

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, September 19, 1956.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**LIMITATION OF ACTIONS AND WRONGS  
ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 576.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The Chief Secretary explained at considerable length the details of the Bill, which we appreciate. The next Loan Estimates will probably be introduced by one of his colleagues, because Sir Lyell will be overseas. I feel that this will result in great benefit to the State. If ever a man deserved a rest, combined with some work, then it is the Chief Secretary, and he has our very best wishes. I compliment him on his devotion to his Parliamentary and State duties. In business circles executives are sent overseas to get new ideas, and I feel sure that South Australia will benefit as a result of the Minister's trip. For part of the time he will be associated with the Director of Medical Services (Dr. Rollison). I have always advocated that responsible public servants should be sent overseas to gain experience and in the end this must result in great savings to the State. Dr. Rollison is a capable officer, and I am sure that the cost of his trip will be money well spent. I compliment the Government on deciding to send this respected doctor overseas.

It cannot be expected that all members will agree with everything I have to say on the Estimates, but I assure them there will be a considerable amount of merit in some of the suggestions I offer on behalf of the Opposition. I hope that my remarks will not be taken as unfriendly criticism and that they will be considered by the Government. Expenditure on loan works is subject to high interest charges, which are a handicap to the State. One would have thought that during the period of buoyant revenue and good seasons with high prices the financial position would be different. Although the Government has taken advantage of pegged wages, this has not resulted in much benefit to the State.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Not pegged wages, but pegged cost of living.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is pegged wages. In all other States cost of living adjustments have been restored. There has been increased taxation here and a lowered standard of living for the workers, despite pegged wages. As a result the workers have been robbed to the extent of nearly 15s. a week, and within another fortnight, if my judgment is correct, a further increase in the cost of living will be revealed by the Commonwealth Statistician. This increase will be reflected in the wages of workers in every State except South Australia. The people here are penalized more under a Liberal Government than those living in any other State. With one exception unemployment has increased more in South Australia than any other State in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Does the honourable member say that the standard of living is lower here than in any other State?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Of course it is, and the workers here have been asked to meet increased prices. Members know that numerous household items have been increased in price since wages were pegged three years ago. The Australian workers can compete with any others in the world in ability, output and production costs. Australia is facing, not so much high production costs, but competition from countries such as Germany and America, that subsidize their export wheat. The manufacturers of this country are alive to the position, and have introduced machinery and other things to lower their costs, but they are handicapped because of those subsidies.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What are the subsidies on?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Wheat, flour, butter and many other things. Anyone who takes an interest in these matters knows that despite the International Wheat Agreement the signatories to that agreement take every opportunity to break it in the way I mentioned this afternoon. The Australian consumer pays a higher price for wheat for local consumption than the export price. Years ago the opposite was the position, but today the price for home consumption is 14s. a bushel and in order to compete overseas some wheat is exported at 11s. 6d. a bushel, which must be done because of the subsidies other producing countries pay on exported wheat.

Much has been said recently about the falling off in production of vegetables, dried fruits, butter and other produce, but I have never heard much said about the falling off in production of flour, which was one of our chief

products. The flour milling industry has suffered for the last three years; in South Australia and other parts of the Commonwealth the wheels of some mills have been idle, yet nothing is said about this important industry. All the talk has been about wheat, not about exported flour. I am often disappointed that in Parliament we have captains of industry who never say one word in support of consideration being given to the manufactured article. We should realize the serious position the export trade is in, not only in regard to this commodity.

For the last couple of years wheatgrowers' organizations have been advocating sowing a lower acreage of wheat, but that is a "go-slow" policy. This year Nature sent bountiful rains and the farmers could not sow even the acreages they wanted. They are still complaining, although they advocated restricting acreages.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—There may be better yields in some districts to offset this.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—There may be. The expected crop for this year is 22,000,000 bushels, but I can remember that not many years ago the crop was about 48,000,000 bushels. I admit that barley has replaced wheat in many areas, but I believe it is serious that we are producing such a small quantity of wheat.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—It is more serious if we cannot sell it.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If a man will not sell his labour there are complaints about it.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The honourable member has been advocating "go slow" methods for years.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In spite of the short hours and so-called high wages, high profits are being made. Nobody objects to fair profits but when wages are pegged and profits of up to 20 per cent are being made I think something should be said about it. I do not expect members opposite to agree with what I say, but I am putting the other side of the picture irrespective of whether it is accepted or not, and this is the proper place to do that.

The Government should open up the country and instead of the acreage being lowered it should be increased. Twenty young farmers recently went to Western Australia looking for land because they could not get any in this State. They went to a State that is willing to do something on behalf of the man who desires to go on the land.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—They send us their unemployed, so that makes it even.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—We have enough unemployed here now, and we are going to have further unemployment. In spite of wages being pegged living costs in this City are about the highest in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Why don't they go out in the country where men are wanted?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I know quite a number of men who have had to come to the metropolitan area because they could not get work in the country. I know of 30 men with homes in Balaklava who have been compelled to come to the metropolitan area and keep homes going in both places because they cannot get any work in the country. Take the position of the River Murray. I do not blame the Government for the suffering of those people, but when any industry in the country is closed, as a number have been over the years, men are forced to come to the metropolitan area to look for work. I have heard the same old cry from members that I heard 30 years ago, which is "why don't they go to the country?" What incentive are they getting from this Government to go to the country? The Government talks about decentralization but it has done nothing about it. It has been in office since 1933, and the State is in a worse position than it has been for many years. It takes away 15s. a week from the ordinary worker and encourages increased profits; these are facts that cannot be disputed. I cannot speak too highly of the men who have helped to build up industry, but some of these men are forced into the metropolitan area because they cannot get work.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—That is in one industry only.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is an important industry. I believe that other industries will be in the same position. The industry I am speaking of was the world's largest exporter before the war, and the fourth largest exporter in Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Nobody has said it is not important.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—These men have acted constitutionally all their lives; they have never had any industrial trouble, and they have assisted to build up the economy of this State. They have done everything they have been asked to do and they have a very proud war record, yet they have been treated harshly—I do not say by this Government, but by another Government. I wish to refer to the recent action of the Federal Government in

