

Playford's metropolis

Susan Marsden

Adelaide in 1938 was no metropolis. The original city, laid out in 1837, formed a small, densely-populated centre enclosed within parkland that was encircled by inner suburbs built up during the 19th century. The closely-built inner suburbs coalesced at their edges with outer suburbs that had grown around once-separate villages and along the main roads radiating from the city. The outer suburbs, with their large gardens and nearby paddocks, scattered houses and local business-places, appeared as semi-rural, self-contained communities.²⁸

Between and beyond the outer suburbs stretched farmland, orchards and vineyards. Market gardens lined the River Torrens and sand dunes ran along the coast to the west and south west, with swamp, dairy farms and ancient river red gums behind them. During the Playford era those suburban villages, farms, dunes and trees would be engulfed by a new metropolitan city. Much of this transformation was brought about by the actions of the state's housing authority, the South Australian Housing Trust under the direct influence of the premier.

The close collaboration between the Trust management and Playford demonstrates how state governments in Australia generally have acted as the country's principal urban governments.²⁹ The public sector in Australia has performed a major part in the shaping of cities in the course of promoting broad economic development under capitalism, and Adelaide is the product of nearly 160 years of interaction between capitalism and the state. The city was designed in 1837 to serve as an outpost of British capitalism and South Australian governments played a powerful role in shaping subsequent urban development.³⁰ The most impressive attempt at public intervention in urban development in Australia was made by the Playford government in Adelaide between the 1940s and the 1960s. During a critical period of city growth Adelaide was structured by direct state intervention and indirectly through government support for the expansion of private building, manufacturing and immigration.

These state policies also determined the social and economic characteristics of post-war metropolitan Adelaide. This transformation had important consequences not only for metropolitan localities but for the state in general because Adelaide was the South Australian capital, its economic headquarters, and housed more than half the state's population. With Playford's active encouragement, industrialisation and the activities of powerful agencies such as the Trust further concentrated population, housing and factories in Adelaide.³¹ By the mid 1960s Adelaide could well be described as Playford's metropolis.

The South Australian Housing Trust

South Australia's Liberal and Country League government established the South Australian Housing Trust, Australia's first public housing authority, in 1936. As proposed by industrialists such as Edward Holden and the Auditor-General, William Wainwright, the Trust was intended not as a means of improving living standards through improved housing or town planning but as a tool in a plan for attracting industrial investment by keeping the state's labour costs below those in the rival states of New South Wales and Victoria.

This role was most developed during Playford's years as premier. Playford supported the expansion of the Trust as a major state enterprise and as a key instrument in the economic policies initiated by his predecessor as premier, Richard Butler. Contrary to his image as a small government premier, Playford fostered the expansion of such public sector agencies as the Trust, the Department of Mines and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, that promoted economic development.³²

In a rapidly developing economy such as that of Australia at present, it has been vital that public authorities should assume control of the planned development and financing of power, transport, housing, water supplies and land settlement. The long-term planning which is required for these undertakings, coupled with the extraordinarily heavy capital finance required, have put them beyond the capacity of private enterprise. Yet the proper and efficient development of these facilities is vital to the operation of private enterprise in other fields.³³

As the government's policies promoted industrial development and population growth, their effects were concentrated in Adelaide. Most scholars acknowledge that the main outcome of Playford's administration was a hastened rate of industrialisation.³⁴ Rather than industrialisation itself, however, the most tangible outcome of Playford-era policies was a new metropolitan Adelaide.

A role as urban developer was implicit in the Trust's founding purpose of constructing workers' cottages on a scale sufficient to restrain rents in Adelaide and stimulate the private building industry. The inadvertent urban planning roles became self-conscious and more extensive from the late 1940s as Playford expanded enterprises such as the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the Trust. The urban policy role of the Housing Trust was an essential part of the government's strategies of fostering industrial development.

The government operated within the constraints set by private industrial interests, most of which preferred city locations. Neither Butler nor Playford would risk losing them to another capital city by insisting upon a rural location.³⁵ The new factories necessitated additional worker housing, further promoting metropolitan growth.

In the 1930s most of the state's secondary industry and industrial workforce was concentrated not only in Adelaide but in a particular segment of it, in a quadrant from the city centre to the northwest along the Port Road and railway that linked city and port. During the late 1930s and 1940s, industries continued to locate in that sector as there were large tracts of suitable land beyond the Port Road.

The establishment of British Tube Mills in 1938 at Kilburn on the northern railway line was the government's first success in encouraging overseas firms to manufacture in South Australia. During the Second World War two major munitions works were also built in the northern and western suburbs, at Finsbury and Hendon. Both were established with Playford's support with a view to post-war private development. Others were attracted to the area as subsidiaries of large expanding concerns such as General Motors-Holden's at Woodville. The process continued until the late 1950s, with new industries setting up and others moving from cramped inner city sites.³⁶

The Trust did not pioneer subdivision in the suburbs at these fringe industrial areas but it had the money and the market to enable it to develop them. This was one of several urbanising roles played by the Trust. By building in semi-

settled districts, the Trust provided a stimulus to private subdivision and housing construction. This effect was reinforced in areas where the Trust also encouraged the extension of public facilities and utilities such as roads, water supply and gas.

