Mr. Bywaters: Some of these people drive their motor cars out to these other areas.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. In these days 30 miles means only a run of about half an hour in a motor car. The facilities offered by local authorities in the more distant parts from the metropolitan centre are being avidly sought after by those who live in the more densely populated areas. I have in mind the Tea Tree Gully Golf Club, which has a full membership, and has many people waiting to become members. The council has developed a beautiful site at Highercombe, with 157 acres in a delightful setting of natural undulating country suitable for a golf club. The council is providing a municipal golf links. It is an excellent move, but the residents of Tea Tree Gully, Highbury, Modbury and Golden Grove might not make as much use of the amenities provided as people who, for the time being, are in the metropolitan area. It is right that assistance should be made available to a council, such as the Tea Tree Gully council, which has done a remarkable job so far in providing open spaces in its area.

Mr. Clark: It is a really good council.

Mr. LAUCKE: It is outstanding and has shown foresight, initiative and a realization of the obligation to ensure that there will be retained in the new area, as it were, land which is so sadly lacking in the inner metropolitan area at present. Thirty acres of land has been purchased at Tea Tree Gully and on it are two football ovals and tennis courts, and, in addition, there will be a swimming pool. All in all, this will be a valuable recreational area. There is an old-established oval, which is being maintained and developed. Land is under consideration for purchase for further extensions of facilities, having regard to the future. These good folk in the district are looking ahead in a way that is salutary. If they can be assisted, and I appreciate what is being done, as they do, by the provision of money from the Government on a pound-for-pound basis, according to the Land Board's valuation, it will be a great help. In a rapidly growing area there are calls on the available rate revenue for the provision of footpaths, roads, bridges and local sewerage schemes. All this adds to the costs of local government.

With all these costs there comes a time when immediate revenues are completely used up and when the borrowing capacity reaches saturation point, beyond which no further borrowing is possible. The stage is then reached where councils, motivated to do the right thing for their people and intent on seeing that they will not be condemned by posterity for short-sightedness, find that they have to forgo portions of their master plans for areas being reserved for recreation purposes because they just cannot afford the expense involved.

It is a great shame that that is occurring. I have in mind the position existing only three years ago when this Government agreed to buy certain lands near Humburg Scrub. At that time it was thought by many, myself included, that that land would not be required for generations, but that it should be purchased and left for ultimate enjoyment by the people when the time arrived for such lands, in good Australian bushland surroundings, to be used for ovals and so on. In three short years we find that that land is now the Para Wirra National Reserve and is in great demand by people not only from the metropolitan area but from other parts of the State who are coming to enjoy the facilities of that most admirable park. I should say that that development was beyond the expectation of every honourable member.

By the same token, that which we regard as ample provision, say, at Tea Tree Gully today could be far short of requirements in a few short years. I have in the past advocated that long-term loan moneys should be available to district councils in the inner metropolitan area that have problems peculiar to their own areas so that they could buy those lands which they have pin-pointed as necessary for the purposes of recreation in due time. Although it may not be necessary to develop them immediately, these councils could purchase those areas and sit upon them, as it were, for the time being until it was necessary to use them. Despite what we have thus far achieved with a pound-for-pound subsidy under the Land Board's valuation and with the approval of the Government, I think there is still a vital need for access to moneys beyond the borrowing capacity of councils. I advocate the provision of long-term moneys, with councils not being called upon to pay interest immediately. If the interest could be deferred for, say, 10 years on long-term money, by then the rate revenue would have grown to a point where councils could meet the servicing of their loans. The vitally important thing

would be that lands had been retained for what, without doubt, would be required by posterity.

This plan is good. It is long-term, and it can be implemented over the years, but there are certain aspects of it which require immediate and urgent attention, and none is more important, in my opinion, than ensuring that we reserve adequate spaces for recreation, not just for our generation but for generations ahead. I hope that the realization which has grown in this place over recent years will be accentuated, with the result that future generations will not point to a given era in the history of the State when we were too short-sighted to do certain things which were afterwards irretrievable, as it were. I support the motion.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I have heard many speeches this afternoon on the motion and they all seem to me to be designed with the one object of taking out any teeth that there happen to be in this Town Planning Committee's report. If there is a molar left, members wish to draw it. On my reading of the motion, that appears to be the intention. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) very rightly pointed out that the planning committees in other States did have teeth and that they did do things. I am not sure that the honourable member knew exactly how objections were dealt with, and I doubt whether the reply he gave to my interjection as to the *modus operandi* of dealing with those objections would satisfy him. I am not criticizing the honourable member: I am merely pointing out that his reply to me was that these matters were referred back to the committee, to the director of the department concerned, or to a Minister.

Mr. Dunstan: In some cases that would be so.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think the honourable member would be any happier than I would be with such a *modus operandi* of dealing with objections. If those objections were legitimate, in my opinion, I should want to have a say myself, as I think the honourable member would, too. Having listened to the debate this afternoon, I am quite convinced that there are aspects of the report that are not meeting with much support in this Chamber. The honourable member made that abundantly clear, as did my own leader, the Premier. I understand the meaning of the word "interim", as I guess most honourable members do, and if this is but an interim report it seems to me that we have got nowhere. We have started on the road and have laid out the skeleton on which it is

proposed to build, I take it, but that appears to me to be all that we have done if we are going to make provision for the lodging of objections from local government bodies. I think it is right that those bodies should have some voice in this matter, because they will be administering most of the committee's findings. However, if that is the case, and if we are to give effect to plans from time to time as they are revised, obviously we are a long way from anywhere yet. It appears to me that if we pass this motion in its present form it will be, in effect, a negation of the report as submitted, and I think we should be honest and admit that.

I cannot see that any other interpretation can be put upon this motion. If the House adopts it, obviously the people who have been concerned with looking at this problem must do all their homework over again. In effect, that is what we would be telling them to do. It is my opinion that teeth in these things are advisable, with certain limitations, and that we should give certain authority to people in this field of planning, yet at the same time limit their powers in certain specified directions. However, it is a waste of time—and I think that is being proved today in this debate—when the money we have spent on this report is, by and large, wasted money. We shall get nowhere with the report. If we pass this motion I cannot imagine that anything will come from the report that we shall wish to act upon.

We have a variety of opinions regarding the inner area, and we have an even wider opinion regarding the outer area just beyond the metropolitan area for which these people have sought to make some provision. It appears to me that we could give one direction (I make this suggestion here) to this committee. Following the remarks of the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who has been active in this field, for which I give him full marks, we must realize that the one thing we cannot recover is land for open spaces once we have lost it. Once open spaces become dedicated to other purposes, like housing or industry, no matter what they are dedicated to once they become developed for some specific purpose they are no longer open spaces and are no longer available for that purpose.

One recreation for which a special type of terrain is needed is golf. A terrain with a variety of country is needed for that sport. In fact, if level country is available for a golf course, we immediately set about making hazards to improve the quality of the game for

the players indulging in it. The member for Barossa has a golf course at Tea Tree Gully where the hazards are natural. There is no trouble about providing a suitable golf course in some of our near hills areas, but for some sporting activities that we like to organize in Australia, like football (which, I suppose, must come first, although I do not know why; but it seems to be the main venue for our younger people), cricket and tennis, reasonably level ground is required. It is costly to turn undulating or steep country into reasonably level ground upon which people can play this type of sport that so many of our young people enjoy.

Golf is a restricted sport. The member for Barossa has told us that the membership at his club is already filled. The membership list is closed because the club cannot take in any more. But there are not many football or cricket teams one cannot join, because they have a number of grades and, if a man cannot get into grade A, he can usually get into grade B, C or D, or even X, Y or Z. People can always get a game in those sports, which is desirable. Australia is designed for outdoor living, so these recreation areas should be reasonably level.

In my own hills area blocks that are reasonably level and can be converted to playing areas are few and far between. One travels many miles to find one. We have a few and there are, I imagine (I shall not be dogmatic about this), a few more that could be secured for this purpose. In the Willunga area, and certainly up towards the Gawler area, this problem of the terrain does not apply so much. It will, however, apply from the point of view of desirability and need to a greater extent than it will in our hills area, because a denser population is to be served on the Adelaide Plains than there ever will be in the hills, requiring some outdoor facilities. So I believe it would have been practical politics here to give the committee some authority to issue to owners of properties, which in the committee's opinion were suitable for setting aside as recreational reserves, notices that it was its intention to recommend to the Government that those properties be acquired for that purpose. It would have been a sufficient deterrent to any possible subdivider. In many places land is now cut up and sold in single blocks, the landowner being encouraged to accept what he thinks is a handsome price based on its productivity as an agricultural proposition. The subdivider has done very well out of it.

It would have been good business if the Government had been told by this committee that these areas should be set aside for recreational purposes and that notices should be served upon those owners so that in due course we should be able to acquire and use the land for the purpose for which it will ultimately be required. That is one aspect in respect of which I should have been happy to give some teeth to our committee—the question of acquisition or the marking out and defining of the areas where in the committee's opinion, recreational facilities should be made available. I have the same sort of complaints to make about my own area as honourable members opposite have expressed with regard to the inner area. The complaints about my area apply also to the metropolitan area. For instance, the Premier, in speaking of Piccadilly, Uraidla and Summertown, referred to the size of blocks built on and spoke about whether building should take place here or there, etc. That applies in my area, too. One of the overriding recommendations of the committee in the Stirling District Council area is that one shall not build on less than half an acre of land. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) mentioned an important point about the size of the allotments on which one can build a house. I have heard Mr. Dridan on this almost *ad nauseam* when he speaks about water. He points out the percentage of water sold by his department for the purposes of watering gardens. It is a very big percentage of the total water used in the metropolitan area. Members are all aware that in country extensions we provide domestic and stock water only; we do not sell water to country extensions for irrigation purposes. However, we are now setting out, if we adopt what is recommended, on a vast irrigation scheme for private gardens. In my area every man has half an acre of land on which to build his house. On the one hand, he can just let it run riot and allow it to become a fire menace and a harbour for vermin and weeds. He can do that, although I doubt whether it is in his best interests so to do. In fact, I deplore such a thing happening.

On the other hand, he can maintain it as he should maintain it. I believe the committee has something to say about what is happening to the natural beauty of our Adelaide Hills. It is a heritage that we should not cast lightly aside. I regret that this problem is not looked at more carefully to see how these places can be retained and whether

we cannot set aside some of our beauty spots, of which there are a number throughout the hills, where there is no need to build houses. In fact, on some of that land it is very expensive to build them in any case. I know people do build them there, reckoning that the money they save on the land enables them to spend more on expensive footings for the house. Many people up there like these "two-deckers" or "three-deckers", as they call them. I believe that the committee's approach to this problem was a little unrealistic. It suggested also that the disposing of household waste water, from the lavatory and from the bathroom, would create a problem in the hills. We have had that problem for as long as I have lived there, and I have lived there half a lifetime. The terrain does not present any problem in such disposal. If we had a group of houses from which the septic tank effluent became a source of annoyance, there would be no great difficulty in doing what was done in the Barossa district (at Modbury and Tea Tree Gully) and grouping half a dozen, a dozen or even 20 houses into a private scheme and running all the effluent to one spot, where it could be cheaply treated. The effluent does not need a complete treatment; it will not do any harm and it will not run into a watercourse. These things are not insuperable difficulties and, if handled with a little common sense, are reasonable and less costly in some ways than the regular yearly rate paid for a sewerage system. They are much less costly than the sewerage rate paid in the metropolitan area.

