

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 1, 1952.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Dunks) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**SLAUGHTERING OF SHEEP AND LAMBS.**

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Yesterday, in answer to a question, the Minister of Agriculture indicated that the slaughtering capacity at the abattoirs, prior to the introduction of the 40-hour week and based on a 5½ day working week, was 85,000 lambs or sheep per week. Since the introduction of the 40-hour week, however, and also certain modifications in the manning scale of the chains, that capacity has been reduced to 72,000, a difference of 13,000 a week, a figure which could have a considerable effect on the export of meat to those countries badly in need of it. Furthermore, it would have a detrimental effect on the capacity of the abattoirs to handle sheep when they should be treated—in the best of condition. Will the Premier instruct the State's representative before the Federal Arbitration Court in the extension of hours case to place these facts before that tribunal so that proper consideration can be given them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not aware of the basis upon which the honourable member's figures have been made up. If on the basis of a 40-hour week, as I presume, I point out that a considerable amount of overtime is being worked at the abattoirs, so the volume of slaughtering would not be governed purely by the 40-hour week. Under these circumstances the figure would be higher than that given by the honourable member. The 40-hour week was granted by the Arbitration Court, which at the same time said that reasonable overtime should be worked. I understand that the Arbitration Court desires certain information to be supplied by State Governments and I have no doubt that full information on any of the subjects mentioned by the court will be made available.

LAND SETTLEMENT AGISTMENT FEES.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked recently regarding agistment of stock at Parndana on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have obtained a report for the honourable member. On checking up I found that the letter which was written to the press was not from an applicant as the honourable member at first thought, but I believe from the mother of an applicant.

In connection with agistment, there is an arrangement between the Commonwealth and the State to place these amounts in a suspense account, and in the event of any writing off that money will be used for that particular purpose. Recently there have been a number of letters on the subject in the press, and it was suggested from the signatures that they were from applicants, but on checking up the last five or six letters we found that they were not from applicants for land; but any information they required we freely gave.

PRICE OF SHEEPSKINS.

Mr. HEASLIP—For some time I have been concerned about the fall in value of sheepskins being sold in South Australia. I have gone to some trouble to get the prices of skins being sold in Western Australia and South Australia in order to make a comparison. I find that the values of the best full wool sheepskins sold in the week ended August 13 were—W.A. 56d. a lb. and S.A. 50d. For the week ended September 3 the prices were W.A. 54d. and S.A. 47d. For the week ended September 10 the price in W.A. was 54½d. and S.A. 41d. For the week ended September 17 the Western Australian price was 54½d. and South Australian 40d. I was unable to get the Western Australian value for the week ended September 24, but in South Australia it was 42d. The average wool price at the first sale in South Australia was 67d. a lb. The only price I could get for Western Australia was from the Goldsbrough sale, where the price was 63d., showing that the South Australian average wool price was higher than the Western Australian. Will the Premier get information as to why there should be this disparity, and why the sheepskin price in South Australia should fall when the wool price has firmed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot give the honourable member today the information he requires. The price of sheepskins is not controlled by the Prices Commissioner and there is no suggestion that the price has been kept down by action by the Prices Branch. Without knowing much about this topic, I believe that there may be some difficulty in getting a very accurate comparison on bulk sales of the nature quoted, but I will get a full report and let the honourable member have a reply in due course. I would have thought in view of the secondary industries operating here, that the South Australian prices would normally have been slightly higher than the Western Australian, because so many sheepskins are treated in this State.

TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC INQUIRY.

Mr. MOIR—Does the Premier expect to receive a report from the committee which is to investigate transport and traffic in the metropolitan area in time to introduce and pass legislation on that matter this session?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It depends on whether the municipal authorities can reach agreement on this matter and, if so, when. It is difficult to place a time limit on negotiations of this nature and I am unable to answer the honourable member's question.

MOUNT LOFTY SCENIC RESERVE.