After the Second World War the Trust became one of the most powerful of the state authorities. The change was due partly to the liberal provisions of a new Act introduced by Playford (the *Housing Improvement Act* 1940) and, as treasurer, to his willingness to greatly increase cheap loan funds.³⁷ The change was successfully introduced by way of a restructuring of the Trust during the mid 1940s. Playford chose a new chairman, Jack Cartledge, and supported his selection of a new general manager, Alex Ramsay, and of many other new staff members and additional responsibilities. The new chairman and general manager were highly intelligent men who created the post-war organisation with its pervasive powers, and directed the Trust for the remaining years of the Playford government. Both men were conscious of the role of the Trust in determining the overall direction of urban growth, and not merely contributing to it by way of building low-cost mass housing.

Housing was provided to a wider market and in an increasing variety of types and locations. For its first ten years the Trust was empowered to build workers' rental houses only, although Playford enabled the Trust to expand its program to rapidly growing country towns, notably Whyalla. But Playford strongly supported the concept of home ownership and the Trust first built houses for sale at Hove (Brighton) in 1946. As well, army camps were converted for temporary housing, and in 1950 Playford initiated an emergency housing scheme to accommodate the thousands of families who were reduced by housing shortages to living in sheds and tents.

The Trust had built 10,000 houses by 1951 and 30,000 by 1957. The Trust became by far the state's largest builder and urban developer. Playford sponsored its development into an urban planner, builder, landlord and financier, producing one-third of new dwellings in the metropolitan area and, in the process, transforming it. Until it began construction at Elizabeth — then rural — in 1954, 77 per cent of Trust dwellings were located in the metropolitan area.³⁸ The extent of urbanisation is apparent from the physical expansion of Adelaide between 1945 and 1961 which was approximately as great as the expansion of the whole preceding period in the city's history.³⁹

The Trust's contribution to urbanisation was vast and varied. It constructed thousands of rental and purchase houses, and decided how and where they were built; it determined the socio-economic character of the new suburbs and their relationship to industry and services; it assisted councils and development agencies to provide essential public works; it encouraged the private house-building industry to expand and modernise its methods; and it provided land for schools, churches and shops. It also embarked upon activities that were unique to the Trust: it sold land for, and later built factories, constructed shops and created a satellite city. As Alex Ramsay remembered:

After the war it became reasonably clear that if the Trust was to help industry in the way it would like, we would need the additional powers so often enjoyed by developers overseas, namely the power to build, sell or lease factories. In the wish to obtain these powers, the Trust was strongly supported by Sir Thomas

Playford, who well knew that there were many cases where a company needed assistance not only with land and labour, but with fixed capital.⁴⁰

In 1946 the Trust bought land in the southern suburb of Daw Park, retaining half the site for housing and reselling the remainder to private industries and developers. During the 1950s and 1960s the Trust also provided land for factories in the northern and western suburbs. In 1954 Ramsay predicted that the Adelaide Plains would be built over within five to ten years. One of the biggest problems, he said, was establishing industry in the southern suburbs so that southern residents did not have to cross the city each day to reach their jobs.⁴¹ Attracting industries to the peripheral southern and northern suburbs was described as 'decentralisation', meaning from the city centre to the suburbs.⁴² As one Trust employee recalled: 'Actually what we were looking at and what we still look at is providing work places. This is our business. Our business is numbers and people. We provide a place to live, a place to worship, a place to shop, to work and to play'.⁴³

This massive building program had strongly contributed to the suburbanisation of the remaining open areas within the Adelaide region by the time the Trust had turned to elongating Adelaide by the development of a northern satellite. The original and principal motivation for Elizabeth was not the creation of a new town in its own right but the development of a large site on relatively cheap farmland to help keep Trust construction costs low generally and help maintain the state's relatively low industrial wages.

The Trust helped to build a circular metropolitan city around Adelaide and then extended it by seeking 'to move out and establish centres at convenient spots so that more or less self-contained towns could be constructed'.⁴⁴ The new urban focal points were Elizabeth to the north, established between 1950 and 1965, and Christies Beach, in the Noarlunga region to the south, established in the 1960s and 1970s. Playford prompted the Trust to begin construction of these new settlements and provided the support for the purchase of large areas of land. From this perspective the key planners were not the Trust town planners and architects but the premier, the chairman and the general manager. Planning was perceived by them principally in terms of broad political and economic purposes and only secondarily in terms of the social and physical development of Elizabeth and the Noarlunga suburbs.