donating a large parcel of wheat to Pakistan. I do not object to that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Why didn't they give them the flour?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That is the point. The flour milling industry has idle establishments all over Australia, and yet the Government gives away wheat. Surely the flour milling industry is entitled to consideration.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Pakistan may have preferred the wheat to the flour.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The unemployed in the flour industry should have been considered. The Government made the gift, and it should have been in the form of flour instead of wheat. It would have been far better to have ground a lot of wheat in Australia than to spend £3,500,000 on extra storage, because if I am any judge there could be a repetition of what happened many years ago when there were huge losses due to a plague of mice. If that happens it will be the farmer who will suffer, and I am here to look after the interests of the farmer in the same way as any other member.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Is it not a fact that wheat importers overseas require wheat instead of flour?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am speaking of two large gifts which were made to Pakistan. A gift of 3,000,000 bushels is not a small amount. Couldn't they have done with the flour seeing that it was a gift from us? When another country is purchasing one of our commodities we have no say in the matter; they buy what they want, but when we are making a gift surely we should be able to say in what form it shall be. Other countries are purchasing our wheat, milling it and then exporting it again at a lower price than that for which Australia can sell flour abroad. This is not because their cost of production is necessarily lower but because their Governments provide subsidies for the manufacturing industries.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—In what form is wheat consumed in Pakistan?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In the same way as in Australia—as bread. The milling trade has taken up this matter with the Federal Government—and in our trade we do not cut the other fellow's throat; we work together, for what is in the interests of the miller is in our interests, and all is in the interests of the Commonwealth—but we might as well have talked to a stone wall.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What can you do with people who do not want to buy your product?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am not talking about buying. I have already said about three times that I am talking about free gift of wheat.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—But it was only a limited amount.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Three million bushels in one parcel is no mere trifle, and the same thing may occur again. That is why I am entering my protest now against this practice because if Australia wants to make a free gift to anyone of any commodity the Government should at least consider the people in the manufacturing industry concerned.

In the *Advertiser* of August 21 I noticed the following paragraph:—

Some South Australians were ahead of the Americans in finding out the attractions of the Esperance area for land settlement. The drift to that area from the eastern farmlands of South Australia began about three years ago, and there is now a small colony of former South Australians settled between Esperance and Salmon Gums.

Here is a nice state of affairs! The farmers of a primary producing country like South Australia are compelled to go to a neighbouring State to secure land because they cannot get it here. The article went on:—

If the huge project now contemplated by the American concern—the development of an area estimated to be between 1m. and 1,500,000 acres, with farms, port, superphosphate works, meat works and the like—is proceeded with, these migrants could easily find themselves established in a swiftly progressing area and partners in a new-found prosperity.

Western Australia is a younger State than South Australia, but of course we know it enjoys a Labor Government, the Leader of which is an ex-South Australian with whom I had the honour to sit in another place. It is not good policy on the part of any Government to force men to leave the State to take up land in another State.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Which wheatgrowing area do you suggest the Government should open up at the present stage?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Under the policy of the Liberal Government I would not expect very much land to be opened up, but I have heard here from time to time that there is plenty of good land in the South-East. When a certain South-Eastern landowner was giving evidence before the Public Works Committee on a certain occasion he said he held 54,000

acres. When asked how much he had under cultivation he said "All but 50,000 acres?"

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Are you suggesting any of that area was suitable for wheat-growing?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It has been proved suitable since. Would my honourable friend have suggested a few years ago that any land in what was once known as the Ninety-Mile Desert was fit for production as it is today? Every member realizes that not many years ago the sowing of wheat in certain parts of that area was never contemplated.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Science had not found the answer to the riddle.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—They have found out in Western Australia how to do it.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—They have learnt from us.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Don't you believe in encouraging the pioneering spirit of young men?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Then why not let them go to Western Australia?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Why force them? We did not try to provide for them in South Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—There are newer and bigger areas over there.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is a matter for serious consideration that what has been accomplished in Western Australia cannot be accomplished here. Our land policy is not strong enough. We know that the Land Settlement Committee has done a good job in inquiring into the opening up of new areas. I recall hearing on my many visits to Kangaroo Island, "You will never grow anything on Kangaroo Island," but look at it today! The Government has done a good job and I would not attempt to belittle it. Admittedly it has been costly, but it has been worthwhile. Nevertheless, while secondary industry has been expanding so fast primary industry has lagged. Our wheat production is now about 22,000,000 bushels compared with 48,000,000 bushels a few years ago.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—What about the increase in sheep population and wool? You cannot have both.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Of course that has increased, but is there any reason why cereal production should have fallen off.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—It has not. We are producing as much wheat, barley and oats as ever we did.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Instead of going back 100 per cent we should have doubled our primary production over the period of years when secondary industries expanded enormously.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—It has not decreased.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—My honourable friend has been associated with the land for many years but he must not think he is the only one who knows anything about it. I ask the Government to consider the position of many South Australians leaving the State in search of land.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—They can get land elsewhere more cheaply.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If land here is too dear the Government should step in and do something about it. The honourable member's Party favours acquisition. That is the way I suggest land should be acquired, but everyone should be given a fair deal. When I entered Parliament first the Loan Estimates were a mere fleabite compared with the sum involved today. In the last five years our public debt has increased at the rate of about £25,000,000 a year. This year it will amount to another £28,000,000. What we want is real development. The interest bill and sinking fund payments are looming larger and larger in the revenue accounts and we are asked to pay higher rates of interest, and this is detrimental to many of our projects.

The Estimates this year provide for a gross expenditure of £28,135,000. The actual expenditure from the Loan Fund last year totalled £29,125,578. Much of the proposed expenditure on loan work is window dressing. In addition to the amount provided for in the Estimates the State will have available £3,600,000 from the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, making the total amount available for loan works this year £31,735,000. Loans are now being raised by the Commonwealth to meet earlier loans that are falling due, and higher rates have to be paid for the conversion. Over the past few years the State's total indebtedness has increased by £125,000,000. Posterity will be faced with a mighty task in making up the leeway.