These things are known to some of us, and, if the committee had taken evidence from some of the old residents who had handled these problems over the years, it would not have been so concerned as to suggest that it was necessary in the hills to have half an acre of land to get rid of the effluent. In some places half an acre would not make a scrap more difference to the disposal of waste than a quarter acre would make. I could take members to some sites and they would agree with me. The physical area is not the answer; the type of country, its absorption capacity and its physical fall decide how household waste can be dealt with. I know of no places in and around the Mount Lofty area where effluent disposal is a problem.

The Stirling District Council had a by-law that provided for a minimum of 12,000 sq. ft. for a house site; that is about half the area recommended by the Town Planning Committee. I think the council has been realistic

about this and that the area it has stipulated is ample. Water is now being laid to these areas, and the larger the area upon which a house is built the longer the line must be. This adds to the cost for this particular amenity without there being any benefit to the occupier who, after all, is only getting water.

These are the aspects that appear to me to require further thought. I think we should be honest with ourselves and say that if we pass this motion we are in effect telling the committee that there are things in the report with which we do not agree. Let it understand clearly that we do not agree with some things. I do not think the Leader intended that this motion should be a vote of confidence in the findings of the committee. If he did, it was worded in a peculiar way. If it was not intended as a vote of confidence, obviously the reverse was intended, and, if the reverse was intended, let us say so. Let us be realistic about it. If we think the committee should be empowered to make recommendations about some things, let us say so. I am content to give the committee wide powers in relation to recreation facilities—which I have mentioned—and access roads, which are just as important. If we allow the topsy-turvy development that has happened since the inception of the State to continue, we shall have the same problem regarding by-pass roads, which are costly by virtue of land acquisition. Sites have been chosen not because they have been ideal but because they have been cheaper since there have been no costly buildings in the way. All these things are taking place now. I would give this committee some authority in relation to highways and access roads. In this field, I should be prepared to trust the people (who are in this instance capable people) if they knew they had a definite responsibility and they could be called to task if they made unfortunate recommendations. The committee must have known that the report need not become law or be acted upon. I like people to have responsibility and to know that what they recommend is what will be done; then we shall have a more considered approach.

Some of the development of the metropolitan area will take care of itself whatever we do. The type of house that will be built and the type of facilities provided in them will come as a result of the needs of the people living in the different areas. We need not worry about design, for instance. However, such things as access roads, highways, and open areas for playing fields (which have occurred haphazardly) should be carefully planned. I do

not object to putting aside reserves here and there if necessary. We have these in the Adelaide Hills, and I am all for them; I do not think we have enough of them. I should be happy for the committee to have some plenary powers in this matter, but I am concerned about the motion. Obviously it will be carried, but I want it known that, although I do not oppose the motion, I am against many aspects of the committee's findings. I realize that, and I think everyone who votes for the motion should realize it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): First, let me hasten to assure the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) that I think he is unduly alarmed about many of the things to which he has objected. I do not ask Parliament to accept *in toto* the Town Planning Committee's development plan. I shall not endeavour to convince the honourable member, however, as I have said all I intend to say on this aspect, but, if he had read what I said when I introduced the motion, he would not have said many of the things he did. The authority I quoted, the Adelaide Division of the Australian Planning Institute, recommended in 1962 certain action for future town planning administration in this State, as follows:

On submission to Parliament of the advisory development plan for the metropolitan Adelaide prepared by the Town Planning Committee, Parliament should immediately amend the Town Planning Act to empower the making of an interim development order.

If this motion is carried, the Government will have the right to amend the Town Planning Act. It will take much to implement all these recommendations. I did not have the facilities or the time to frame the motion differently, but, if I had done so, it probably would have involved some Government expenditure, and I was not able to act in that way. Another recommendation by the institute was:

A major amendment to the Town Planning Act should be passed providing for the setting up of a metropolitan planning authority with power to prepare and review the overall and detailed planning schemes for metropolitan Adelaide; to control development of metropolitan significance; to acquire and dispose of land; to control a fund to be used for planning purposes; and to exercise interim control. I agree that all who thought about the Town Planning Committee's report could find fault with some recommendations, but they could also find much valuable information. I am sure that as the Highways Department develops freeways, it will refer to the maps of suggested freeways in the plan. The report suggests that

councils should act as soon as the report is adopted. I do not insist that councils should be compelled to alter their zoning, as is suggested in the report, nor do I agree that councils should hide behind the recommendations and use them to implement their own plans. Some councils have not zoned their areas in keeping with the desirability of planned development. The report suggests a certain zoning proposition in my district. This matter is now before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and it is proposed to extend an area much further than is suggested in the report. Although industry went to the expense of assisting in this matter some time ago, the council now wishes to draw another demarcation line that is unsuitable for industrial purposes.

I should be the last person to suggest that the Premier does not know anything about the hills area. I do not wish to be embroiled in an argument, because he is an authority on that area. The same could be said of other honourable members about their districts. I am sure we are all trying to assist in the future planning of this State. It will be the Government's responsibility, with the assistance of its officers, to amend the Town Planning Act as it desires. I emphasize that we must not confuse the existing metropolitan area and what is shown in the report as metropolitan Adelaide, because these are different areas. I am pleased that I had the opportunity of bringing this matter to the Government's notice. I ask for its co-operation, not only in the interests of Parliament but for the future benefit of the State. Finally, I urge honourable members to support the motion.

Motion carried.

#### ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 985.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support this simple Bill, and do not need to detain the House very long, any more than some of the speeches we heard this afternoon needed to detain the House very long, but did. It is merely a matter of whether or not polling hours should be reduced at State elections by two hours by making the closing time of polling booths 6 p.m. The Leader briefly explained the Bill and pointed out its important feature. When the Premier opposed it, he did so briefly, and relied for his opposition on the fact that it would not be uniform with Commonwealth legislation providing for polling hours to be

from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. We have never known the Premier to be concerned about uniformity when it suits him. We are not concerned with uniformity in polling hours in this State. For instance, in the Local Government Act country polling districts close at 6 p.m. and in the city at 7 p.m., whereas our Parliamentary elections close at 8 p.m. It is astonishing that in country areas the council polls should close an hour before they do in the metropolitan area. One would have thought that country people would have more difficulty than city dwellers in getting to a polling booth on time. In 1946 our Local Government Act was amended, but before then the polling hours in district councils—probably the most outlying parts of the State—were from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. That provision was subsequently amended to provide for the present hours. The Premier said that whilst it would be possible for people to vote before 6 p.m. they would not find it convenient. He said that frequently we see several people voting just before 8 p.m. Of course we do! Some people always come in at the last moment.

Mr. Clark: As soon as the doors are shut, people are hammering on them.

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently I was a scrutineer at a polling booth. Just as the doors were being closed a lady hurried in. I followed her because I wanted to be present when the ballot boxes were opened for the count. She secured her ballot paper, dropped it on the floor and put her how-to-vote card in the ballot box. My point is that if a polling booth were open until midnight someone would still get there at the last moment.

Mr. Millhouse: Which how-to-vote card did she put in the ballot box?

Mr. JENNINGS: Unfortunately she put a Labor one in. This Bill was introduced in good faith. The Premier claims that South Australia leads in many respects: why should we not give the lead in this direction? The Commonwealth might follow suit. I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Every speaker has said that the subject matter of the Bill is within a small compass. So it is, but I wish to refer to two aspects. I am entirely and utterly opposed to the Bill. The fact that the member for Enfield has just spoken has, of course, had some influence on me in that regard. I oppose the Bill for two reasons. First, I respectfully adopt the argument put by my learned leader, the Premier, that it would breach uniformity between the Commonwealth and the State. The member for Enfield

spoke of council elections and said that we have no uniformity there, but if one adopts a commonsense attitude—as I know he intended to do, but just failed—one remembers that the chances of confusion lie not between State Parliamentary and local government elections but between State Parliamentary and Commonwealth Parliamentary elections where voting is compulsory and districts larger. I can visualize much confusion arising if for some compulsory voting the closing time is 6 p.m. and for other compulsory voting 8 p.m. I remind members that in 1941 the present closing time of 8 p.m. was adopted for State elections. That is within the living memory of many members of this place.

Mr. Frank Walsh: In fact, I was responsible for that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was a Government Bill. I checked on that today. No doubt the Leader was responsible and I would be the last to deny him credit where credit is due, but before 1941 the closing time was 7 p.m. What did the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Richards, say? He said:

I see nothing contentious in this Bill. It appears that an attempt is being made to arrive at a more uniform system in the conduct of the State and Commonwealth elections. I think the Bill could go much farther, particularly in the direction of uniform franchise. It is very desirable that a more common policy should be sought on all possible points and so avoid continual misunderstanding by the electors. The proposed amendments to the Act, as contained in the Bill, invite little discussion, and because of their uniformity with similar provisions of the Commonwealth Act should be speedily dealt with. I raise no objection to the polling hours of 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. being altered to 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Where long distances have to be travelled to the polling booth in outback areas, I rather think that this will be an improvement on the present Act.

Mr. Jennings: There was Saturday morning work then.

Mr. Loveday: There were not as many motor cars then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am adopting not only my leader's argument but the argument of a former Leader of the Opposition who, in the name of uniformity, gave his blessing to the hours which we now enjoy in South Australia. Of course, both those gentlemen were entirely right.

Mr. Loveday: I thought you did not like uniformity.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly do, in this instance. I do not want to delay this debate—

The SPEAKER: It's being held up now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My other objection is perhaps a more practical and less theoretical one. The Labor Party has now declared itself in favour of six o'clock closing of the polling booths.

Mr. Bywaters: I am all for six o'clock closing!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That introduces the very point I want to make. I assume that every member of this House at elections, other than those in which he himself has been a candidate, has given out how-to-vote cards between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. I defy any member to deny that his experience is that after six o'clock, when the pubs have closed, there is always a busy period when people come to vote. My experience has been that during the afternoon—

Mr. Shannon: They get into the spirit for voting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, they have to be well oiled so that they know how to vote.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What is the position in other States?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know, nor do I care in this case. All I know is that at present there is a busy period after 6 p.m. until about 6.45 p.m., then a lull, and then another busy period just before 8 p.m. Members claim that there will always be a busy period just before the poll closes. That is true. Some people always forget and rush in at the last minute to try to keep within the law. However, it is obvious from my experience that many people like to vote after 6 p.m. If this Bill is passed we will be denying them that convenience. In the name of uniformity and for the sake of the convenience of the electors (and accepting wholeheartedly yet another of your strictures on me for speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker), I oppose the second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I had hoped that something would be said that would justify this Bill and that some reason would be put forward for closing the polling booths at six o'clock. I can think of only one good reason that could be put forward: the wear and tear on the candidate through worrying about his fate for another two hours. However, I cannot see anything terrible about that.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not apologize to the member for Mitcham for having, in 1941, advocated in Caucus an amendment to alter polling hours from 7 p.m. to 8 p.m. My reason was a desire for uniformity. In 1941 the State poll closed at

7 p.m. Prior to that there was a Commonwealth election at which the poll closed at 8 p.m. Since then a 40-hour working week has been introduced and many amenities provided that were not enjoyed then. Many voters are not concerned with public transport facilities.

Mr. Hall: Not everyone has a motor car!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member should interject from his own seat and I would listen to him. In the Southern District by-election held on December 15, 1962, in the subdivision of Willunga at Rapid Bay only two people voted—one for Gartner and the other for Gold; yet that booth was open for 12 hours to record only two votes. At Cherryville three people voted, and I complain about the stupid practice of keeping the polling booth open until 8 p.m. when only three votes were recorded during the whole day. In the subdivision of Woodside, at one polling place, only two people voted; at Carpenters Rocks only four voted. I am concerned that polls should be open for 12 hours to receive two or three votes. At Wellington East only two people voted all day. I do not wish to deny people the chance to vote near their homes. I do not desire to deprive the voter of his right to vote; indeed, I advocate universal adult suffrage for both Houses. Such a suffrage would mean that more voters would vote in the Legislative Council poll. My Party seeks to close the polling booths at 6 p.m. and this is in the interests of all concerned.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller) and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Teusner.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, on the ground that the House may further consider the matter, I give my vote in favour of the Noes, so the question passes in the negative.