Elizabeth successfully absorbed much of Adelaide's growth at a time the city as a whole was experiencing its most rapid growth and highest rates of immigration.⁴⁵ Migrants accounted for over 65 per cent of Elizabeth's growth, with 70 per cent of them coming from Britain.⁴⁶ 'The most significant examples of orderly urbanization' were achieved by the Trust taking an initiating role. Its work at Elizabeth and Noarlunga, 'designed to relieve metropolitan Adelaide of some of the demands and consequences of growth, are government enterprises far beyond the scope of the usual statutory processes of land use planning and control'.⁴⁷

Since opportunities for new industrial development were freely offered at Elizabeth, both population and employment growth were diverted there. Most of the inter-censal increase (1954 to 1966) in Adelaide's population and in manufacturing jobs was in Elizabeth and the surrounding Salisbury region. Between

1954 and 1966 the population of the northern Adelaide Plains increased from 7,730 to 68,711.⁴⁸

Many important features of the Trust's metropolitan development role were developed in response to the requirements of Elizabeth. These included widened industrial powers, responsibilities for building social facilities and a migration scheme. The Trust itself contributed to the flow of migrants to South Australia and from 1958 to 1971 ran a Migrant House Purchase Scheme from an office in London. This scheme attracted more than 3,000 families to the state, many of whom bought houses at Elizabeth.

The Trust played a town planning role within housing estates only to a limited extent before planning Elizabeth. The skills of the Trust's planners and architects were fully deployed at Elizabeth, which firmly established the Trust as an effective town planner.⁴⁹ The Trust operated as 'metropolitan planner' at several levels: as formal town planner at Elizabeth; as *de facto* metropolitan planner, integrating factory development and housing and extending the suburbs; and as a major state planner.

While the Trust was never granted formal town planning powers, as provided originally to the Housing Commission of Victoria, in 1938, it was the Trust that exerted a dominating influence during the period of most extensive suburbanisation in the history of Australian cities. Most other state governments introduced formal planning legislation in the attempt to direct post-war urbanisation. The delay in introducing such legislation in South Australia, which had to await Playford's electoral defeat in 1965, seems to have been deliberate on Playford's part as it ensured the continuing *de facto* planning role of the Trust. The Trust as planner was more acceptable to private interests than formal planning because it was clearly supportive of those private interests. It was acceptable to the population at large because it helped raise living standards and promoted employment.

The differences in the post-war development of the capital cities may not have been so much due to differences between housing authorities as to the Trust's uniquely close association with the state government and the extraordinary support of that government. Playford was given sensible and imaginative advice by Trust management, but where the Trust was left to its own devices its rental estates varied little from those in Sydney and Melbourne. Thus it was Playford's input that distinguished the Trust's efforts from the public housing bodies in the other states.

Playford's celebrated meanness when it came to expenditure on 'non-productive' services was also a factor in the austere appearance of the public housing estates. Playford had been impressed by the Trust's early success in obtaining an inexpensive house design (semi-detached brick cottages) and a builder whose economies of scale kept costs, and therefore rents, below the amounts specified in the *Housing Trust Act* 1936. The semi-detached design with its sparing use of building materials became the prototype for 'double unit' rental houses that were built in their thousands for more than 30 years.⁵⁰ Cheaper building materials were used and ever-larger rental estates were constructed: the effect on the physical appearance of extensive areas of Adelaide and on the living conditions of their residents was immense.

The Trust maintained that 'in this State the semi-detached cottage can provide the maximum reasonable standard of convenience and comfort with the minimum expenditure of materials and labour'.⁵¹ When deputations protested to him about housing standards, Playford invariably repeated those sentiments.

Limited house types and unimaginative layout of estates were the outcomes of the compromise between social amenity and economic cost. Trust suburbs were the built expression of idealism and acute social need, combined in uneasy tension with the stretching of funds. The consequences for the metropolitan area as a whole were spelt out in the *Advertiser* in 1957:

South Australia's need to house quickly as many families as possible has produced more than 56,000 houses ... since 1945. This rate of construction has been sufficient to change Adelaide's character in a decade without adding much to its reputation as a garden city and without producing much real estate variety. More vision 10 years ago, and a master plan for the fast-growing outlying suburbs, would have enabled Adelaide to take full advantage of that decade of rapid growth ... It is to be hoped that the need to provide housing for all who need it ... will not produce another decade in which the austerity look will become a stronger characteristic of Adelaide's housing ... [The South Australian government should move] to protect the huge Housing Trust programme with better community planning.⁵²

Adelaide transformed

What was the outcome of the Trust's activities under Playford? Demand for housing built up during the depression and war and further increased by cheap housing finance, high birth-rates and immigration, was catered for within 20 years of the war and to standards which satisfied most householders. By supporting the establishment of new industries in Adelaide, building a quarter of the city's new dwellings and housing migrants from other states and overseas in Adelaide, the Trust contributed to the urbanisation of the state's existing and its post-war immigrant population. Promoting metropolitan growth was a founding aim.