One of the most important items provided for in the Estimates is an amount of £10,000 for work associated with a new Jervois Bridge, following a recommendation by the Public Works Standing Committee for its construction on the site of the present bridge. The selection of the site aroused much controversy among

heads of Government departments and citizens generally. I hope the Government will give priority to this work. I have always contended that the Birkenhead Bridge was built in the wrong place, and we are suffering from it.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The honourable member knows why.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Because of certain influences, and the honourable member does not want me to say any more than that. The Public Works Standing Committee recommended that the bridge be constructed from Commercial Road to Elder Road, but certain influences got to work and the matter was reconsidered by the Committee, which recommended a change of site. I did not agree with the recommendation. As a result there is a bigger congestion than ever. If the bridge had been constructed on the site originally recommended there would not be the present congestion in St. Vincent Street.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—We would have had to break contracts to alter the site.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Nothing of the sort.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—The new proposal does not look like relieving the position very much.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not think the Minister knows very much about it. The people who have lived in the district all their lives know more than he does about it. If it had been decided to erect the bridge at the Dale Street site congestion would have been worse than ever, and it would have been a more expensive project. All the eastern traffic to the wool stores and other hives of industry would be involved in two or three turns and the position would be worse. The Highways Commissioner wanted the Dale Street site, as also did the general manager of the Harbors Board, but the people of Port Adelaide did not, and neither did the manager of the Tramways Trust. It was suggested that another shopping area could be established in Dale Street. This would have deprived dozens of people of their homes. Is it suggested that this should be done so that another shopping centre could be established when one already exists? One blunder was made and I am glad to see that the Government does not intend to make another. Right across the end of Dale Street is the large timber factory of Walter and Morris Ltd. and this would have to be transferred. Its acquisition would cost a terrific amount.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—It would have been much the same position with the other site.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—No. Anyone going down the Port Road and crossing from Elder Road to Birkenhead has a straight run right through without any turnings.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—You would still have vested interests.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—At least the people of the district have now been considered. In spite of what my honourable friend said earlier this afternoon, the people referred to would be entitled to reasonable compensation if deprived of their properties. I compliment the people of Port Adelaide for the interest they have shown in the project, also the town council, members of the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures and the Retail Traders' Association, who have large interests in the district. Before the evidence was commenced, and after hearing competent Government officials, I might have been prepared to support what those officials recommended, but on the weight of evidence it was impossible for me to do so. When one is a member of a committee he must be judicial and consider not only the interests he represents or whether he lives in the town or not, but what is in the best interests of the State. The difference in cost of bridges at the two sites amounted to hundreds of thousands of pounds and that was an important matter which had to be considered. The Jervois Bridge was erected 78 years ago, but has now outlived its usefulness. On hot days it cannot be opened and traffic is held up. It was suggested that there should be an opening bridge, but the question of costs had to be considered. I have heard even Ministers say that the Dale Street site was preferable, but they were speaking without knowledge of all the facts. It was proposed some years ago to erect a barrage just south of the present railway bridge. Strong representations were made in the Port Adelaide district, but I opposed the proposal. I was told that I should not do so, and I replied that I would do what was fair and reasonable. It was not constructed. The time is fast approaching when even two bridges will not be sufficient to carry the traffic to LeFevre Peninsula.

The Hon. C. R. Story—We have to get a bridge on the Murray first.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I agree that the Murray people are entitled to consideration. They are not greedy—all they want is a railway, a road, and two bridges at the same time! Will the honourable member say where a bridge should be erected—at Swan Reach, Blanchetown or where? We have one section

of River Murray settlers opposing another section. One section wants it in one place and one in another.

The Hon. C. R. Story—We have been waiting for two years for the committee to examine the site.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The erection of a bridge at Blanchetown is under consideration. A good road was recommended but many difficulties arose, and it was then suggested that the road should go north of the Blanchetown punt, which would have meant a considerable expenditure, so the matter was referred back to the Highways Commissioner. What is the use of discussing whether there should be a bridge at Blanchetown, Swan Reach or anywhere else? What would be the position if a bridge had been commenced before the present floods? Hundreds of thousands of pounds would have been wasted.

The Hon. C. R. Story—I am just staking a claim before the third bridge is constructed at Port Adelaide.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Nobody could have envisaged a few years ago that this new bridge at Port Adelaide would have been necessary, but it is. Some years ago the engineers said that the Millbrook reservoir would meet our water requirements for 30 years, but it was soon necessary to construct Mount Bold. Nobody could have foreseen how quickly the State would grow. The Myponga reservoir will cost £3,000,000, and £10,000,000 has already been spent on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. There are also schemes for reservoirs on the Onkaparinga and in many other places. Not many years ago a profit of 11 per cent was made in the metropolitan water district, but in the year before last a loss of £450,000 was sustained. Although assessments and rates have been increased, the Government was too late in taking this action. The increases should have been made years ago when the people could have paid instead of at a time when the State faces the worst economic position for years.

We are asked to approve items in these Estimates for schemes that should have been constructed years ago, instead of at a time when wages are pegged.

The Hon. J. L. Cowan—They have been pegged for only 12 months.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The honourable member has a bad memory; they have been pegged for three years. It was thought that wage pegging would halt inflation, and if it had done so nobody could object, but prices

were not fixed, which was unfair. It is daylight robbery to take away wage rises at a time when there are increasing costs.

I would like to place on record my appreciation of the assistance of the people of Port Adelaide who played such a wonderful part in submitting a case to the Public Works Committee in support of the Jervois Bridge. I refer to all the witnesses, but particularly to Mr. Bampton of the Port Adelaide Council. They did not take advantage of anyone else but spoke as they felt, for which I commend them. I am very happy to have been associated with the unanimous finding of the committee in this matter. Members should know the schemes that have been submitted to the committee when dealing with these Estimates. However, I think it is a waste of time to submit proposals for works that have no chance of being commenced for many years. The committee sometimes makes a recommendation at a certain figure but when the work is commenced, sometimes four or five years later, the price has increased considerably. Many matters submitted to the committee should not have been referred to it.