Second reading thus negatived.

Mr. LAWN: I desire to ask you a question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot ask a question. He may make a point of order.

Mr. LAWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what did you mean when you said that the House could give the matter further consideration? I understand the only way the House, or a Committee, can further consider a matter is by carrying the second reading so that the matter will still be before the House or the Committee.

The SPEAKER: No point of order is involved in that matter. For the benefit of the honourable member, it is a well-known precedent that when there is an equality of votes the House must give further consideration to the question, and that means a reintroduction of the matter.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 992.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the Bill, which provides for the wearing of safety belts by passengers in the front seats of motor vehicles. Although I support the measure, I realize that it is rather hopeless for this to be done unless there is compulsion. I appreciate the difficulty in the matter, but if safety belts were installed in vehicles and were not used it would be unnecessary expense. I urge that the matter be taken further. For a long time I have been intending to install safety belts in my car. I was convinced of their value when I had the pleasure, with an officer of this Parliament, of going through the university at Birmingham, where much time and money are spent in considering all aspects of road safety. Whenever an investigation is made into the cause of an accident there is an inquiry into what would have been the position if safety belts had been worn and if not worn. I cannot give any figures on this for I seem to have mislaid them, although I remember sending them home. The number of man hours saved by the wearing of safety belts is colossal. The people who were conducting the tour pointed out that in many road accidents where safety belts were not worn there was irreparable head injury. It was an injury far more serious than could be generally appreciated. Often it resulted in people being mentally affected, causing increased costs to both the Government and the community. Irrespective of how uncomfortable the wearing of safety belts may be, we should look at the safety angle and the economics of the position. We have regulations compelling people to do many things they do not want to do, and this is

resented, but the time will come when, like other countries, South Australia will make the wearing of safety belts compulsory.

Mr. Nankivell: The effectiveness of safety belts applies mainly in connection with head-on collisions. What about side-on collisions?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I appreciate that interjection because it enables me to make a point that was made by the people who showed us around the university at Birmingham. They explained that occasionally tragic accidents occurred when safety belts were worn. However, those occasions are very rare. I think that answers the point the honourable member was trying to make by way of interjection. Those people proved to me that the advantages of safety belts far outweighed the disadvantages. Therefore, for economic reasons and for the welfare of the community I support the Bill, with the one reservation that it will be useless unless the wearing of belts is made compulsory.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I thank all members who have spoken and for the interest they have shown in this measure. I especially, of course, wish to thank those who have spoken in support of it. I have been very heartened by the support I have had in this place, which was greater than I had expected to get when I originally introduced the Bill. I think it is also worth reporting to this House that I have received several letters from individuals and bodies outside Parliament since I introduced the measure, and I should like to mention them very briefly for the benefit of members. The first letter I received was, I think, especially significant, for it came from Dr. John Birrell, the Victorian police surgeon. That letter, dated September 9, reads:

Thanks to some kind soul in our Correspondence Bureau I have just seen a copy of your Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961. If I may presume, it is magnificent. All power and success to you and to the Bill. It is saddening, perhaps, to realize that my own State has been so slow to move, but with your break-through, if it succeeds, together with the break-through in the United States, things will be cracking at last. It is such a simple Bill, such a simple procedure, and with all the waffling on the road toll by our so-called experts, your measure will return by far the greatest dividend and for so little outlay. You will, no doubt, have seen Mr. Herbert's latest paper from the Snowy. His figures are not large and probably not as significant as he would like, but by his damage index he has given us a rule to measure the effectiveness of the seat belts in Victorian police cars. These have, I am sure, saved a number of lives already. Good luck to you, sir, and to your measure. That, I suggest, is quite a significant letter, first, because it comes from the Victorian police

surgeon, a man who is dealing, of course, in the nature of his duties, with the effects of road traffic accidents and, secondly, because from what he says he is obviously involved in the aspect of road safety.

Mr. Freebairn: Are all Victorian police cars fitted with belts?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know that definitely, but it sounds to me as though they are. Another letter is from the State Secretary of the South Australian Country Women's Association, dated October 11. I will not read the whole of the letter, but this is what it says, in part:

At our recent State conference a resolution concerning safety belts in cars was passed wholeheartedly by our members. The resolution reads as follows: That all cars sold, new and secondhand, should be fitted with safety belts in the interests of public safety.

The letter further states that the resolution originated from Mypolonga, and it goes on to explain how it came to be passed. I suggest that that, too, is a resolution from a very significant, powerful and influential body in South Australia.

Mr. Bywaters: And highly responsible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not suppose there is one member representing a country district who does not have a branch of the C.W.A. in his district, and I likewise count myself very fortunate in having two branches in my district.

Mr. Bywaters: I was pleased to hear that the resolution originated from my district.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; it came from the Mypolonga branch. That is another letter of encouragement. I also received—as I guess every member did—a letter signed by the four members of the Traffic Accident Research Unit of the University of Adelaide—such responsible people as Professor Robertson (Professor of Pathology); Dr. Hodge (the Senior Lecturer in Forensic Pathology), who, incidentally, conducts by far the greatest number of post-mortems held as the result of deaths in this State, both on the road and elsewhere, and who has made a special study—as his membership of this unit shows—of this problem; Dr. Ryan (a Research Fellow); and Mr. McLean (the engineer attached to the unit). Those people say in their letter:

There is no single action that can be taken at the present time which will be more effective in reducing the toll of death and injury on our roads than the fitting of seat belts as proposed in this Bill.

I will not say any more on the credit side, as it were. Regarding criticism of the Bill, I think this has been along two lines. The first of these relates to the expense involved, and that, if I may say so, was very ably

answered by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), who pointed out what is likely to be the effect on third-party insurance premiums if the accident rate is reduced. In any event, the cost of belts is such a trifling proportion of the expense of a new motor car that I suggest it can be ignored altogether. The other criticism voiced, I think by the Royal Automobile Association, is that the compulsory fitting of belts is likely to repel people. The association says that if belts are not compulsory, people will wear them, but that if they are compulsory people will not do so, apparently out of cussedness. Well, if one regards the whole community as a group of spoiled children who will act in that irresponsible way, then perhaps the R.A.A. is right in its attitude. However, I do not regard the community in that light, and I do not believe that the compulsory fitting of belts in motor vehicles would have that effect.

The motor car industry, as expressed any way through the Chamber of Automotive Industries, is apparently opposed to this measure. Perhaps I could tell members briefly what has happened in the U.S.A., and especially what has happened in the State of New York. I have here a 1960 publication of the New York State Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles and Road Safety which sets this out, as follows:

The automobile industry's stated reasons for not installing seat belts must be analysed. Admitting the effectiveness of seat belts in preventing and reducing injuries, the industry objects on the basis of public non-acceptance of installation, non-use of belts even if installed, and the additional cost.

Those are exactly the reasons given here. It goes on:

The industry claims—on the basis of lack of public demand for seat belt installation—that the belts would not be used by the travelling public once installed. The committee believes the belts will be used at times, at least by the driver, for children, when travelling at high speeds on super highways, and in inclement weather. Furthermore, the committee believes that when supplied with information about accident evaluations and controlled tests, the public will welcome seat belts.

In fact, that is just what has happened. The growth of the installation and use of seat belts in the United States has risen tremendously in the last three years. Only a few weeks ago I received a letter from Senator Speno, whose name I mentioned when introducing this measure. That letter is dated September 19. In contrast to the attitude expressed by the automotive industry in 1960, this is what he says now:

The Automobile Industry in the U.S. is going standard with seat belts, starting January 1, 1964.

He enclosed a press release which shows that Ford, American Motors, General Motors and Chrysler have all now agreed to install seat belts in their cars as standard equipment from the beginning of next year, yet it is only three years since they were entirely opposed to the proposal. I suggest that the experience of the U.S. will be repeated, but in a shorter time, in South Australia.

My last point is this. In speaking on this Bill, the Premier said he did not oppose it outright (I was not quite sure from his remarks on this occasion what he proposed to do) but he suggested that education was needed before people would use safety belts. Surely the first step in educating people to use seat belts is to ensure that they are available in the car, to be used if necessary. That seems to be the essential first step. If they are not there, they cannot be used and people cannot be educated to use them.

The Premier made an offer that, if I was prepared to accept an amendment that this Bill should come into operation on proclamation, he would support it—presumably so that in the meantime people could be educated to use seat belts. He did not go on to say how this would be done and how education would be carried out in the interim; nor did he say how long he thought it would be before the time was ripe to proclaim the Bill. I cannot accept that offer. I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of the House that this Bill will not in any case come into effect for more than 14 months from this date, and then only in respect of new cars as they are bought and registered.

Mr. Riches: And then only when it is proclaimed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No: that is only if I accept the Premier's amendment, which I am not prepared to do, because I think that more than 14 months is ample time for any period of education that may still be required in South Australia. The only hesitation I had in drawing the Bill was whether I was putting the period too far ahead. The Bill will not come into operation in respect of any car before the end of next year.

Mr. Riches: How can you insist on having a time when the Bill shall be proclaimed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is no provision in it for proclaiming. That was the Premier's offer. He said he would support it if I would accept an amendment that it should come into effect on proclamation.

Mr. Clark: But it can be proclaimed at any time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe it can; I do not know. But I am not prepared to accept an amendment on those lines. Let us leave it at that. The Bill as it stands provides that cars registered for the first time after the beginning of 1965 will have to have the belts fitted. It would not apply to any car now on the road in South Australia, nor would it apply to any car that might come on to the road in South Australia between now and the end of next year. If that does not give ample time for any further education of the public that may be required, I do not know that any time span will. So, with very great deference, respect and gratitude to the Premier for his offer, I cannot accept it. That is all I want to say in replying to the debate. I again thank honourable members for the attention they have given to the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Safety belts."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I move to insert the following new subsection:

(7a) A person shall not drive a motor vehicle to which this section applies on a road unless he and every passenger in that motor vehicle sitting in a seat for which a safety belt is fitted pursuant to this section wears such safety belt. Penalty—£5.

The closing remarks on second reading by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) have clearly indicated that this Bill is a first step only towards what I wish to achieve. It will not apply to any motor cars on the road today or that will be on the road in the next 12 months; but thereafter it will. The fitting of safety belts will impose a further cost on those motor car owners who have to fit them. The next step to be taken by the honourable member will be to say, "You have to wear them." If the Committee is not prepared to accept this amendment, then I shall not be prepared to accept the Bill on third reading.