It is difficult to assess how much the Trust contributed to the rate of urbanisation because the rate was high for most Australian capital cities. What is more certain is the Trust's significant contribution to the population *increase* in Adelaide. In common with all states, the population was increased after the war mainly by migration. Most of that population was concentrated in the capital.⁵³ Between 1940 and 1966 South Australia's population increased by 84.3 per cent. Only Western Australia (82 per cent) experienced a similar increase.⁵⁴ In both states extensive public housing authority activity was concentrated in the capitals.⁵⁵ To satisfy the objectives of industrial growth, the Trust built many thousands of houses as near as possible to metropolitan industries and assumed a direct role in siting new industries, mostly in Adelaide.

By the late 1960s the Trust had helped to create a city which was more equitable and less expensive than comparable cities in terms of land and housing prices.⁵⁶ Without this state leadership, 'Adelaide would surely have become a smaller, denser and overcrowded city with a smaller industrial base ... a larger private rental sector and less home ownership'. Living standards would have been lower for many

residents and costs higher.⁵⁷ In Australia generally the contribution of public sector, architect-designed, 'group housing' of the 1940s and 1950s to improved living standards has been under-appreciated.

The Trust's industrial package also offered benefits to industrialists. It helped with establishment costs, housed workers and kept the price of industrial land lower than in most other capitals.⁵⁸ The Trust strongly influenced the distribution of major manufacturing sites. Industry was encouraged to locate progressively in expanding housing areas in Adelaide's middle south, further south and the north. This reduced commuting distances and kept travelling costs low, with many workers housed near industry. By ensuring that industry was well-spaced throughout the metropolitan area, the Trust served the interests of both capital and labour.

Public utilities were also distributed efficiently. This was due to Playford's support and the ability of the managers of the big utilities and the Trust to coordinate programs. The Trust also formed its own workforce to carry out some work customarily done by local government, such as road building and stormwater drainage. The Trust performed a range of urban planning and development roles in fringe sites where local government had limited resources. By the mid 1960s, Adelaide's new suburbs were better serviced than in other Australian cities with made roads, water, electricity and gas, Trust shops and other community facilities.⁵⁹ After Elizabeth, the Trust even offered land, funds or builders for some halls and libraries.⁶⁰

The Trust's careful siting of housing estates within existing metropolitan boundaries until the 1950s and then in concentrated settlements to the north and south helped to contain un-coordinated sprawl. Nor were many Adelaide residents crammed into high-rise flats, as is usually considered necessary for urban consolidation. By 1971 Adelaide had the highest percentage of semi-detached housing but the lowest percentage of flats of any Australian capital.⁶¹

The Trust influenced the overall linear shape of the city, which was extended north and south earlier than would have been the case with a purely private city. This process was in two phases. The first involved construction on the existing urban fringe in the 1940s and 1950s, from the north and north-west through to the southern coastal districts. The second phase of fringe development was in satellites that were intended ultimately to be part of an extended Adelaide. In British planning terminology, the Trust initiated in South Australia and in Australia, both Mark One (satellite, garden-city) and Mark Two (denser, linear city) forms of metropolitan development.⁶²

The Trust planned second-stage growth around shopping centres. This, and other features of its planning, had an enduring influence on formal town planning. There was a strong similarity between the Trust plan for Adelaide's expansion and the proposals presented in the *Report on the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide* in 1962. This endorsed the strategy of extending the metropolitan area in stages as a linear city, while protecting the Adelaide Hills face and retaining people's access to the hills and beaches. Metropolitan planning after Playford continued to reflect his attitudes and expectations and those of the Trust managers and planners appointed during his term as premier.

The urban impact of the Trust had other social and demographic consequences. Its activities helped to increase the proportion of the city's population that was industrial working class and contributed to the rise of a new middle class of factory administrators and professional workers. The Trust's decisions as to housing type and tenure strongly influenced the social structure of many localities. The metropolitan area by 1966 demonstrated both the spatial and the historical impact of the Trust's programs in terms of socio-economic status and the age and ethnicity of resident families. From 1937 to 1966 the Trust concentrated rental housing construction in the belt of suburbs running from the southwest through to the northwest and north. Analysis of census data for 1966 showed that the suburbs with the lowest socio-economic status were in the same sector. The youngest families lived in suburbs built progressively further from the inner city.

Housing areas outside this sector, which were developed for private purchase partly by the Trust, were of high socio-economic status. They included coastal suburbs near Glenelg and in former market garden districts such as Lockleys, where Alex Ramsay and his family lived.⁶³ These suburbs housed the new middle class which had found employment in tertiary industries, which had increased even more rapidly than secondary industries. However, the Trust showed a marked disinclination to build rental estates in high-status suburbs in the east and south, which helped perpetuate their status.⁶⁴ The Trust was firmly restricted to housing the two middling classes, professional/managerial and working class, rather than people who were wealthy or very poor.