Last year the Act was amended to provide that the committee need not hold an inquiry into any public works costing less than £100,000. Mr. Bardolph has a motion on the Notice Paper dealing with a public accounts committee, and I think something should be done to deal with increased charges. It is all very well for someone to come along and say what he wants, but Cabinet should be in a position to say that some things cannot be done instead of asking the Public Works Committee to consider and recommend works that the Government does not intend to proceed with. A few years ago the Public Works Committee recommended the construction of Government offices in Victoria Square at a cost of about £250,000, but the work was never started. However, the Government has since bought Foy & Gibson's building at a much higher price. Land in Wakefield Street was also purchased and the committee has considered a proposal for the construction of Government offices on it, but this, like many other schemes submitted, has no chance of being started. In relation to the Jervois Bridge the committee found:—

1. That Jervois Bridge is near the end of its useful life. Because of its limited width and the costly nature of the work that would be necessary, expenditure on repairs to the bridge in order to keep it in service longer is not warranted.

2. That it is desirable, therefore, to construct a bridge across the Port River to replace Jervois Bridge.

3. That a bridge can be built opposite the end of Dale Street but heavy expenditure would be incurred in constructing an approach road from Hart Street on the west side of the river and the total cost for a bridge without an opening span would be approximately £400,000. Very substantial additional expenditure would be involved in payment of compensation for property acquired. From the point of view of location, the bridge would not serve some sections of the Port Adelaide community as well as Jervois Bridge does.

4. That the site which would best serve the majority of the interests concerned is the site on which Jervois Bridge stands or adjacent thereto.

5. That a bascule bridge on that site with a 60ft. double opening span can be constructed at an estimated cost of £595,000. If the bridge were located alongside the present bridge, the approaches would cost an estimated sum of £173,000. With such a bridge, 1,500ft. or more of river frontage would be available upstream for the berthing of shallow draught vessels.

6. That a non-opening bridge can be erected on the site of the present bridge at an estimated cost of £315,000.

Honourable members will note the difference between the amount of £595,000 and the last-mentioned figure of £315,000. In recommending that, the finances of the State as well as the people living in that district must be considered, and I think that is a very important point.

The Public Works Standing Committee has had an extraordinarily busy time during the last 12 months, and they have made recommendations which are of great importance to the State. An enormous amount of work has been accomplished, and several of the recommendations have been carried out. I would have liked the opportunity to say something about bulk handling of wheat, but I will leave that for a future occasion. I hope members will give some consideration to the points I have raised, which have been put forward in good faith in the interests of no particular Party but of the State of South Australia. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I am now getting used to the large amounts which are required every year under the Public Purposes Loan Bill, but one thing that disturbs me is the fact that so many people wish to borrow money. It applies to individuals, companies and State Governments, and it seems that the only authority in the country that does not need to obtain loan money is the Commonwealth Government. As a

State we have become accustomed to a Loan Bill running into £30,000,000 or so. The Bill before us seeks approval for the borrowing of about £25,000,000 and the spending of about £28,000,000, and that is a fair amount of money in anybody's language. The total Loan indebtedness of the State is now £268,000,000, and the interest and sinking fund which has to be met amounted last year to £11,692,000. Our receipts in 1955-56 were, I think, £55,000,000, and out of this we had to allot nearly £12,000,000 for the interest and sinking fund. It is generally recognized that one day's work out of five should pay the rent for a house, and we now find that even the State has to allot one-fifth of its revenue for interest and sinking fund to meet its capital expenditure obligations.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Most of that money is expended on capital works, and the interest rate would be steeper at the beginning of the period than at the end.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Loan money should always be spent on capital works, and I presume from this Bill that that is the position. I mention these figures to show their magnitude and to stress the necessity for some regard to be had for the money which we borrow from the Loan Council. The Loan Council allotted to the States £190,000,000, and South Australia should receive £19,000,000 under the ratio of one-tenth usually adopted as the percentage which this State bears to the whole of Australia. The actual amount allotted, however, is £28,000,000, which indicates that those who handle our Loan matters have been able to obtain an advantage over the other States. I think the reason for that is that the counterparts of so many of our Government departments are semi-government departments in the other States and are responsible for raising their own money. That additional amount over the normal ratio will be to our advantage, because Loan money raised by the Government costs at least one quarter per cent less than that raised by semi-Government departments, and is easier to obtain.

I want to deal with the method by which the Loan Council grants money to the various States. It seems to me that if any persons should know the economy of the country they are the Treasurers and Premiers and their officials when they assemble at the Loan Council. That body should have a policy which should be a guide to the rest of the community, and everybody should be able to accept that policy or at least treat it with a good deal of respect. We find that that is not so, and the

States and the Commonwealth Government are constantly bickering as to the amount that should be raised as Loan money.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Isn't that due to the financial agreement of 1946?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I do not know what the reason is; I merely say that that is what occurs. I am puzzled why men of such qualifications should not be able to see the economy of the country from the one viewpoint. It is confusing to the public and very unsatisfactory to the community, and I am hoping that the time will come when the economy and stability of the country will be above Party interests. Surely there is a basis on which these things can be decided.

We are always pleased to listen to Mr. Condon, but on this occasion he has slightly misconstrued, as he always does, what he claims to be pegged wages. We have the Federal Arbitration Court for the purpose of arriving at our wage conditions, and that body is composed of men of the highest ability who are as well informed as anybody in Australia on the matters on which they have to adjudicate. In addition it obtains the greatest help from all interested sections of the community in arriving at a decision. Its latest decision was an increase of 10s. a week in wages and a promise that after 12 months the matter would be considered again. In my opinion that hardly constitutes "pegged wages". The Federal Arbitration Court is the best informed authority on such matters and should be entitled to respect. Unfortunately that is not the position. If the question of the economy of the country is to be considered, then that body is the best informed of any to consider it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Don't you think that it is unduly influenced?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I think it is most unbiased and gives judgment in the best interests of the country—not only of the employer, but of the employee as well.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—I think confusion arises between a ceiling for wages, as during the war, and the pegging of wages.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Exactly. The so-called basic wage is often not the actual wage, as overtime and bonus payments are made as well as marginal allowances. Very few people work on the basic wage.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Marginal allowances are determined by the court.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Of course they are and they have been increased from time to time. I deplore that any honourable

member should decree a body which should be looked up to. The Commonwealth Government has adopted the policy of paying for its public works from revenue and supplying money to the States from taxation. It has not adopted this policy without considerable thought. I should say it was with the object of checking inflation, and in accordance with its ability to obtain money on the loan market. These two factors are basic, and I am prepared to accept largely what the Commonwealth Government has done as a result of advice from the Commonwealth Bank and the best financial advisers available. It seems strange to me that the Commonwealth Government can undertake all its loan works from revenue and tax the people for additional moneys and then loan these moneys to the States at an interest rate. I have an idea that the framers of the Constitution thought they had provided that any surplus revenue should be made available to the States in proportion according to population. Instead of that we see surpluses charged to trust funds and public works in order to evade what was the expected position when the Constitution was framed.