Let us assume that we now agree to this measure and that after 1964 it will be necessary for people to fit safety belts in motor cars. Let us assume also that there is an accident involving the passenger in the front seat. The insurance company will then inquire, "Did you have safety belts fitted?" The answer will be, "Yes." Then the company will ask, "Were you wearing them?", to which the reply will be, "No; we did not think it was necessary." Just how foolish shall we get in this? I do not want to impose

any hardships. When earlier today I mentioned the use of cars for elections, some honourable members said that everybody did not have them. Nobody will use them for that purpose. Purchasing a motor car is a costly business because, as soon as it goes on the road, it becomes a used car and drops heavily in value. The same thing happens when one buys a car from a used car dealer on the deferred payment system. Whichever way it is done, it is a costly business and often the insurance premiums are greater for a car being purchased under a hire-purchase agreement. So motor car owners are up against it. They could meet with an accident at any time. The insurance company could refuse to meet claims because the people did not wear the safety belts provided. Unless it is made compulsory to wear safety belts, I will oppose the third reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope the Committee will not accept this amendment. I am surprised to find that the Leader is so adamantly in favour of safety belts as to move this amendment; I thought until now that he had rather given me the brush-off. However, I have had one convert, and he is such a shining jewel; I am proud of him. Nevertheless, I think the amendment goes too far. As far as I know, nowhere in the world is the wearing of safety belts compulsory. Certainly no State in the United States of America makes the wearing of belts compulsory. Now there are 19 States there—the magic number mentioned last week—in which the fitting of belts, such as proposed in this Bill, is an obligation, but in none of them is it compulsory to wear them. I fervently believe that safety belts should be provided in cars to be used if people want to use them. I think everyone should be obliged to have them in a car. If the Bill is passed, I hope that safety belts will become standard equipment in cars in the same way as brakes and windscreen wipers are standard equipment.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: How many belts would you suggest?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One for the driver and one for the front seat passenger.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You would limit the front belts to two passengers?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, the Bill does not say that. It provides that there must be at least one other belt in the front seat if there is room for a passenger beside the driver. Last week the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) made a good analogy between belts and brakes, saying that, although every vehicle must have a foot brake, it is in the discretion of the

driver whether he applies it or not. The same applies to seat belts.

Mr. Dunstan: Are you suggesting that when a driver sees an accident is inevitable he suddenly slings on the seat belt?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member knows I am not proposing that at all. I suggest that he have a word with his more enlightened colleague, the member for Murray, who will explain the analogy to him. Although brakes are for the protection of the motorist and other people and seat belts are for the protection of the motorist and the passenger, the analogy is a good one. My great objection to the amendment is that it is a form of undesirable compulsion and it will be difficult to police it. I do not know how the Leader proposes that the police should check this. The penalty for not wearing a belt is only put at £5, whereas the general penalty that would be applicable to other subsections in the proposed new section is £25.

Mr. Freebairn: Is an agricultural tractor classified as a motor vehicle for the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know, but a tractor may not have a seat next to the driver. However, the Road Traffic Board has power to exempt vehicles of certain classes, and undoubtedly tractors would be exempted. I was glad to hear the Leader say that my proposal was a step toward what he apparently wanted. Apparently it is not what he practises in his own car, but it is what he now so vehemently wants for himself. Despite all he has just said—which, with respect to him, seems to me to be a dog in the manger attitude—I hope he will be prepared to accept the Bill as a first step and that he will not insist on the amendment. Let us see how the Bill works after it comes into operation and, if it is necessary then (I do not believe it will be) and if the use of seat belts is not widespread, which the Leader apparently thinks will be the case, let us have another look at it.

Mr. Bockelberg: What about the primary producer carrying produce to market?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think any of the difficulties being thrown at me will be practical difficulties. As the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) will see from the proposed new section, the Road Traffic Board will have power to exempt certain classes of vehicle. I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment.

Mr. BYWATERS: I support the amendment. Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

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

## THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, £103,306,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1073.)

## THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £13,900.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the first line. With other members, I express my regret at the passing of the late Mr. W. W. Jenkins, better known affectionately to all as "Bill". I served with him for several years on the Land Settlement Committee and found him sincere, friendly and determined in all his undertakings. Members of this Chamber will miss one who was friendly and courageous. I congratulate the member for Stirling on his maiden speech. It has been said, and I know from past experience, that one's first speech in this place is always an ordeal. I understand that one member said his first speech was an ordeal for him; the remainder of his speeches were an ordeal for the other members. I am confident that that will not be the case with the member for Stirling, who said one or two interesting things. In reply to a statement made, I think, by the Leader regarding the inability of young people in the Stirling District to find employment, he said that he was advertising for a laborer or a farm hand at award rates. I understand no award rate exists.

Mr. McAnaney: There is a station hands' award.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I accept that explanation. The honourable member also said, in reply to a comment by the member for Adelaide:

The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) made some comment about not knowing what faction I might belong to, but he overlooked the fact that the people of the race from which I come are always invincibly ourselves.

He went on to say, "When we are in an adopted land we fit in with the culture of that country." I would say that he must be an Irishman, because there seems to be something contradictory about all that. He added: I hope that in this place I can follow the traditions of those people and stay invincibly myself.

Mr. Lawn: He will find out that he cannot do it with the master.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I welcome the new member the same as I would other new members, and inform him that he should be conscious that he is here in the name of a Party and

should be at all times a member of that Party.

Mr. Lawn: I warned him that he had to be "for" or "against".

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am sure the honourable member will be aware of that before long. Nevertheless, I wish him a happy stay in this place. I congratulate the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches). Last evening he said that he had been 30 years in this Chamber, and when he said that, it reminded me that he was serving his 28th consecutive year as Mayor of Port Augusta. That could be a record for the British Commonwealth of Nations, for a man to be 30 years a member of Parliament and during that time to be a mayor for 28 years.

Mr. Lawn: If we had democracy here, he could have been a Minister for 27 years.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That is a magnificent record of service, and I sincerely congratulate the honourable member. I trust that nature will be good and allow him to reach the rank to which the member for Adelaide referred, and that he will become a Minister of the Crown. I am concerned with the financial position of this State. The time is overdue when we should consider reconstructing the machinery that manipulates the finances of this, and other States. In case I have been misunderstood, I am not talking politically. I consider that the Loan Council is a replica of the Premiers' Conference. It cannot be denied that anyone approaching the Loan Council or the Premiers' Conference has a bias toward his own State, and we should expect that irrespective of whom the person might be. We must acknowledge that whichever Party controls the Commonwealth Government, it must be swayed in its decision by the political advantage given by the control of finance.

Mr. Bywaters: That has been proved.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. I consider that the time is ripe for the setting up of a body modelled on the Commonwealth Grants Commission, to replace the Loan Council. It should be organized to meet the requirements of individual States, and to provide for the development of the nation as a union or as partners or as States with equal importance. This is something that has not been done in the past. We have read articles recently, and have heard Commonwealth Ministers saying, that Western Australia and Queensland are developing rapidly.

Mr. Lawn: Why? Because the Government wanted political support from those States.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That was obvious. This authority should be similar to the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and should consider the States' needs to ensure that each State has equal opportunity of developing. I agree with the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) that a Budget, which proposes the expenditure of £103,306,000, places a responsibility on members to carefully scrutinize its details. I emphasize that members have little chance of making any changes. Standing Orders do not permit the Opposition to increase the amount provided in the Budget, and any move to decrease it would fail because the Government has the support of a member who has opposed the Government at all elections for longer than most members of the Opposition.

Prior to calling for a scrutiny of each item contained in the Budget, the member for Torrens said that this was a remarkable Budget. I agree, but for entirely different reasons. Complaints made in past years have been wilfully ignored. I remind members that the Leader of the Opposition has again been denied the right to examine the Auditor-General's Report before speaking on the Budget. Why? The Leader is the only member of the Opposition with a personal staff, yet the eight Ministers have personal staff and have access to the facilities of every Government department. The public should be told why the Leader is denied the benefit of a valuable report in preparing his reply to the Budget. Why was he not given an advance copy? I can suggest two reasons: first, that the Government wanted to hide something; and, second, that the democratic rights of the people of South Australia are denied—and this is an established fact. I believe that the answer lies in part in both reasons. The member for Torrens said that the fact that the Treasurer had presented his 25th consecutive Budget was a remarkable feature. It is. The Treasurer's reign is a glaring example of power without glory. The member for Torrens had the effrontery—the callous audacity—to say, "On behalf of members I congratulate him on the achievement." I dissociate myself from those remarks. No person with an ounce of democratic decency could congratulate a Government on remaining in power by denying people their democratic rights. Individuals should have the freedom to elect the Government of their choice or to reject the Government they do not want. The people of South Australia are disgusted and disappointed.

Mr. McKee: But they are much wiser now.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. I am not expressing the opinion of a Labor member only. I remind members of an editorial in the *News* of March 9, 1962, headed "Vote System Wrong," which states:

The Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, has made his bold decision, and now it rests with Parliament itself whether the L.C.L. Government is to continue in office. In his dramatic telecast last night, the Premier made it perfectly clear that his Government would not quit because Labor had 19 members to his Government's 18.

Mr. Jennings: It was not a bold decision; it was a brazen one.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I congratulate the honourable member on his choice of words. He is much more able than I. The article continues:

There will be mixed feelings whether a Government should cling to office on constitutional grounds regardless of any moral issues involved. But it is obvious the Premier is taking the opportunity of making the first test of strength in the present extraordinary position. It is a matter of either the L.C.L., or Labor, governing with the support of Independents. Neither party can govern with simply its own numbers. Therefore, it becomes more a question of opportunity. Has the Government the right to have first chance to try its strength on the floor of the Assembly? If the Playford Government fails to gain the support of the Independents—say, in the passage of the Supply Bill—then the Premier must resign immediately and inform the Governor that he cannot continue. Labor would then be invited to form a Government and test its strength.

Morally, the Opposition Leader, Mr. Frank Walsh, is quite right when he says the Premier should get out because he has no mandate from the people to continue to govern. No party with only 34 per cent of the total votes cast in an election, to another party's 54 per cent, has a moral right to be in office. But the net result of the L.C.L.'s 34 per cent to Labor's 54 per cent was the loss of only two seats to make the respective numbers in the Assembly 18 and 19.

It is not so morally wrong for a party to hang on to office because it is one seat down. What is morally wrong is that an outmoded, undemocratic electoral system should be perpetuated, a system under which the real wishes of the people cannot be expressed. It is clear beyond doubt that a big majority of people felt that Labor should be given an opportunity to govern. In view of this, one of the first measures the Playford Government must take is to bring in legislation to grant much-needed electoral reform.

It has already been unofficially canvassed that Sir Thomas might bring in a Bill to alter the electoral system from the current two zones to three zones—metropolitan, country-industrial and rural. Whatever the merits or otherwise, the public will demand, and has a right

to be given, a new deal on electoral boundaries under which the will of the people can be more accurately reflected through the ballot boxes.

Mr. Lawn: Did you see the Government members examining copies of the new electoral boundaries this afternoon?

Mr. HUTCHENS: No, I did not. World authorities agree with that editorial. Right alongside that editorial is a charming cartoon which depicts a boxing ring with the Premier lying flat on his back, whilst leaning against the ropes and grinning is the Leader of the Opposition. The referee, the Independents, is declaring the fallen Premier to be the winner.

Mr. Lawn: Why don't you get it included in *Hansard*?

Mr. HUTCHENS: No, I won't, but I will get some copies made. Webster's *New International Dictionary* defines democracy as, "The government by the people. A form of government in which supreme power is retained by the people and exercised either directly or indirectly." One of the greatest writers on constitutional matters said, concerning democracy and its functioning, that, first, the electoral system must be carefully devised to ensure that one side did not win by fortune alone, but that it should have a definite majority of votes behind it. Secondly, he said, the majority in the assembly must harmonize with the majority in the country, and the majority must have a vocabulary of diplomacy and adequate guarantees for the rights of the minority.

A few extracts from Stevenson's book of quotations may prove useful. I refer particularly to the address by Abraham Lincoln at the dedication of the national cemetery at Gettysburg on November 19, 1863.

Mr. Nankivell: Let the dead bury their dead.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I wish I could do that because the dead hand of democracy in this State would be buried and South Australia would have electoral justice. President Lincoln said that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." Surely that is a sufficiently compact statement concerning the basis of true democracy. As Theodore Parker said:

A democracy, that is a government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people; of course, a government after the principles of eternal justice, the unchanging law of God; for shortness' sake, I will call it the idea of freedom.