Through its Migrant House Purchase Scheme and the publicity given to Elizabeth as a 'British' new town, the Trust also helped attract British migrants to South Australia. British migrants contributed a much higher percentage of Adelaide's growth than of any other capital city's between 1947 and 1966.⁶⁵ The population distribution of Trust tenants and house-purchasers was even more heavily skewed to British-born persons than in Adelaide as a whole.⁶⁶ As Mark Peel observed, 'British Elizabeth constituted 60 to 70 per cent of the [Elizabeth] population ... In 1966, Elizabeth – not Richmond or Carlton or Leichhardt – was the single most concentrated immigrant settlement in Australia'.⁶⁷

The Trust's rent control functions, allied to its large rental housing program hastened the decline in private rental housing.⁶⁸ This had several consequences, not simply reducing the quantity of sub-standard housing and the profiteering of private landlords. The decrease in private rental houses reduced the variety in rental housing, which limited choice.⁶⁹ The substitution of public for private rental also reduced the housing available in the inner city, reduced housing rented to the 'undeserving' poor, and concentrated the 'deserving' poor in public housing estates at increasing distances from central-city jobs and services.⁷⁰

Working women were especially disadvantaged. Many were relocated to outer suburban housing away from most clothing and service industries. The problem was reinforced by poor public transport and by an industrialisation strategy that did little to increase women's employment opportunities, at the same time as the female manufacturing workforce dropped from its wartime peak.⁷¹ In the metropolitan region a high correlation was found between female unemployment and the post-war Trust rental estates, whereas this was not the case with male unemployment until the 1970s, after the Playford era.⁷²

The social characteristics of Trust places such as Woodville Gardens, Salisbury North

and Elizabeth made them vulnerable to any reduction in demand for industrial labour.⁷³ The very success of the Trust in housing workers as inexpensively as possible close to industrial areas has since come to constitute a grave problem of concentrated unemployment near barren landscapes of abandoned factories.

Apart from the social and economic costs of fringe development, there were costs for the old city. During the 1950s and 1960s the City of Adelaide and the inner suburbs suffered steep declines in population. Vacant houses were replaced by commercial and industrial buildings and the residential environment built up over more than a century suffered degradation and destruction.⁷⁴ Commonwealth and state government support to new housing in outer suburbs was a major contributing factor. Government-backed loans were biased towards the purchase of newly-built homes in new suburbs.⁷⁵

The economic strategies adopted by the state government, the Trust and other agencies such as the Highways Department, meant that the central district was treated as a redevelopment site for commercial and industrial construction and for new commuter roads. This view coloured the 1962 Metropolitan Plan and its offshoot, the 1968 Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study,⁷⁶ and was shared by the councils concerned, despite some ineffectual efforts to protect the interests of the remaining residents.⁷⁷

Thus, the Trust 'success' as metropolitan planner required individual suburban communities — mainly rental tenants in the peripheral estates and private residents in the inner city — to bear the costs in terms of poor public environments and poverty of local facilities.⁷⁸ Playford was himself careless of the damage done to the Adelaide region's natural beauty as well as its heritage.⁷⁹ Nor did he care to improve people's quality of life by spending on social or cultural services — unless economic benefits could be demonstrated: 'Central economic planning ran half a century ahead of a central lack of compassion — saving on *that* was where the winning margins of investment in cheap land, water, power and housing came from.'⁸⁰

Playford expected state authorities to minimise 'non-productive' costs, hence the lack of facilities in many Trust rental estates. This lack was partly made up by the Trust but, in Playford's time, never to the extent that facilities were provided in Elizabeth. The metropolitan change prompted and shaped by the Butler/Playford administrations reflected the 'priority awarded to tangible factors, such as growth and development, over intangibles, such as community well-being and historic and aesthetic assets'.⁸¹

Playford's policies and Trust programs aggravated some local problems, but the broader achievement of urban development was impressive. Adelaide by 1966 was an exemplar of urban policy made by experienced managers of a powerful state authority, rather than by town planners. This was done within the constraints imposed by the capitalist system and the need to encourage and to cater for its growth, and within the constraints of state politics and policies.

Although the Trust's powers were curbed when the Playford government lost power in 1965, Ramsay's skills and the long lead-times for construction meant that the development agency character of the Trust and the metropolitan impact of its programs outlasted Playford's defeat by more than a decade. Even more enduring was the city which the Trust under Playford had helped to build and

shape.

²⁸ Susan Marsden, 'Oral history in South Australia' in *The Flinders History of South Australia: social history*, ed. Eric Richards, pp.479-81. See also David Hilliard, 'God in the suburbs: the religious culture of Australian cities in the 1950s', *Australian Historical Studies*, vol.24, no.97, 1991, pp.406-7.

²⁹ Andrew Parkin, *Governing the Cities: the Australian experience in perspective*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1982, pp.59-65.