The Loan Bill has to be considered under three main headings. A certain amount of the loan programme will return to the Government full interest and sinking fund charges, whereas on the other hand a number, although not large, will be able to pay portion of the interest and sinking fund payments. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that the Engineering and Water Supply Department should be revenue producing, but in recent years it has had to be subsidized from general revenue. Perhaps the main items which should receive consideration are those which do not return any interest and have to be maintained. In looking at the Bill I roughly added up the amounts coming under the last heading and they amounted to about £8,000,000—about one-third of the total of the loan programme. They involve the State in providing interest and sinking fund payments amounting to about £500,000 a year, and this goes on indefinitely. We have to face the fact that every year as a result of these loans at least £8,000,000 will be non-revenue producing. Included in this is expenditure for schools, hospitals, police and so on. I am not objecting to that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—What about Government charges for its hospitals?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—If the honourable member had listened to the Minister of



Health he would have known that the amount of 35s. a day proposed to be paid by patients will not nearly meet expenses. I do not wish it to be inferred that I consider that the Government is over-spending. To keep pace with the development of the State I am afraid I could not question many of the items included in the Bill; but if the future stability of the State is to be considered it is better to retard rather than encourage the expenditure of loan moneys except on necessities. I was sorry to hear the Leader of the Opposition mention that hard times were just around the corner. We are shaping up to something which will hit us sooner or later, but I question whether it is just around the corner. It behoves anyone who is subject to financial responsibility, whether it is the Government, businessmen or private people, to consider the effects of inflation on the economy of the country.

The Minister gave an excellent explanation of where this loan money was to be spent. It was a more amplified statement than previously given on such Bills and therefore the House is indebted to him. The Government has nothing to hide and has been explicit as to its intentions. It seems trivial to me that a Government which has a revenue of £65,000,000 should have to take into the loan accounts small amounts totalling only a few thousand pounds. Surely if it is competent to spend £65,000,000 it should have some say in the taxation imposed and the responsibility for its collection, and be able to decide whether the small payments I referred to should not be paid out of general revenue. If we are to continue building up the loan account, we are not being fair to posterity in not accepting our share of what should be current expenditure. We are enjoying the development carried out at a cheaper rate by our forbears, but we are handing on to those who follow us the buildings and plants purchased at present inflated values.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Don't you think posterity should also bear some of the burden?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I think we are burdening posterity too much. When I entered this House 10 years ago the total Loan programme for Australia was about £100,000,000, but it has increased by 150 per cent since then. We are not being fair to posterity, yet we are enjoying the advantages passed on to us by our forbears. It was pleasing to me to know that a Joint Faculty from the University of Adelaide and the School of Mines has been arranged to provide for a

degree of Bachelor of Technology. The course will be for three years, it will replace the five year course, and will provide industry with the type of staff that will be very useful.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—It will not include craftsmen?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I think it will, because many subjects in the five year course at the University are not necessary for a practical man in industry, whereas the three year course will turn out well equipped practical men instead of theoretical men. This course will provide builders as against designers.

I support this Bill because I have every confidence in the Government administering it, but I hope that the people who are responsible for these loans will be careful in considering their effect on the economy of the country and that they will be guided by such authorities as the economists advising the Federal Government, the officials of the Commonwealth Bank and the Treasury officers. To my mind these people form a body of opinion that is entirely without self interest, and we should give due weight and consideration to their opinions.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—If they were in industry they would be broke in a month.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Perhaps so, because they are dealing with abstract matters. However, I suggest that no member of this House is competent to judge and counter the effects of inflation on the economy of the country. Although I support the measure, I hope the time will come when we will have no need for such a big Loan Bill every year. A number of projects are gradually fading out from the list. One of these is the uranium field, which this year appears as a credit. I hope that some of the improvements in the various departments will enable them to show a return in the future, and the Government will not continue to need about £30,000,000 regularly each year for loans.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MOTOR PARKING).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 580).

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—I rise to speak to this measure because I am of the opinion that it affects country motorists just as much as those in the city. The Bill introduces legislation that is entirely new to this State and therefore creates particular interest, and many opinions are in circulation as to the

wisdom of introducing parking meters. In other States where meters have been operating for a considerable time many people who opposed them at first changed their views after a little while. South Australia has an increasing population; there are about 230,000 registered motor vehicles and 266,000 drivers' licenses, so it is natural that there will be congestion in the city. I believe that the provision of parking meters will improve this position. We have a vehicle to every 3.5 people in this State. Naturally every person who owns a motor car desires to use it, and country people who motor to the city experience problems in parking their vehicles in the city.

It has been said that business people would monopolize certain stands in the city. However, it could cost these people or any others 8s. a day to park at parking meters. If they bring in their vehicles five days a week it could cost them £2 a week for each, which is fairly substantial. At the same time, they must be there before the inspector when the time of each parking period expires. I have often tried to find out how vehicles can stay for so long in the main parts of the city under present conditions. It has been suggested that motorists prefer to leave their vehicles and take a chance on having to pay 10s. fine, but if the council could detect every offence this would be very costly to motorists, because each offence would cost them 10s. Detection is much easier with meters because a red disc is visible when the time expires, and this is very easily noticeable by the inspectors.

It has also been said that meters will make the city unsightly. When I was in Melbourne after meters were introduced there I asked a policeman to point one out to me, and he said I was standing right alongside one. Before eight in the morning and after six in the evening they are very prominent, but during the day when every space is used they do not show up very much at all.

The introduction of meters will bring in greater revenue to the council, and suggestions have been made as to what should be done with portion of the money. I believe it will cost about £60 to install each meter and that the total cost to the council will be about £250,000, which will take a considerable time to recoup. The interest on the money will be considerable, so the council will not obtain any profit from them for a long time. An advantage of the meters is that they will keep traffic on the move. Sir Arthur Rymill said that vehicles are left

near his home, which is about half a mile from the Adelaide Oval, by people going to the oval who wish to save the 1s. parking fee. I do not think that is their reason, because I often leave my car just as far away from the oval to avoid the congestion that occurs afterwards. I think that is the main reason, and not to save money.