Surely this is the conception of true political freedom. When a Government is defeated,

however, and it says that no-one else shall govern if it cannot, that is the very antithesis of democracy. No Government should continue in office, said Jefferson, without the approval of all the people who must control the political destinies of the nation. Of course that is true. If a Government is not good it is corrupt. Members of this Committee should remember that these are not my words: they are quotations. Nevertheless I subscribe to them all. Governments in certain countries have remained in power against the will of the people. There has been suppression of the Opposition by a denial of the full and clear right of scrutinizing Government actions.

Mr. Lawn: You mean South Africa and South Australia?

Mr. HUTCHENS: That is a very good comparison. Such a state of affairs can only result in Government corruption that is so coated in the early stages as to look and even taste nice; but finally the people under domination rise in rebellion, with resultant bloodshed. That is the very phrase used by the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) earlier in this debate. The people rise and overthrow government authority. This sad state of affairs, if it does come and if history is to be repeated, will find the people ripe for rebellion eventually. Why was the Leader of the Opposition denied an advance copy of the Auditor-General's Report? Was the Government afraid that the Leader might beat the Premier to the bitter pill it contained? Was the reluctance of the Government to produce the Auditor-General's Report to be construed as a sign that all was not well? If it was to be so construed, the Government's fears were justified because, in the few minutes the Leader had at his disposal to peruse the report, he was able to note the words in the introduction on page 2:

The public debt, comprising bonds, bills, stock and debentures and other interest-bearing indebtedness of the State at June 30, 1963, was £464,000,000, equivalent to £460 per head of population, an increase of £24 per head during the year under review. Interest-bearing indebtedness has increased over the past 10 years (from £197,000,000 in 1953) by 135 per cent, but the amount per head has risen only by 81 per cent due to gain in population.

The total payments on account of debt charges, *i.e.*, interest and sinking fund payments for 1962-63, were £22,744,000, representing 24.35 per cent of the Consolidated Revenue payments. Some of this amount was recovered from the earnings of public utilities and statutory bodies whose financial transactions were not included in the Budget. The payments for interest and sinking fund were £7,069,000 in 1952-53 (16 per cent of Budget

payments) and £16,076,000 (23 per cent) in 1958-59.

The expenditure from Loan moneys on capital works results in recurring debt charges each year. Many of the works considered necessary to meet demands arising from increased population and the development of the State and to provide social services on an increasing scale, will not recover costs. To the extent that such works do not meet operating costs and debt charges, an increasing burden will be imposed on the taxpayer.

Last year I stated that, because of this, it was necessary that the costs of individual works should be the subject of closest review to enable the maximum return to be gained from Loan moneys available. I do not consider that this is being done to the greatest possible extent in all cases. Whilst the proposed work is no doubt justified (and in major projects this is examined by the Public Works Standing Committee), I am of the opinion that closer reviews could be made in an endeavour to provide the facility at a lower cost. Although the Public Works Standing Committee examines this aspect for projects referred to it, and has effected many reductions, the move for economy must of necessity emanate from departments. In determining the standard of projects, full consideration shall be given to the burden of interest and sinking fund payments which will be payable yearly over a long period of time.

Then the Auditor-General gives some examples. Last evening I was delighted to hear the newly elected member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) assure members that Parliament should have a public accounts committee. For years the Auditor-General has been saying that, and members on this side have argued that way; but this is the first time in the history of this Parliament that a supporter of the Government has said that a public accounts committee should be appointed.

Mr. Clark: But one gentleman came very close to saying it.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. The total amount of the public debt and its spectacular rise in recent years must cause concern. Standing as it does at £460 a head of population, it is becoming troublesome to most people. During the 25 years the Treasurer has been in office the public debt has risen by £275 a head to £460. That is a remarkable feature, and we could ask the Auditor-General why it is. I ask members to study his remarks. The Government is a spineless, hopeless lot of muddlers content to condemn posterity to bankruptcy for the sake of its own glorification, whilst posing as a public benefactor. When the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) was speaking in this debate and referring to the public debt the Minister of Lands interjected, "The total interest charges to be met are £9,000,000

greater than the total amount of taxation collections." Mr. Coumbe said it was true, and the Minister then interjected "I want an answer to that from somewhere." I submit that the Minister knows the answer.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I have not had any recognition from the Labor Party.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member should not jump his hurdles too soon. He might not measure them very well. I will prove to the Committee that the Labor Party has supported the Minister's contention. We who have been in Parliament for years have heard him time and again expounding the theory of national credit. I was always delighted to listen to him. For hours, year after year, we have sat and listened to him using words that were plentiful, powerful and purposeful. At least that is what we thought, but because other members have not spoken at length the Minister does not seem to understand. In a few words in this debate the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said what the Minister took hours to say. He said:

The Opposition has raised this question on more than one occasion and claimed that most, if not all, capital works could be financed from national credit.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I did not hear him say that, but I may not have been here.

Mr. HUTCHENS: There is none so deaf as those who are conveniently deaf. National credit has been tried and found advantageous and the Labor Party has used it successfully. Mr. M. R. O'Halloran, a former Leader of the Opposition, referred to the matter many times, and one of his best speeches on the subject was made on August 23, 1956, when speaking during the Loan Estimates debate. He said:

It is a country with great natural resources, with business people of considerable ability, with workers who are without peer and who will develop our natural resources and produce great wealth, which is the security offering to overseas investors. My point is that the money we borrow overseas increases our overseas commitments. In addition to having to buy certain commodities from overseas we have to meet interest and sinking fund on these loans, which also increase our exchange difficulties. Australia should not have to resort to overseas borrowing. We were able to finance the greatest war in history from our internal financial resources. Why can we not finance the development of the country from the same source?

The Minister of Lands says that he has not changed his views, and I am delighted to hear that, but I will produce evidence to show that he spoke with much courage on

many occasions. On September 21, 1960, during the Budget debate, the Minister (then member for Burra) said:

Mr. Millhouse did not do very well when he used the Auditor-General's Report to support the Treasurer's Budget remarks concerning the dead weight of public debt. The plain facts are that the Auditor-General's remarks are more in the nature of excuses for the national debt than anything else. Much has been said in this House about the dead weight of the South Australian debt, but for the first time to my knowledge in a period extending over 20 years some attempt has been made to say that the dead weight of the debt structure has no effect on the body politic of South Australia. I disagree with that.

The Treasurer said that the dead weight of our debt charges was the highest in the Commonwealth with one exception, but it had given us a strong, diversified, and well-balanced economy. Surely, we are not to say that because we have a balanced Budget we have a balanced economy. We have a diversified economy—very much diversified but not balanced; in fact very much unbalanced. I disagree with the statement that the debt structure of South Australia had given us a strong, diversified, and well-balanced economy. If that were applied to an individual who was heavily in debt could one possibly say that his position was well-balanced? It would be so unbalanced that probably he would have to enter the Bankruptcy Court. I agree with every word.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I still endorse that.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Later in that speech the Minister said:

I am not criticizing the industry but I criticize the tremendous hire-purchase system that comes out of it. The honourable member for Norwood, with whom I heartily agree on this point, and heartily disagree with in other respects, said that there is an inner circle of finance in Australia outside the banks which is operating at a margin of profit that the banks never dreamed of because the banking system has never extracted heavy profits from the Australian people. This hire-purchase business is a parasite on the Australian economy. Various forms of debt structure are being manipulated by these people and I will have no mercy on them. They have no place in the economy of Australia because they are the most rabid blood suckers any country has ever had. I am not a "red-ragger" but there is no warrant for the continuation of what these people are doing to the Australian public and they should be stopped. How are we going to stop them? We say we cannot do it because the Commonwealth Government wants more power and it is only the Commonwealth Government that can stop them. We could stop them in their tracks in South Australia if we had the guts to do it.

Mr. Loveday: Who said that?

Mr. HUTCHENS: The Minister of Lands.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I still believe it.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In that Budget speech the Minister also said:

Everybody in this House knows where I stand on this matter. I think posterity will brand the people—and I say this after mature thought—who represent the Liberal Party today. They will be held by posterity as guilty men because they have permitted this state of affairs. It is usually accepted that the Labor Party does not represent the captains of finance. Who is going to take action against these people? Who represents them? Are they without representation? Somebody represents them.

Mr. McKee: Who said that?

Mr. HUTCHENS: The member for Burra, now the Minister of Lands. I remind the Minister that he is now, by his own choice and in his own words, in the company of guilty men. It is no good asking someone else to give the answer. The issue is important, and I suggest to him that he is the one man who can resolve this position about which he pretends to be so concerned. He must take a stand now; he has the choice of appearing in the eyes of posterity to be a man of integrity and a man of courage or, in the record of his own words, a guilty, gutless Liberal.

I know from my own experience and my associations with a number of worthy gentlemen that in South Australia we have a group which is anxious to deal with the disease of alcoholism. I refer to the State Foundation on Alcoholism, which I know has done remarkable work in rescuing people from the disease—and it is a disease—of alcoholism. This organization, unlike other established organizations, does not wait until a person becomes a victim of this disease: it goes out and searches to rescue a person who is on the way to becoming a victim. This organization is supported by highly reputable people. The patrons are Sir Herbert Mayo, LL.B., Professor Sir Mark Mitchell, M.Sc. (Deputy Chancellor of the University of Adelaide), Sir Ewen Waterman, Dr. Dwyer, Professor Robson and others who are interested in and working hard for this worthy cause. My colleague, the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), knows Mr. Gordon Swanbury, who has played a major role in this work. Recently a meeting of all the churches of all the known denominations was called. The only one not represented was the Lutheran Church, from whom a very sincere apology for non-attendance was tendered. However, this church is also supporting the move to cope with this disease.

I believe that Gordon Swanbury—who has experienced the disability of this disease, and

in fact makes no secret of it—has a sincere desire to rescue other people from falling into the pit into which they can fall through over-indulgence in alcohol and thus becoming alcoholics. He has pointed out that there is a difference between a drunk and an alcoholic, but I will not go into that matter now. I believe that Mr. Swanbury and some others have served and worked without payment, and that they are now almost penniless themselves and are suffering great sorrow because of their inability to obtain financial assistance. Accordingly, I plead with the Government to lend an ear to the appeal of these people of all denominations. I believe the Minister of Lands has some interest in this matter, and I commend him for that because it is a most worthy cause. I hope that some financial assistance will be forthcoming, even if it is only a small amount, to keep the organization in existence in order that it may be able to gain further public support and to carry out the work that is so important to the happiness and the welfare of many people. As there are 30,000 alcoholics in Australia, this work is important not only to the welfare of these people but to the economy and the well-being of the State. I trust that the discussions on the lines will result in our being able to agree to work for the advancement of the State.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): Briefly, I wish to lend my support to the first line of the Budget. I join with other members in paying a tribute to the late Mr. Bill Jenkins, who represented Stirling so well for a number of years. He was indeed one of nature's gentlemen, a fact that has been acknowledged by all members of this House. I listened keenly yesterday to the speech delivered by the new member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), and I offer my congratulations on his excellent contribution. He was very brief, and conversant with all the matters on which he spoke, which is a good thing in a maiden speech. I extend my best wishes to the honourable member.

My main reason for speaking in this debate is to refer to the accident danger at railway level crossings in South Australia. All members are alarmed that accidents at level crossings have been increasing for the past three or four years. In some respects I blame the short-sighted policy of the Railways Commissioner, because he has been more concerned about the economics of the matter than the preservation of life. I have here a newspaper report of September 14 headed, "Two Killed in Accidents at Rail Crossings." The article

states that a woman was killed at Pimpala crossing near Reynella and that a lad of 11 was killed at a crossing in the Semaphore district. The policy of the Commissioner has been most disappointing, to say the least. Together with the members of the Port Adelaide City Council, the Taperoo Progress Association, and the high school committee in Largs North, I have been concerned because, despite numerous requests by those bodies for a warning device at the Gedville Road crossing at Taperoo, the Commissioner has denied that protection to people who have to use that crossing. The danger is accentuated because scholars from the Taperoo High School, the Taperoo Primary School and the Taperoo Roman Catholic School use this crossing. In recent months about 250 Housing Trust houses have become occupied, so the danger is even greater than before.