³⁰ See Andrew Parkin, 'Adelaide: reflections on the scope for public policy', *Urban Policy and Research*, vol.2, no.2, 1984, p.6.

³¹ Between the census of 1933 and 1947, Adelaide's population as a proportion of the state's population rose from 53.8 per cent to 59.2 per cent, compared to the marginal increase to 60.7 per cent by 1954, where it remained in 1961. There was no subsequent increase as marked as that between 1933 and 1947: a similar increase over a similar period of time (1954-1966) to 66.5 per cent reflected expanded urban boundaries adopted in the 1966 census. *South Australian Year Book 1975*, pp.125, 127.

³² See Marianne Hammerton, *Water South Australia: a history of the Engineering and Water Supply Department*, Wakefield, Adelaide, 1986; Susan Marsden, *Business, Charity and Sentiment: the South Australian Housing Trust 1936-1986*, Wakefield, Adelaide, 1986; Bernard O'Neil, *In Search of Mineral Wealth: the South Australian Geological Survey and Department of Mines to 1944*, department of Mines and Energy, Adelaide, 1982; and Bernard O'Neil, *Above and Below: the South Australian Department of Mines and Energy 1944 to 1994*, Department of Mines and Energy, Adelaide, 1995.

³³ State Library of South Australia [SLSA] PRG 837. Thomas Playford, 'Free enterprise under changing economic conditions', William Queale Memorial Lecture, University of Adelaide, October 1956.

³⁴ Initially the South Australian Housing Trust [SAHT] was formally restricted to Adelaide but in 1940 funds were committed to provide housing for the new industrial works at Whyalla. The industrialisation motive predominated as strongly in country housing programs as in Adelaide and promoted the concentration of rural population in a few large centres. See Marsden, *Business, Charity and Sentiment*, p.189.

³⁵ See the chapter by David Rich in *Playford's South Australia*.

³⁶ A 1959 survey found that 39 per cent of metropolitan manufacturing employment was in the north west (Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide and Woodville Councils) and 13 per cent in the north (principally Enfield Council), together providing 52 per cent of manufacturing employment. The city centre still employed 15 per cent and Thebarton and inner West Torrens Councils to the west provided 13 per cent. The city centre and the quadrant from north to west thus accounted for 80 per cent of the urban manufacturing workforce. Town Planning Committee, *Report on the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide 1962*, Adelaide, 1962, pp.145-46.

³⁷ By contrast to state government expenditure overall, advances to the SAHT increased markedly, reaching a total of £1,055,000 by 1945. The SAHT gained increased loans possibly at the expense of other agencies: Brian Dickey demonstrates that total state government expenditure in South Australia contracted in real terms during the war, although it began to expand in the late 1940s. Indeed, a large 'profit' was made in 1947, which seems to have been tucked away for future use. B. Dickey, 'The South Australian economy in World War II', *Journal of the Historical Society of South Australia*, no.16, 1988, p.25. As Playford later told an Elizabeth audience, 'We were not without money during the war time, and did siphon off a considerable amount ... for the Housing Trust to buy this land.' Sir Thomas Playford, transcript of a speech given at Rotary Luncheon at Elizabeth West, 19.11.1980. In an earlier interview he recalled making large sums available to the SAHT for buying metropolitan land generally for housing and for factory purposes. Interview with Sir Thomas Playford by Mel Pratt, 4.2.1972, National Library of Australia.

³⁸ Calculated from the cumulative number of dwellings (around 16,454) built for the SAHT in South Australia by 1954. See Marsden, *Business, Charity and Sentiment*, Appendix, pp.428-9.

³⁹ A. Marshall, 'The growth of subdivision in the Adelaide urban area', *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia South Australian Branch*, vol.62, 1961, p.25.

⁴⁰ SAHT library, A.M. Ramsay, untitled paper, c. 1968, pp.6-7.

⁴¹ *Advertiser* 12.8.1954.

⁴² The SAHT's decision about industrial use of land in the southern suburbs near South Road was followed by local government, which designated a stretch of land along both sides of South Road industrial in 1950. Annely Aeuckens, *More about Mitcham*, City of Mitcham, Mitcham, 1989, p.147.

⁴³ SAHT Oral History Collection, Interview with Kevin Phillips [now in SLSA].

⁴⁴ SAHT Annual Report 1966.

⁴⁵ For example, see Frank J.B. Stilwell, *Australian Urban and Regional Development*, ANZ Book Co., Brookvale, 1974, p.71.

⁴⁶ I.H. Burnley, 'International migration and metropolitan growth in Australia', in *Urbanization in Australia: the post-war experience*, ed. I.H. Burnley, Cambridge University Press, London, 1974, p.113. The percentage of population in Elizabeth born in the UK peaked at 44.5 per cent in 1966. This had dropped to 42.8 per cent by 1971 but with other Europeans, mainly Dutch and German, the population was 48.6 per cent European immigrant compared with 26.3 per cent in the metropolitan area at large. Marsden, *Business, Charity and Sentiment*, pp.298-9.