The Leader of the Opposition objected to the method by which by-laws will be made under this Bill. He said that the City Council will be able to make by-laws before Parliament has had an opportunity to disallow them, but we will have an opportunity when Parliament resumes.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—After the council has spent a great deal of money on meters.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—The by-laws could be disallowed if we did not consider they were giving the satisfaction the council expected. I believe the meters will be a distinct advantage because they will keep traffic moving, which is a very important consideration. Members of Parliament are privileged to have a reserved area in front of this building, but others who have no parking rights have to keep driving around the city until they find space. Meters will assist people who require the space, as Sir Arthur Rymill pointed out in his speech. When parking was banned in Rundle and Hindley Streets business suffered to such an extent that it had to be reintroduced. Meters will overcome that problem which resulted in the council banning parking in those streets. I understand that business people were suffering to such an extent that some of them were almost forced out of business. I compliment the City Council and the Minister in bringing this Bill before the Council. I support the legislation, and I hope that when it comes into operation it will prove to be as great an advantage as I expect it to be. I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I have listened very attentively to this debate, and as a result I will vote against the Bill in its present form. I have come to that decision as a result of the remarks made by various members supporting it. I am slightly suspicious of this measure, and feel that the proposed installation of parking meters is for the specific purpose of raising revenue. All honourable members who supported the Bill made it quite clear, to my mind, that the legislation is for the purpose of raising revenue. The assessment of the City Council in 1955-56

amounted to £3,540,396. The revenue derived was £604,817, and the rate imposed was 3s. 5d. in the pound. Various statements have been made to the effect that these meters will keep traffic moving and ease congestion, but I do not agree that that will be so. The payment of 6d. for half an hour is not going to deter a motorist from parking. It will cost 1s. an hour in one hour parking streets and in two hour streets it will cost 1s. to park for two hours. I assume that the half-hour limit will be in King William, Rundle and Hindley Streets, and if a man has business to transact in one of those streets he will park there.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—He cannot park now because there is never any space.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—There will not be very much space for him when the meters are installed. We have time limitations today, and if a motorist exceeds those limits he is very fortunate if he does not get a sticker, for which he must pay 10s. to the council. When these meters come into operation he will be able to park in the city for eight hours at a cost of 4s., which is very cheap parking. The general public is going to take advantage of that.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Won't it cost 1s. to park for an hour?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes, and it will only cost 1s. for two hours. That means that a motorist will be able to park for eight hours for 4s., which is a lot cheaper than the 10s. he must pay if he gets a sticker.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—There will have to be some experimentation.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes, and I think there will be anomalies. I feel that sufficient investigation has not been made, and that is why I will oppose it.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—The Bill does not contain any mention of fees.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That is so, but the fees have been disclosed and publicized in the press.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—That is only the opinion of one member of the City Council.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—No, it is not. The council must have considered this matter and disclosed what it intended to charge. Honourable members have said that if a person does not wish to pay the fee he can use public transport, but why should any person be imposed upon to such an extent that he must leave his car at home and use public transport which will cost him a lot more? I do not think we should have legislation merely for the purpose of forcing a section of the general

public to use public transport if they do not desire to do so. If the Tramways Trust had done the right thing more people would be using its vehicles now. It costs me 8d. to come to the city in a tram, a journey which takes four minutes in a car.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—I doubt if the honourable member could run his car for 8d.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—If it cost me that much to come to the city in my car I would be surprised. I would prefer to pay 6d. for a parking meter than use public transport. I maintain that there is discrimination between the motorist who desires to come to King William, Rundle or Hindley Streets and the person who does not desire to come so close to the city. There is a one hour's parking limit at Grote Street, and presumably it will cost a motorist 1s. to park there for one hour.

Another point which was raised was the question of the parklands. I fully appreciate Mr. Anthony's point that the parklands should not be used, but with the increase of population in the metropolitan area and the vast building activity which is taking place the time is coming when something will have to be done. I would rather see a decent parking area with lawns and trees than the terrible eyesore which we now have in the parklands at the direct approach to the city. Visitors to Adelaide see this and cannot be very impressed. I refer to the so-called hostel in the parklands facing the continuation of North Terrace, which has been there for some considerable time, and apparently will remain for some time. What a great advertisement for our city!

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—That is on railway property.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes, but I never heard the honourable member protest against its establishment there. We have become accustomed to the sight, but what must it look like to overseas visitors? Would it not be far better to utilize the area as parking space and beautify it? In any case it is time the Government did something better for the people who are forced to live there.

I do not like the provision in the Bill that permits a by-law to become operative immediately it is promulgated, and approved or disallowed by Parliament afterwards. Suppose that a by-law is tabled on the last day of a session. It is extremely unlikely that it would be dealt with in one day and therefore would remain operative until Parliament reassembled after the recess, perhaps six months later. In the interim circumstances may have arisen which would cause Parliament

to disallow it, but the disallowance would not make it illegal for the period it had operated, and a motorist who had paid his parking fees would have no claim for a refund by reason of the disallowance of the by-law. On the other side, of course, there is the argument that the City Council would be put to the expense of buying and installing the meters and might be involved in considerable loss if compelled subsequently, through the disallowance of the by-law, to remove them. What I object to is the establishment of a precedent which could be followed in other respects, for if it is done once there is no valid argument against extending it to something else.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Is the honourable member suggesting that no by-laws are brought into operation before they are tabled?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—My experience has been that by-laws are dealt with by the Subordinate Legislation Committee and then laid on the Table for the stipulated period before becoming effective; they are not effective while they are being dealt with.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—Yes they are.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I understood that they are not operative until assented to by Parliament.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—No.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That was the basis of my protest and I thought it was laying down a far-reaching precedent. However, as I intimated earlier, I feel that I must oppose the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I think everyone who takes notice of the traffic in Adelaide will concede that it is growing in volume. I do not regard the traffic as being great, but agree that parking of cars is a source of great inconvenience, and it is a matter which should receive the attention of somebody. It is reaching the stage when people will have to park on the outskirts of the city, thereby cluttering up the roads there. It would be far better if they used public transport made available to them.