I have been on deputations to the Railways Commissioner and to some of his officers, but without success. However, the Commissioner gave an undertaking to the council in writing, and I think I should read his letter, addressed to the Town Clerk, City of Port Adelaide, to make the position abundantly clear. It states:

Taperoo-Gedville Road level crossing. Further to my letter of December 3, 1962, I wish to advise that traffic conditions at the Gedville Road level crossing have again been investigated. As the investigation failed to reveal any fresh evidence to support the allocation of a high priority to the installation of warning equipment, I am unable to accede to your request that automatic warning devices be installed at this crossing. However, as previously advised, I am prepared to divert to Gedville Road materials purchased for other projects, provided that the corporation is prepared to meet the actual cost of the installation.

This is the policy laid down by the Commissioner during the past two years. Whereas in the first place he took the responsibility of having railway crossings serviced with warning apparatus and equipment, now he endeavours to throw the onus on to the council. The cost of a warning device would be £3,500, and it would serve an admirable purpose; but the Commissioner says that it is not warranted.

Mr. Clark: If the railway line was not there, a warning device would not be needed.

Mr. TAPPING: The onus is on the Commissioner. The council's contention is entirely correct. The council two years ago, through its inspector, took a traffic count of those using the crossing morning and night and, on the figures provided by him, it was found beyond any doubt that a warning device was necessary. Following a plea by the council, the Railways Commissioner sent down an officer to make a count, on the evidence of which he said a

warning device was not warranted. This was almost two years ago, since when there has been a big increase in housing and population. I am fearful of what may occur.

Four weeks ago members may have read in the press that a motor car containing two passengers collided with a train at this crossing. Luckily, the passengers were not badly injured but, when we realize that children have no idea of the danger at these crossings, we urge the Railways Department to proceed forthwith to do something about it. If the Commissioner is adamant that he will not provide protection for this crossing and says, "On economic grounds I cannot install a warning device", the Government should provide a special fund to provide for adequate protection at this type of crossing. This is not the only one, but is the one that comes to my notice because it is in my district. I am fearful of what may occur unless the Railways Department changes its ideas in this connection.

It is interesting to note an article that appeared last August in a publication that members receive entitled *Road Safety Digest*, better known as the *Australian Road Safety Council Report*. The extract that appealed to me was headed "Child Traffic Schools in Two States." It reads:

City firms and individuals in Adelaide have contributed £5,000 to develop a city traffic set-up in a suburban area. Sponsored by the Adelaide Rotary Club and supported by police and the National Safety Council (S.A.) Inc., the safety course will be used by children between six and 12 years who will be instructed by police officers. Bicycles and tricycles will be used and the children will also be given pedestrian training.

It refers to a similar set-up in Western Australia which has been supported by the Lions Club and an oil company to the extent of £5,000. We should try to educate our children about traffic hazards and the preservation of life. In contrast, the Railways Commissioner, because of his false ideas based on economics only and not on the importance of lives, is not prepared to help to safeguard these children. I repeat the warning that, if this is allowed to continue, valuable lives will be lost because in a fortnight three people lost their lives at level crossings in South Australia. This is because, as I say, of the short-sighted policy of the Railways Commissioner in not helping in this regard.

On the same matter I refer to the hazard that exists in Birkenhead adjacent to the LeFevre Primary School, which has about 900 scholars. A railway line comes out of the Glanville station, proceeds across Dunnicker Road and Rann Street, then towards the works

of Wallaroo-Mt. Lyell Fertilizers Ltd., the Adelaide Chemical and Fertilizer Co. Ltd., and other factories. In the last four years one lad has lost his life coming from the LeFevre school; another boy aged only 11 or 12 had his leg amputated. Despite those happenings, we get no protection from the Railways Department. On the contrary, it says in effect that, if protection is desired, it must be at the cost of the council—and that, in this case, is the Port Adelaide Corporation.

Mr. Clark: It is a very hard department to deal with.

Mr. TAPPING: It is most unreasonable. In regard to the railway service from Glanville station to Birkenhead, we know it is essential to provide some service to those industries. It goes near the school for some hundreds of yards and by private dwellings and crosses two main intersections. The danger is great. My suggestion is that the line be relocated, that it do not go down Dunnikier Road or Rann Street, but that it go through Holdens' property. In saying that, I want to make it clear that Holdens at Birkenhead will be converted to Harbors Board ownership in a few years. That will make way for a line to go through that industry and finish up by the Birkenhead Hotel and down Elder Road. It would by-pass the heavy traffic and in particular the pedestrians and children who are suffering great risk at the moment. If this line were relocated the danger would be lessened by 80 per cent. I ask honourable members to back me in an appeal, for this applies not only to **Semaphore** but to the whole metropolitan area. If the Railways Commissioner is not prepared to finance these projects that are so essential, it behoves the Government to establish a fund from which it can finance these safety measures. I appeal to the Treasurer for his support.

Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Education about this railway crossing because of its danger. It followed an announcement by the Minister of Education that children attending schools would be insured against accidents on roadways that they cross going to and from school. My question to the Minister was that he should consider bringing in insurance to cover this type of thing that I have been referring to down at Taperoo so that, if a child was killed or maimed, the parents would get some relief from insurance. I have tried, on behalf of the children in that district, to bring before Parliament the necessity for these protective measures. The danger has been evident for some time and, as the population in the district grows, it will be accentuated, so I appeal to the Government

to consider this matter seriously. If the Railways Commissioner does not do the job, it behoves the Government to provide the money to carry out this work.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I join with other members in congratulating the newly-elected member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) but before doing so I express my sympathy at the sad passing of our late friend Mr. Bill Jenkins, who endeared himself to every member on both sides. It was sad indeed to learn of his passing. I do not know the new member for Stirling personally and I shall not be here long to see much of his progress because at the end of this Parliament (it may not go the full term; I am not expecting it to) I shall be retiring. However, I can at least wish him good health even if I do not wish him anything else. He said that he would pay a station hand's award rates, but I do not know of any such award. Perhaps he was referring to the pastoral award, but certainly there is no award such as he mentioned.

Mr. McAnaney: I got it from the Australian Workers' Union.

Mr. FRED WALSH: That would be a Commonwealth award; there is no State award. Throughout the years the Labor Party has tried to get this class of employee covered by our Industrial Code but the Party to which the honourable member belongs has refused to include them. If any amendments are introduced to bring these people into the Code, I hope the honourable member, as he is prepared to pay award rates, will support it.

The floodwaters scheme for the Fulham Gardens, Henley and Grange areas is before the Public Works Committee as a result of legislation passed last year that was drafted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in conjunction with the Highways Department and engineers associated with the Woodville and the Henley and Grange councils. As a result of proposals made by the South Australian Housing Trust, it has been amended slightly. These amendments will, in the opinion of members of the Public Works Committee, considerably improve the scheme, and I have no doubt that both councils, when asked for an official opinion, will subscribe to this view. This scheme will bring about a considerable easing of the conditions that people in this area have had to tolerate in the last year or two, particularly during last winter when we had such abnormal rains and the whole of the area from Fulham Gardens to the reaches of the Port River, including parts of Seaton, was flooded. On three occasions people

could not get outside their houses. There are no sewerage facilities in the area, and they were unable to dispose of the effluent from their septic tanks because of the high water table, with the result that the effluent was running all over their back yards. They were unable to dispose of it except by pumping it into the side and back streets. Members can imagine the smells that remained there for days on end.

On occasions, residents in the area telephoned me over the weekends asking me to try to get some relief for them. Thanks to some officers in the department, pumps were sent down on occasions to ease the worst places. This sort of thing should not exist in a well-organized community, particularly in an area within five or six miles of the General Post Office. I am concerned to see that this drainage scheme is proceeded with as soon as practicable. It should not be held up, as it will to some extent take away the surface water and this in turn will assist in the disposal of septic tank effluent.

I have raised this matter on many occasions in the last two years and have been told by the Minister of Works and by officers of his department that plans are being prepared with a view to their submission to the Public Works Committee for inquiry. Last year I was told that the plans would possibly be ready towards the end of last year. We were told towards the end of last session that the scheme would cost about £1,000,000 and that we would be getting the plans within three months, but we have not received them yet. The latest advice (perhaps I should not say this, because it came from an officer of the department) was that we would soon be getting them, but later the Minister said they were not completed and we would not get them until the end of this year or early next year. The only conclusion I can reach is that the Government has not got the money and is not prepared to proceed with the sewerage of this area for a considerable time. This, in my opinion, is to its discredit, because no part of the metropolitan area is in a worse state than this district. I do not have to tell the Minister or his officers about these facts, which they know. I know they have proceeded with the plan and that it is almost completed. I know the difficulties associated with implementing the plan and that it will be costly. However, last week the Treasurer made a statement about the number of areas to be sewered by the department by arrangement with private people, apart from the Housing Trust. I concede that the trust is perhaps entitled

to a certain priority and that certain houses have been built by the trust which cannot be occupied until they are sewered. The department has a scheme whereby it sewers certain areas under an agreement with private people. Last week the Treasurer supplied a list of the areas, which are Mansfield Park, Ayton Estate, Kingston Park, Seaview Downs, Marion, Mitchell Park, Beaumont, Woodforde, Rostrevor, Stradbroke, Newton, Campbelltown, Klemzig, Felixstowe, Holden Hill, Strathmont, Gilles Plains, Beefaeces, Highbury, Seacombe Park, and Darlington. None of these places is in as bad a condition as the areas I have been speaking about. Yet the department has seen fit to agree to a scheme financed originally by the following major development companies: Reid Murray Development—Para Hills (1). Reid Murray Development—Para Hills (2). Lonora Limited—Para Hills. Para Hills Estate Syndicate. Rialto Limited—Para Hills. Alan Hickinbotham Limited—Parafield. Southern Securities Limited—Modbury. A. V. Jennings Constructions Limited—Dernancourt.

Orlit S.A. Limited—Dernancourt.

Ocean Development Limited—Semaphore.

While I am on that, I understand that Reid Murray Ltd. has gone out of business, first to Reid Murray Holdings, then to Regent Developments (S.A.) Ltd. and now it is called Modern Tract Development Company. If one could explain who and what these companies are then he would be a better man than I, Gunga Din! The honourable member for Norwood knows something about these companies. The Modern Tract Development Company is a new company, and I do not know its association with the others. I do know that the arrangements for a new block of houses at Seaview Downs have not yet been approved because the arrangements have not been finalized. A Reid Murray company was involved in that, and whether others will take over that scheme I do not know. No doubt these are *bona fide* companies, and I do not suggest that anything is wrong with them. However, men and materials are being used that could be used to sewer the areas I mentioned previously. Once these areas are sewered and the drainage is laid, development can take place, and the Housing Trust can build houses, a programme that is at present held up because of the lack of sewerage.