⁴⁷ P. Harrison, 'Planning the metropolitan areas', in Burnley, *Urbanization in Australia*, p.218.

⁴⁸ Margaret Allen, 'Salisbury (S.A.) in transition', MA thesis, University of Adelaide, 1975, p.78.

⁴⁹ This is evident in the many references made to the SAHT new town by Australia's planners at the time and subsequently.

⁵⁰ SAHT Historical Collection K.S. Isles, 'Report to Mr Crawford, Commonwealth War Workers' Housing Trust', University of Adelaide, 22.10.1941. Isles found that, while SAHT houses 'cannot be expected to satisfy the requirements of all working-class families at all stages of their development, the sizes of those houses, and the sizes of different rooms, can be safely taken as the optima in South Australian conditions for the present'. From 1945, after the capital cost limits were abandoned, the SAHT began to build larger and better-equipped double units, increasing each to five rooms.

⁵¹ SAHT Annual Report 1947.

⁵² *Advertiser* 12.6.1957.

⁵³ Chris Maher, 'The changing character of Australian urban growth' in *Urban Australia: planning issues and policies*, eds Stephen Hamnett and Raymond Bunker, Mansell, London, 1987, p.15.

⁵⁴ These figures compared with 69.7 per cent (Victoria), 63.6 per cent (Queensland), 53.2 per cent (Tasmania) and 53.1 per cent (New South Wales). Calculated from figures provided in *Year Book Australia* 1968, p.122. From 1944 to 1980 an average of almost 75 per cent of State Housing Commission dwellings in Western Australia were built in Perth.

⁵⁵ Elizabeth Harman, 'The city, state and resource development in Western Australia', in *Urban Planning in Australia: critical readings*, eds J. Brian McLoughlin and Margo Huxley, Longman, Melbourne, 1986.

⁵⁶ Blair Badcock, 'Land and housing provision', in *The State as Developer: public enterprise in South Australia*, ed. Kyoko Sheridan, Wakefield, Adelaide, 1986, pp.172 (Table 8.1), 173. See also discussion in Hugh Stretton, *Ideas for Australian Cities*, 2nd edn, Georgian House, Melbourne, 1975, p.165. By 1976, in comparison to the other capitals, Adelaide had the highest rate of home ownership, a middle ranking in levels of mortgage repayments and the lowest rent levels. C.A. Maher, *Australian Cities in Transition*, Shillington House, Melbourne, 1982, pp.72 (Table 4.2), 84.

⁵⁷ David Kilner, 'The evolution of South Australian urban housing policy 1836-1987', PhD thesis, University of Adelaide, 1988, p.374. For example, in the two cities of nearly equal size, the percentage of public rental housing was 10.2 per cent in Adelaide and 5 per cent in Brisbane in 1966. Maher, *Australian Cities in Transition*, Table 4.7, p.86.

⁵⁸ By 1971 industrial land in Adelaide sold for half its price in Brisbane and Perth and about a third of that in Sydney and Melbourne. 'If the price of industrial land were the only determining factor, every new factory in Australia would be in Adelaide'. This cheap land was attributed mainly to the activities of state government instrumentalities. 'Ask any Adelaide real estate agent about industrial land, and he will probably send you around to see the South Australian Housing Trust ... one of the biggest owners, vendors and lessors of industrial land in the state'. *Rydge's* September 1971, p.131.

⁵⁹ This contrast is not recognised in other studies of Australian cities, which emphasise the poor provision of public infrastructure in the 1950s and 1960s. For example, see Chris Paris, 'Housing issues and policies in Australia', in Hamnett and Bunker, p.89.

⁶⁰ M. Talbot, *A Chance to Read: a history of the institutes movement in South Australia*, Libraries Board of South Australia, Adelaide, 1992, pp.185- 89, 216. The Elizabeth experience persuaded Playford to give modest support to proposals for a free public library system generally, supported by the government and councils. These libraries spread slowly after the opening of the Elizabeth library.

⁶¹ M.I. Logan, J.S. Whitelaw and J. McKay, *Urbanization: the Australian experience*, Shillington House, Melbourne, 1981, p.88 (Table 5.5).

⁶² See Robert Freestone, *Model Communities: the Garden City movement in Australia*, Nelson, Melbourne, 1989, pp.230, 237.

⁶³ Freestone, p.156. See also M. Shanahan, 'Dress circle or stalls? A note on the geography of income-distribution in Adelaide', *Flinders Journal of History and Politics*, no.10, 1984, pp.23-39. He confirms the SAHT reinforcement of the low socio-economic status of the northern suburbs and the second-highest ranking of the coastal belt suburbs.