I take it that this Bill was introduced at the instigation of the City Council which desired to do something within its boundaries to overcome the great inconvenience. The council seeks to do it by the provision of parking meters in various zones within the city, and certain charges are to be made for the use of parking space. The authority controlling that naturally must be the City Council which is responsible for the roads. Adelaide

has wide streets—in the main, wider than those of the average city. We have also surrounding Adelaide many hundreds of acres of parklands and it seems to me that Colonel Light designed this city so that it could be adapted to a good many changes in the forms of locomotion.

A few weeks ago I attended a lecture given by Professor Dean Belluschi of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, U.S.A., who is a recognized authority on town planning, and one of the greatest in America. The lecture was given under the auspices of the Australian Institute of Architects which was holding a conference in Adelaide at the time. In the course of his lecture the professor exhibited slides showing the proposed reconstruction of Fort Worth, a city in Texas. The whole city was to be remodelled and no cars were to be allowed to come into the centre. Garages and large parking spaces were provided on the four sides of the city from which the approach will be made to the city by foot, and none would be more distant than three minutes walk from the centre. That indicates the type of thing one of the most world-renowned town planners envisages, and I am inclined to think that if Colonel Light were designing the city of Adelaide now he would make greater use of the parklands than we do. I do not know what his original idea was; it might have been to take care of cattle or horses, or he may have looked far into the future when he surrounded the city with a good wide belt of open space that might be used for anything. I think that he would now devote a good area of the parklands for a well laid out car park; it might be in the form of grassed and tree planted areas, or underground or elevated.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—There are nearly 2,000 acres in the parklands.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Yes, and it seems to me that if 100 acres were set aside as a car park no great disability would be suffered by anybody. I believe there is some room for change and improvement in the original intention and I have very little patience with those who hold up their hands in horror at any suggestion of improving or altering the parklands. It should be done properly and efficiently and beautified, but use could be made of them. Like Mr. Anthoney, I am concerned with new section 75 (g) which states:—

Any municipal council may construct and provide on land vested in . . .

I draw the Minister's attention to the words "vested in". Are the parklands vested in the city council? If not, it is all right, but I would be very disturbed to think that a measure designed to provide for the installation of parking meters was so stretched as to give authority to the City Council, or any other body, to have a free hand with the parklands unless that aspect was fully discussed as such. I would be agreeable to it if it were discussed, but it would not be fair for the City Council to have a clear run of the parklands if these laws are vested in it without this Parliament knowing what it was giving up. I hope that point will be clarified by the Minister.

Sir Arthur Rymill introduced a certain amount of detail into the discussion, and although it was informative I thought it was outside the scope of the Bill. The City Council as a governing body is next to Parliament, and in delegating powers to it we should feel sure we can do it in a general way, leaving the implementation of the powers to the council itself. I do not think a charge of sixpence in Rundle Street for half an hour is sufficient. The closer to the hub of the city cars are parked, the dearer the charge should be, and the quicker they should move. I do not agree with the idea that the object of installing the meters is to raise funds, although undoubtedly the council will make some money out of parking fees. It will have an opportunity to expend that revenue in the interests of motorists.

Those who will be affected by the Bill, apart from motorists, are the owners and occupiers of properties adjoining the meters. I have received no objections from them. A staff member from one of these properties could not draw up in front of them unless he clocked himself in. Evidently the owners are satisfied with that position. Although they may be inconvenienced, I suppose they are prepared to put up with this to attract business. I feel sure that the City Council will consider the convenience of owners of properties adjoining the meters. Certain owners of cars employ drivers and there should be areas where they can without double ranking be allowed to pick up and drop their passengers. I presume that places will be provided in the streets for taxis where no parking will be allowed. I think we can with every confidence leave the details to the council. I support the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—The Bill is in conformity with some of the actions of the Government in bringing down such measures which in my opinion are a complete negation of Parliament. New section 475b gives mandatory powers to the City Council to promulgate regulations and after they have been confirmed by the Governor they automatically become law. Should Parliament be in recess when such regulations are framed and assented to by the Governor and published in the *Government Gazette* it may be nine or possibly 10 months before Parliament would have the opportunity to say whether it agreed with them or not. I foreshadow an amendment to that section to give the council power to promulgate a regulation, but then it is to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which in turn will have power either to give the green or the red light. If the council agrees to my suggestion it will keep the legislation within the perimeter of the activities of this Parliament and allow the responsible authority set up by Parliament, the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, to determine the position and answer for its actions.

I also foreshadow another amendment concerning the parklands. I am fully seized of the necessity to deal with our traffic problems, and believe that every honourable member and citizen knows of the urgency of providing necessary parking areas to keep the flow of traffic moving and making the business thoroughfares available to everyone and not only for the advantage of a few. I call attention to new section 475g, which reads:—

(1) Any municipal council may construct and provide on land vested in or leased by or otherwise under the care, control, or management of the council, and may manage car parks, parking stations, garages and similar places in which vehicles may be left and may from time to time, fix fees and charges to be made for the use of any such car park, parking station, garage or other place or for any services rendered thereat.

I propose to provide at the end of the section that parklands shall not come under a council's provision. In my opinion this would provide a means for the City Council to circumvent the custodianship conferred upon it by an Act of Parliament passed many years ago. Parklands are under the control of the council. I am not suggesting that it will do anything not in the best interests of the citizens, but the membership of the council changes from time to time and new members might hold a different view. If the Government desires to give this power to the City Council then the