Mr. Clark: These companies recoup the department for the cost of sewerage.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, but the owner pays the cost. These expenses do not come out of the companies' pockets. I emphasize

that men and material are being used with these companies financing the schemes, but if the Government would sewer the area I am concerned with, it could develop. The local councils cannot be expected to build roads and kerbing while the area is in such a condition. Immediately they do, the rains come and everything is washed away. Householders cannot be expected to beautify their houses in the way they are attempting to do it. Houses there cost between £8,000 and £10,000, and a block of land costs from £1,500 to £2,000. These are not ordinary little cottages being built in the area; many are fine houses. The members for Torrens, Rocky River and Gawler have inspected this area and can verify what I am saying. The Government should not delay this scheme. It does not make any difference to me personally, but I have pledged to do what I can to further this scheme during the few months I may yet be here. It is possible that this matter could be used, and will be used, at the next State election by the Liberal candidate. I do not know. I am suggesting that something should be done in the interests of those people, who have been compelled to live under most unsatisfactory conditions for the last two years.

The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) in his usual breezy speech attacked the Party to which I am proud to belong and gave the member for Stirling some advice. I strongly suggest to the member for Stirling that he should not take much notice of that advice. The member for Gouger said:

... the new member for Stirling will recognize that as he sits here giving his time and attention to the matters that come before Parliament. One of the greatest assets of the Opposition, and I say that they are good at it, is the camouflaging and hiding of their true policy. I hand it to them. During the by-election campaign they did it very well indeed, and they have continued to hide it. They will not vote as they speak, but they will not be able to hide it continually. The attention of people is directed to what happens in other States where we see Labor Party policy in its true aspects. We know that the member for Adelaide, and other members opposite, have not mentioned the true basic beliefs of the Labor Party and the directions that come from Labor Party conferences and executive meetings.

I tell the members for Gouger and Stirling that we are not ashamed of our policy and will proclaim it from the house-tops. Although the member for Stirling may prefer to take the advice of the member for Gouger, I inform him that our policy has been published in a book sent to me by the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament, Mr.

Calwell, which can be purchased by the public. It states:

The Federal conference of the Australian Labor Party in Brisbane in 1957, lays down as our objectives: the democratic socialization of industry, production, distribution and exchange to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features in those fields in accordance with the principles of action, methods and progressive reforms set out in the Platform; and further—Labor believes that democratic socialization is the utilization of the economic assets of the state in the interests of citizens, and that man is greater than the machine or the environment in which he lives. Included in the section on methods is: (4) nationalization of (a) banking, credit and insurance; (b) monopolies; (c) shipping; (d) public health; (e) radio services and television; (f) sugar refining.

To indicate what is meant by that I will quote further from the book. Mr. Calwell states:

It is a false but commonly-held assumption that Government enterprises have not been effective or profitable. Yet a glance at the balance sheets of some of the important Commonwealth enterprises disproves this:

P.M.G.:

Assets (at book value): £500,000,000 plus.

Turnover: £1,000,000,000 plus.

Profit (before interest): £16,000,000 (approximately).

Staff: 90,000 (approximately).

Commonwealth Banking Corporation (comprising Trading Bank, Savings Bank, Development Bank).

The total group has deposited funds of £1,150,000,000; capital reserves of £50,000,000, and a total of £6,250,000 accounts.

Profits for the three banks for year ending June, 1961—

Trading .. . . . .	£670,000
Savings .. . . . .	£1,172,000
Development .. . . . .	£611,000

Total .. . . . .	£2,453,000
------------------	------------

Australian National (Shipping) Line (June, 1961):

Paid-up capital: £16,400,000.

Value of assets: £23,600,000.

Fleet tonnage:

44 ships of 267,000 tons dead weight  
cf. B.H.P. P/L 130,000 tons in a  
total interstate tonnage of 640,000  
tons.

Tonnage carried: 5,900,000 tons.

Annual revenue: £14,200,000.

Annual profit: £1,400,000.

Principal cargoes: Ore (53 per cent),  
coal and coke (27 per cent), steel  
(4 per cent), searoad (8 per cent).

Commonwealth Railways:

Capital expenditure to pre-  
sent .. . . . . £45,300,000

Value of assets .. . . . . £5,000,000

Number of employees .. . . . . 2,739

Revenue .. . . . . £6,000,000

Profit .. . . . . £680,000

I could go on speaking of nationalized industries and the value of the returns therefrom. No-one can suggest that they operate at a loss. I have not mentioned Trans Australia Airlines and its profits, which would be further enhanced if T.A.A. were given the open go originally intended. However, the present Liberal Government has forced T.A.A. to share with Ansett-A.N.A. Additional restrictions that have been placed on T.A.A. do not apply to Ansett-A.N.A. I could refer to what the Menzies Government has done since 1949 in selling the holdings in nationalized industries, including Amalgamated Wireless, Commonwealth Engineering Company, Commonwealth Oil Refineries and so forth.

There is nothing wrong with nationalized industries. We do not seek to interfere with private enterprise—with the small man—as suggested by the member for Gouger. I received an autographed copy of Mr. Calwell's book yesterday, and I thought that this would be a good time to refer to it. Some members may not have read it and others may have picked it up and thrown it aside saying, "It is only from Calwell. It isn't worth anything at all." When he is speaking, the member for Gouger is really a meal ticket. If he spoke on farming he could flatten me, but he tackles questions relating to hours and wages, about which he obviously does not know much.

Mr. Casey: He raises turkeys.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I do not want to get personal. He spoke of hours and twitted Labor members on the 35-hour week. I could give a long discourse on working hours. I started work when I was very young—a long time ago—and I have always been interested in this subject. Last Wednesday I attended a dinner. The diners were celebrating not the introduction of the eight-hour day but the 90th anniversary of the formation of a committee that sought an eight-hour day. In fact, people worked longer than an eight-hour day in the middle of the 1940's. A 48-hour week was worked in the middle of the 1930's. During his speech the member for Gouger said:

After the Second World War there was a sellers' market and many anomalies existed in price structures. There was a black market under Socialist controls from Canberra. Many restrictive measures forced prices up. Since they have been removed and since we have gradually achieved true competition, we have seen the market come around more to a buyers' market, and this transition has in many respects counteracted the 40-hour week.

Let us examine that statement. We had controls in South Australia after the Second World War. They had been imposed during

the war by the L.C.L. Government. In fact rent controls were removed only last year. There was black marketing after the Second World War, but there was black marketing in Europe as well as in Australia. Visitors to Europe immediately after the war saw ample evidence of black marketing. Cigarettes and cameras were the only form of currency in Germany. Because there was no production in some of the European countries Australia was able to sell goods there, but when the European countries got back into production in the early 1950's with Marshall Aid from America they started to compete with us, as did Japan. When they started to stabilize and develop their industries they became keen competitors of Australia on the world markets. Anyone who studies the position knows that that is so, but the honourable member said that it was all due to the reduction in working hours. Let us go back to 1931, in the middle of the depression. Then we had a 48-hour working week and a basic wage of £3 3s. In January 1939 we had a 44-hour week and a basic wage of £3 18s. In January 1948 the working hours were reduced to 40, but the basic wage increased to £5 6s. In September 1953 wages were pegged and the basic wage was £11 11s. Later it was increased to the present £14 3s. The Menzies Government had been in office all that time and we were on suspended quarterly adjustments since 1953. Since the quarterly adjustments were suspended, if we had had a basic wage based on the C series figures we would have had £5 4s. over the pegged wage. If we had accepted the consumer price figures, which are accepted by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission and the Statistician, we would have received £4 3s. over the pegged wage. If I am any judge at all, from now on the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission will begin to determine the basic wage on a periodical adjustment basis.

Next year there will be a review of the Commonwealth basic wage, and, in turn, of our living wage, because it is tied to the Federal basic wage. The application by the unions will be to increase the basic wage by £2 12s. There has been no application for an increase in that wage for three years because the unions have been concerning themselves with increases in the marginal rates. As a result, the man on the basic wage has been more or less lost sight of. The application next year will be to bring him up, on the C series index figures, by another £2 12s. If the commission accepts the consumer price figures he should get at least £1 11s. I do not know what will be

the decision of the commission, because it will determine the matter in the light of the country's economy. I am telling this to members so that they will know what is likely to happen. Don't think these things can't be met. We cannot remain static. I don't think the member for Gouger wants things to remain static. We must progress. I want to quote some remarks by Sir Douglas Copland, a famed economist. No more notice is taken of a man's remarks than remarks made by Sir Douglas on economics. There may be some who will disagree with him, but generally most people accept his views. One statement he made was as follows:

Little people who wanted to regulate, control, and have stable price levels in Australia should "go and jump in the lake". We must not be afraid of growth. If we have to choose between stability and growth, then for the love of Mike choose growth. During the fifties Australia had one of the highest rates of growth in the western world, but not as high as the rate in Japan and Russia. However, the rate of growth had to be increased by about 1 per cent on the current rate of 4.3 per cent. This would necessitate a quite substantial increase in investment, perhaps 10 or 15 per cent on the current figure.

Sir Douglas strongly recommended the setting up of a planning authority of elder statesmen and private businessmen. He added: "Under this system the credit squeeze could never have happened." We would all subscribe to anything that would prevent our having another credit squeeze. The Commonwealth Government would not want another. It might, after the next Commonwealth elections, be compelled to introduce one, according to how it views the change in our economic position next year. I do not want to see any change, and I certainly want no change for the worse. I want to see conditions prosper. The following is an extract from the *Monthly Summary of Australian Conditions* by the National Bank of Australia:

From the point of view of the overall business scene there cannot be much doubt that 1963-64 is starting from a better position than did 1962-63. Possibly a measure of disappointment is felt that production is not more buoyant and some businessmen are not confident that, of its own accord, further steady progress will be achieved in the new financial year.

That is something for us to note. The statement continued:

It is also true that in certain industries unused capacity is still imposing restraints on activity and profitability. But, by and large, it would appear that our economy has been steadily, if slowly, taking up the slack and that, given a degree of encouragement, a

real forward move could emerge during the next 12 months . . . In the early months of 1962-63 it appeared possible that our export income would be considerably lower than in 1961-62. However, since November monthly export totals have exceeded those for the comparable months last year and exports for the full 12 months reached £1,071,000,000, a little higher than the 1961-62 figure.

Imports at £1,079,000,000 were little different from exports, and a net deficit of possibly £260,000,000 on account of invisible items will be more than covered by the capital inflow item which, in the aggregate, may approximate £290,000,000 to £300,000,000, inclusive of £66,000,000 of Government overseas borrowing. That is the point that we have to note: overseas borrowing. We do not know much about the invisible items that have been referred to, and we are unable to trace them. It is significant that Mr. Holt came back with what I believe were very unsatisfactory reports regarding the possibility of raising loans in America. Despite the contradictions that may have emanated from the Prime Minister, I think that has something to do with the decision to hold a snap Commonwealth election. This matter is also tied up with the possibility of having to seek a loan in Britain, and the possibility of an election in Britain in the not far distant future which will be unfavourable to the present Conservative Government there. All those are factors that lead up to one thing, in my opinion, and that is the desire of the Menzies Government to go to the people before things become more tangled and while it thinks it has prospects of being returned with an increased majority. If the Menzies Government waits too long there will be an overwhelming landslide against it, and without doubt a Labor Government will be returned.

One could go on for a long time, but I appreciate that the hour is getting late. As I have said, it is possible that I will not have an opportunity of speaking in Parliament again on the Budget. I have a feeling that if the opportunity presents itself it could well be that the Government of this State will take advantage of the circumstances and hold a snap election early in the new year, and therefore this could well be my swan song.

Mr. Nankivell: You will get a special dispensation to stand again, too; don't worry.

Mr. FRED WALSH: No, I do not want it. Members do not have to worry about me in that regard. What Mr. Makin and Mr. Thompson do is their own business, but I will give a written assurance that it will not affect me.

I am happy with the associations that I have made in this Parliament, and I shall have no regrets about leaving. I am only pleased that I have been able to render little services to the people I have represented during the years I have been here, and I only hope that they are satisfied with the representations that I have been able to make on their behalf. If they are satisfied, then I am more than doubly pleased. Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in supporting the first line.