⁶⁴ These differences are still marked. In 1986 SAHT rental housing formed 1.2 per cent, 1.4 per cent and 2.7 per cent of dwellings in the mostly high-status councils of Burnside, Mitcham and Unley respectively, compared to 48.7 per cent in Elizabeth, 27.1 per cent in Enfield, 13.6 per cent in Marion, 13.5 per cent in Salisbury and 10.6 per cent in Woodville. Kilner, Tables 5.3, 5.5, pp.543, 545.

⁶⁵ I.H. Burnley, 'International migration and metropolitan growth in Australia', pp. 100-102.

⁶⁶ SAHT Oral History Collection, Interview with P. Edwards. That also reflected British expectations of a right to public housing because they were used to it, compared to the attitudes of Greek and Italian settlers, who also had a high propensity to purchase houses.

⁶⁷ Mark Peel, 'Making a place: women in the workers' city', in *Australian Historical Studies*, vol.26, no.102, 1994, p.2 (fn.1).

⁶⁸ By 1966 Adelaide had a much higher percentage of public housing tenants (10.2 per cent) than the total for all the Australian capitals (5.7 per cent) but a much lower percentage of private tenants (15.1 per cent, 21.6 per cent). Kilner, p.392.

⁶⁹ This is evident in Britain where rent controls have effectively ended private rental housing. P. Saunders, 'The limits to liberation: Hugh Stretton on housing', in *Markets, Morals and Public Policy*, eds Lionel Orchard and Robert Dare, Federation Press, Sydney, 1989, p.185.

⁷⁰ While little has been written on the earlier points, there has been much written on public housing authority discrimination against the poorest Australians, particularly after the Henderson Inquiry into Poverty (1975) had shown that most of the poor were not public housing tenants, and that SAHT tenants had a higher socio-economic profile (in 1966) than that of other authorities. See M.A. Jones, *Housing and Poverty*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1972. The authorities housed increasing proportions of the neediest applicants as economic growth slowed in the 1970s. [See also S Marsden's history of the SAHT, second volume, 1987-2011].

⁷¹ G. Snooks, 'Manufacturing', in *Australians: historical statistics*, ed. Wray Vamplew, Fairfax, Syme & Weldon, Sydney, 1988, p.287. Women's increased workforce participation since the war has been in the service and professional industries. Ramsay became aware of this problem and the SAHT made some effort to attract female-employing industries to Elizabeth. See also Carol S. Fort, 'Equality of Sacrifice: munitions production in war-time Salisbury, South Australia', BA Hons thesis, University of Adelaide, 1993, and her chapter in *Playford's South Australia*.

⁷² Clive Forster, 'Spatial organisation and local unemployment rates in metropolitan Adelaide: significant issue or spatial fetish?', in McLoughlin and Huxley, p.226.

⁷³ Forster, in McLoughlin and Huxley, p.230; Murray McCaskill, 'Urban planning', in *Atlas of South Australia*, eds Trevor Griffin and Murray McCaskill, Government Printer, Adelaide, 1986, p.96. See also Evan Jones and Frank Stilwell, 'When is an urban problem not an urban problem?', in *Social Process and the City*, ed. Peter Williams, p.17: unemployment appears as a spatial problem because it is concentrated in occupational groups whose housing is spatially concentrated. Concentration of unemployment is a permanent feature of the spatial landscape.

⁷⁴ In the Adelaide City Council area an average of 100 dwellings per year were demolished between 1957 and 1967. Susan Marsden, Paul Stark and Patricia Sumerling (eds), *Heritage of the City of Adelaide*, City of Adelaide, Adelaide, 1992, p.44.

⁷⁵ The population of Adelaide City Council peaked at around 43,000 in 1915, declined gradually to 35,032 by 1951, then rapidly dropped to 19,000 by 1967. The sharp decline was caused by the easing of wartime restrictions on private building, mass housing schemes of state and federal authorities, and the state government's zeal to support the building industry by actively discouraging lending institutions such as the State Bank from providing loans for the purchase of established houses. Marsden, Stark and Sumerling, pp.40, 43-5. See also SAHT Oral History Collection, Interview with G. Seaman [now in SLSA].

⁷⁶ Marsden, Stark and Sumerling, pp.43-5.

⁷⁷ Marsden, Stark and Sumerling, pp.43-5. See also Peter Donovan, *Between the City and the Sea: a history of West Torrens from settlement in 1836 to the present day*, Wakefield, Adelaide, 1986, pp.217-219, for the actions of West Torrens Council, whose motto proclaimed, 'Not to progress is to regress'.

⁷⁸ This is strongly conveyed in Allen's thesis.

⁷⁹ The government's town planner, Stuart Hart, was most dismayed by Playford's indifference to beauty. Stewart Cockburn assisted by John Playford, *Playford: benevolent despot*, S. Cockburn & Axiom Publishing, Adelaide, 1991, p.164.

⁸⁰ Stretton, p.143.

⁸¹ Allen, p.116, offers this conclusion with regard to Salisbury.