correct procedure would be to amend the Parklands Act and come out boldly and tell the people that the purpose of amending the Act was to give the council these specific powers. The Labor Party has considered this measure, and its considered opinion is that these things should be done not to thwart the council in providing the necessary parking areas, but provide the necessary protection, which has been done over the years since we have had representative government. The section provides for penalties not exceeding £20 for any breach against a by-law, and I propose to move an amendment to reduce this amount to £5. I think members will see the wisdom of my proposals and will embody them in the Bill.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—I congratulate honourable members on their contributions to the debate. Several have offered suggestions worthy of the most careful consideration. It is obvious that considerable interest has been taken in the Bill not only by honourable members, but by members of the community. Because the Leader of the Opposition raised certain specific questions I took the liberty to get a further report on the matter, not only for his information but that of other honourable members. Mr. Condon suggested that the installation of parking meters might not relieve traffic congestion. It will not mean that the streets in which they are placed will be freer of traffic, but they should have the result of traffic being able to move with greater freedom. Motorists who do not wish to pay the parking fee will not be able to leave their cars in streets where there are parking meters. It is a common thing for many cars to be left in the one place for lengthy periods, and although the City Council has its traffic inspectors it is practically impossible for them to police the position fully, and at the same time permit the use of space by another vehicle which a parking meter would in many instances do. To some degree the parking meters will be their own inspectors by notifying the time that a vehicle can be left. An offence is easily indicated. The suggestion made by Mr. Bevan that this is just a revenue-raising plan is not quite correct. It is not suggested that it will not bring in revenue, but as Sir Frank Perry mentioned, there are considerable costs associated with the scheme and it will still be necessary to pay the wages of the inspectors as well as the capital costs and upkeep charges of the meters. There will be a certain amount of clerical work at the Town Hall in connection with the meters and, as members are no doubt

aware, the present staff is not sufficient even to deal with present parking offences. If there is excess revenue, I agree that it could be applied to the provision of off-kerb parking facilities, and the Bill gives that authority.

An important matter brought forward by members is the use of the parklands. I have conferred with the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman on this matter, which I feel is of such importance that members must have the position fully clarified before I could expect them to vote for this particular clause. This I intend to do when the Bill is next before us, when I hope we will be in Committee.

The Bill limits powers to install parking meters to municipal councils. Some members asked why district councils should not be included, but it is considered that meters are only appropriate to be used in suburban areas. It is likely that in many country towns there would not be any case for establishing parking meters, because there would be space otherwise available for parking and the motorists would therefore not park at them, so it has been deemed unwise to have such a provision in the Bill. Generally speaking, the more densely settled areas are in the municipalities, and it is not considered necessary to extend the proposed powers to district councils at present. This kind of differentiation applies to a number of matters under the Local Government Act, and the policy of that Act is that, as in certain cases the problems of municipal councils differ from those of district councils, extended powers are accordingly given to municipal councils.

I now come to the knotty problem regarding by-laws, and I will quote fairly carefully from the report on this so that it will be in *Hansard* and members will be able to take their time perusing my remarks. I am not disputing certain statements made by members with regard to the by-laws, but they are not complete, and I wish to fill in the gaps. The Local Government Act provides that after by-laws are made by a council they are laid before Parliament, and if not disallowed are then submitted for confirmation by the Governor. If confirmed, they are gazetted and come into operation. The general rule for regulations, by-laws made by others than councils and other subordinate legislation is set out in section 38 of the Acts Interpretation Act which provides that by-laws, etc. are made by the Governor or other authority and, if necessary, confirmed by the Governor. They are then published in the *Gazette* and come into force.

After publication, they are tabled in Parliament and are subject to disallowance. Thus, a regulation or by-law may be made in, say, January and take effect from the time of publication in the *Gazette*. It may be disallowed by Parliament as much as six or seven months later, when it ceases to have any further operation.

Section 38 applies to the greater part of subordinate legislation enacted in this State—for instance, in road traffic matters—and thus the practice of this form of legislation coming into force and later ceasing to have operation if disallowed by Parliament is of general application. This method, it may be added, applied to local government by-laws until 1934, when the present special rule for local government by-laws was introduced. One result of the Local Government Act method is that it can involve considerable delay between the making of a by-law by a council and the time of coming into operation. If a by-law is made in January it cannot be tabled until Parliament meets. It has to be tabled for 14 sitting days and it is only after the expiration of this period, assuming there is no motion for disallowance, that it can be submitted to the Governor for confirmation, be gazetted, and come into force. If a by-law is made in late November or early December it is too late for the 14 sitting days to elapse before Parliament prorogues, and thus it cannot come into force until some seven or eight months after it is made. In many kinds of by-laws this delay is not material. It is considered, however, that parking meter by-laws should not be subject to this delay.

The Government is strongly of the opinion that the charges under the scheme should be fixed by by-law and be subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. It is almost certain that as the scheme develops and the council has experience in its operations it will be found that variation of the charges will be desirable, but unless the by-law method is changed or the council is given power to fix the charges by resolution, there would be too great a delay in making a change. It was submitted to the Government that the council should have power to fix the parking meter charges by resolution of the council, but the Government feels that there should be Parliamentary control over this most important matter. It is thus felt that there is a strong case for the procedure for by-laws proposed in this Bill.

With regard to penalties, a matter that I knew the Leader of the Opposition and Mr.

Bardolph would bring up, the Bill enables the by-laws to provide for maximum penalties of £20, although it is for the court to decide what penalty up to the maximum will be imposed. It is considered that a maximum penalty of £20 is reasonable, particularly as there is no provision for a second or subsequent offence, and the maximum should be sufficient to deter a persistent offender. It should also be borne in mind that an offence against a parking meter by-law can be brought within the scope of section 64 of the Police Offences Act. The council may be empowered under that section by regulation made by the Governor to give the offender an opportunity to expiate the offence by paying to the council an amount of up to £1. This provision is widely used for minor offences. It is most likely that it will be used to deal with most of the persons who offend against the parking meter by-law, and that in general it will only be persistent offenders or offenders who fail to expiate their offences under section 64 who will be brought before the court.

Another point made by Mr. Bevan was that he thought this would be an infliction on motorists. As Mr. Condon said, and Sir Arthur Rymill also pointed out, these laws have always met with objection when introduced in other parts of the world, but after they have been in operation the general public, particularly the motorists, have decided that they are a good thing. In the few years in which meters have been in operation in other parts of the world, we have been able to benefit from their experience. I am certain that the City Council would not have asked for this legislation unless it felt that it would be of benefit to the community and to the corporation as a whole, because after all the corporation must consider the benefit of the community.

Mr. Bardolph has foreshadowed some amendments. I assure him that if he will let me have them I will see that they have technical consideration at the earliest possible opportunity by the Government's advisers, and I have no doubt that every member will wish to have the opportunity of perusing them at an early date.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.52 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 25, at 2 p.m.