First line (Legislative Council, £13,900)—passed.

House of Assembly, £20,880; Parliamentary Library, £9,244; Joint House Committee, £12,478; Electoral Department, £29,650; Government Reporting Department, £50,022; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, £4,154; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, £2,495; Miscellaneous, £54,843—passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

State Governor's Establishment, £10,630; Chief Secretary's Department, £21,723; Statistical Department, £33,749; Audit Department, £88,827—passed.

Printing and Stationery Department, £349,032.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I am concerned about the accommodation provided for the Government Printer. Many promises have been made in this matter, and I seek information about what is to be done.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Leader referring to something that comes under the Loan Estimates? What line is the Leader speaking on?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Accommodation for the Government Printer.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Leader link it to some line?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am concerned with the maintenance of machinery and equipment in the department. We were promised that something would be done about accommodating the Government Printer in another place. Can the Treasurer say when that is likely to happen?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The problem has been to get a suitable site. The Government Printer has asked for a large area because he maintains that from the point of view of efficiency it is necessary to have all the plant and equipment on the ground floor if possible. An area of several acres has been mentioned as being necessary. Members will realize that a

large proportion of the Government Printer's work is associated with this Parliament, and therefore it is necessary for the convenience of Parliament that the area should be close by. That is the problem that we have been up against. We have been trying to divorce the Engineer-in-Chief from some of his land close to the railway line near here, but when it is a question of shifting one department out to shift another in all sorts of problems occur, and up to the present we have not reached what could be regarded as an ideal solution. The matter is receiving close attention, and further attention may be given to it when the Morphet Street widening proposal is considered.

Line passed.

Police Department, £3,179,200.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I note that the Commissioner for Civil Defence is also the Deputy Commissioner of Police, that there is a Deputy Commissioner for Civil Defence with a salary of £1,964, and that there are constables (two, I presume). Are we doing enough about civil defence? What are the duties of these officers for whom we make this provision? What are the Government's plans for civil defence in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Civil defence activity has so far been run in conjunction with the Commonwealth authorities, and basic training has been given the first consideration. Some equipment has been provided by the Commonwealth on which there has been some training, which, incidentally, would be valuable even in peace-time—rescue work, and that type of thing. So far, the administration has not gone very far and the amount of money provided by the Commonwealth for developments has not taken us very far, either, because this matter has not been placed high on the list of Commonwealth defence expenditure.

Line passed.

Sheriff and Gaols and Prisons Department, £579,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am most concerned about the line "Keeper of Gaol (also Officer-in-Charge of Inebriate Institution)". We know that the Sheriff is vitally concerned about the welfare of inebriates and alcoholics. Broadly, this matter will need greater attention in the future than it has received in the past. Who is to be in charge and how are we to settle questions concerning inebriates and alcoholics generally? Should they come under the care and control of the Sheriff or of some

religious organization? Apparently, it is not so much a question of what we shall provide for an inebriate as what we shall define as an alcoholics centre. Under "Labour Prison" there is provision for a medical officer, as is the case with the Yatala Labour Prison. The time is long overdue when serious consideration should be given to the problem of people being sentenced for some crime, then a plea of insanity is entered and, if successful, as it often is, they are transferred to the Parkside Mental Institution and placed in the security block there, from which they often escape.

It is not unusual for the Police Commissioner then to be informed of such an escape, and he is compelled to try to re-arrest the inmate and escort him back to the security block. That is not good enough. The moment a prisoner is transferred from the Yatala Labour Prison to the security block at Parkside, the Police Commissioner has no further control over him; he cannot go into the Parkside Mental Hospital. It is no reflection on the mental institution because the Medical Superintendent there can admit only mental defectives. I maintain that there should be hospitalization within the confines of the Yatala Labour Prison to cater for those prisoners who may be mentally affected. I admit that difficulties may arise if people are determined, say, to go on a hunger strike. When a mentally defective person escapes from the security block at Parkside, the Police Commissioner has to apprehend him and return him. Has the Government envisaged accommodation to cater for convicted inebriates and alcoholics and accommodation for those people who have been committed to Yatala and are subsequently transferred to the mental hospital?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The answer to the first question is "Yes". The Government has submitted comprehensive plans to the Public Works Committee that are at present being examined by it, and I think the committee has asked for additional information about the types of buildings and the set-up.

Mr. Frank Walsh: If this scheme proceeds, will it be under the control of the Sheriff or of some other organization?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the committee recommends the plan, steps will be taken to call for tenders, and provision will be made in the Loan Estimates for the necessary buildings. There has been some discussion before the committee about whose control this should be under, and I am not sure how far the committee has got with its evidence. I believe some claim was made that

this should be controlled by the medical authorities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and another claim was made that it should be controlled by the Sheriff because people are legally committed by the courts to his custody. The committee has taken evidence on both these matters, and the Government is awaiting its conclusion with much interest. The steps taken in South Australia are, I believe, advanced compared with those in other States; they are the result of the work of a committee and overseas investigations. I doubt whether the committee has made any decision on this, because there are two angles—that alcoholism is a disease and that it is also an offence against the law for which a person can be committed. These angles are contradictory, and there are contradictions in our thinking about this problem.

In certain cases an offence is committed, and the courts submit people to incarceration; on the other hand, many people consider this to be a medical disease and a medical problem. Although I am not anticipating any decision of the committee, ultimately it may recommend two institutions. The answer to the Leader's question is that comprehensive plans have been drawn up as a result of the work of a committee appointed by the Government. I believe this is probably one of the most expensive schemes for an institution ever submitted to the Public Works Committee as it will provide for all types of treatment, both medical and psychological, to attack the problem from every possible angle.

I believe that when a person is certified insane it is necessary by law for him to be transferred to a mental institution, although I am subject to correction on this. In those circumstances, unless the law is changed no provision will be made for a mental institution inside a gaol. When a person is charged with murder, for instance, but is ultimately adjudged insane, he is committed to a mental institution. I know of no mental patients being held in any of our gaols, which I believe would be unlawful. The problem of security in mental hospitals has received some attention. We have been trying to make our mental hospitals much more open and free, but, when that is done and there are various classes of people in the hospital, much trouble is experienced. The answer to the Leader's second question is "No".

Mr. DUNSTAN: A matter that has caused me some concern is the case of a prisoner named Brian John Turner, who is now a prisoner at Yatala, who was convicted on

June 19, 1941, at the age of 15, of murder, and who has been in gaol ever since. At the time of his conviction, it was clear from evidence before the court that, although there was no insanity, there was some psychological maladjustment. He was in my class at school and I, and most of the people who knew him, knew that at that time that was the case. While in the early days of his imprisonment he showed some tendency to be a refractory prisoner, of later years that has most definitely not been the case. There has been no sign of any sort of trouble or difficulty with him for many years. A series of psychiatrists has examined him, and many responsible psychiatrists, independent of the Government, have recommended that after the many years of imprisonment he has undergone and the treatment he has had while in gaol it will be safe to consider his release on certain terms. I should be grateful to have some information on this from the Treasurer, but I understand that the view of the Government psychiatrists is similar to that of others, who think he is now a stable character who can prove that he can lead a stable and satisfactory life and that the kind of condition he was in at the time the crime was committed at the age of 15 is not likely to arise in future. They cannot see any reaction on his part that is likely to lead to any recurrence of the offence with which he was convicted. Undoubtedly the many years of imprisonment he has undergone since 1941, when he was 15 (he is now in his late thirties), have had a considerable effect on him, and there is now a chance that he can lead a satisfactory life outside a prison institution.

Mr. Nankivell: Have you seen him?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have not seen him personally but I have spoken to people who have. I have spoken to some people who have psychiatric knowledge and who know him. I have also spoken to members of the profession who have seen him and to associates who have known him for many years.

Mr. Nankivell: You have not had the chance to form your own opinion?

Mr. DUNSTAN: No, but I am sure I would be given the opportunity if I asked. I cannot suggest that I would be able to form the kind of opinion that responsible psychiatrists have been able to form as I am not an expert in that field. I have seen the reports by Doctors Forgan, Southwood and Gillen, who have seen him and who agree that it would be safe to release him. I understand that a recent

petition, framed in a way that I would consider would be a good case for his release, has been refused by the Government. I earnestly ask that this matter be reconsidered. I do not think that anyone in the community could suggest that this man has not undergone severe punishment in the years he has been in gaol, and it could not be suggested there was any lack of deterrent to others in the punishment he has undergone. I consider strongly that this is a case for reconsideration and ask the Government to do so.

On occasions I have examined the records of cases heard by visiting justices at the Yatala Labour Prison. Unfortunately, some irregularities have occurred, which in normal circumstances of a case brought before a court of summary jurisdiction, would be the subject of an immediate appeal to the Supreme Court. The decision of the visiting justices, under the Gaols and Prisons Act, is final, except in exceptional instances where possibly a special prerogative writ of *certiorari* to remove the proceedings to the Supreme Court might be available, but this is an expensive proceeding. The prisoner is unable to seek any redress for irregularities in the proceedings. If a man is to be charged for an offence before visiting justices at the Adelaide Gaol, then that offence should be as strictly proved and as regularly dealt with as if it were before other courts of summary jurisdiction. No reason exists why a prisoner should be dealt with in a more cavalier fashion than a person before an ordinary court of summary jurisdiction. I urge consideration being given for prisoners to have a right of appeal from decisions by visiting justices at the Yatala Labour Prison.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Referring to the first case mentioned by the member for Norwood, the procedure is that certificates of the appropriate medical authorities are obtained, to see whether it is safe to release a prisoner with a mental condition that may lead him to repeat what could be a serious crime. The reports are considered by Cabinet, and I know of no case, when the recommendation has been favourable, that Cabinet has not given effect to it. I believe that the case mentioned by the member for Norwood was dealt with two or three weeks ago. Several cases came before Cabinet then of patients who had been in custody for a long time, and I believe I recognize the case by the description given by the honourable member. If this is so, the case was favourably considered and I believe there was some question of an adjustment because the prisoner had

been in gaol for over 20 years. If memory serves me correctly, the prisoner concerned is at present, or was, at the training camp at Cadell. I am not sure what was involved in the adjustment, but I will inquire and inform the honourable member. My own recollection is that the reports were favourable, that for some time there had been no sign of the ungovernable temper that appeared to have been responsible for the previous lapses, and that the prisoner had adjusted himself satisfactorily. Regarding the second matter, I am not competent to speak about it. We are dealing with a line of expenditure rather than a question of legal procedure. I will obtain a report and tell the honourable member when it is available.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: A sum is shown for the purchase of fire-fighting equipment. I have inspected the equipment at the Labour Prison, and have been informed that the prisoners show a keen interest in its operation. The people in the area will be well protected from any fire emergency, because the prisoners have been trained and are doing a good job.

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is for emergency fire-fighting equipment. Remarkably good work has been done, and it helps to re-establish the prisoners. It is a service given by the prisoners, and they have done well. It is an efficient unit and has given service outside the gaol. I believe it is a means of furthering rehabilitation work and therefore is worth while.

Line passed.

Progress reported: Committee to sit again.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON TOWN PLANNING ACT APPEALS.

Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's resolution.

(For wording of resolution, see page 465.)

The Hon. Sir. THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Legislative Council's request be agreed to; that the members of the House of Assembly to be members of such committee be Messrs. Coumbe, Ryan, and Fred Walsh, of whom two shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council informing that House accordingly.

Motion carried.

#### INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS 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 amend the Industrial Code, 1920-1960.

Motion carried.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 17, at 2 p.m.