Mr. SHANNON—Yesterday the estate of E. S. Backhouse, deceased, offered certain land in the Mount Lofty area for sale by auction. A small committee of which I am a member was interested in that area from the point of view of preserving it in perpetuity for the public, but we found that the Lands Department was also interested. Can the Premier say what success the department had at the sale, whether any of the land was acquired and if so, at what price, and the purpose for which the land will be used?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member's information is correct. An estate adjacent to Mount Lofty Ridge was offered for sale yesterday. Some of the land which had been reported on by the Tourist Bureau and the Botanical Gardens Board was considered to be of very high value from the point of view of a national reserve, and the Land Board was asked to value it and to attend the sale on behalf of the Government to tender for the land up to that valuation. I understand it was able to purchase about 32 acres outright and that, in conjunction with another buyer, by pre-arranged agreement, it was able to secure an additional 60 acres. A particular high block of about 4 acres desired for scenic purposes was secured by the Government and will be made a very beautiful place for tourists. Only a small expense is involved in providing access to it and I believe it provides one of the finest views in the Mount Lofty ranges.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORT OF POTATOES.

Mr. SHANNON—I have been requested by potato growers in my district to ask the following question of the Minister of Works but in his absence I direct it to the Premier. About eleven or twelve hundred tons of potatoes, surplus to the requirements of this State, have

already been shifted to Victoria or New South Wales by road and sold there. Another consignment went by rail, but because of the long time taken in transit arrived in such condition that I believe the vendors lost about £7 or £8 a ton on the consignment because of loss of weight and other factors. I understand the Transport Control Board has issued an edict that no further permits will be issued for road transport of potatoes to other States, and that such consignments must go by rail. My informants tell me that the Railways Department has told them that the minimum time factor in shipping potatoes across the border is 10 days, and it may take longer; in fact on one occasion it took 19 days. This means a big deterioration in these consignments and consequent loss to the grower. Will the Premier ask the board to re-consider its decision as there still remains to be shifted between 400 and 500 tons of potatoes not required by South Australian consumers?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will take up the matter immediately. I agree that any suggestion of taking 19 days for the transport of a consignment of perishable commodities to another State is unreasonable and would inevitably lead to a very heavy loss. Later this afternoon, as soon as opportunity offers, I will personally investigate this matter and let the honourable member have some more information concerning it.

CONTROL OF MURRAY WATERS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Macgillivray—

That in the opinion of this House, a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the control of the waters of the River Murray within the State of South Australia.

(Continued from September 17. Page 570.)

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—In closing this debate I thank the Minister of Works for his offer to overcome the difficulty which has confronted growers on the River Murray and those controlling its waters. The growers along the river take a keen and active interest in the control of these waters, and for years they have felt that that control has not been administered as wisely or as well as it might have been. A sore has been growing in the minds not only of the growers but recently of the trading community as well. I thought it wise to open up that sore, give the matter publicity and see what conclusions could be

arrived at. I am satisfied with the alternative to a select committee offered by the Minister—to set up an advisory committee on which will be representatives of the settlers from the settlements on both sides of the river from Cadell to Renmark. Not only will settlers be enabled to know the difficulties confronting the department controlling the Murray waters, but it will also give the department the benefit of those settlers' experience. While experts at times may tend to overlook the view of the layman, often practical men from their personal knowledge are able to make extremely valuable suggestions. I hope that will be so in this case and that the work of the advisory committee will benefit both the growers and the department.

Before the Minister made this offer it seemed to me that he thought there was not much substance in my motion, but, if that were so, he overlooked the fact that practically all organizations on the river, including citrus growers, the A.D.F.A., the Renmark Trust and the Berri Traders, have complained at times of the way the control of the River Murray waters has been carried out. That being so, I cannot understand why the Minister should feel there is no substance in the demand. He also told the House that 30 grains of salt to the gallon, of which I complained, was not much to worry about, and he remarked that in the city the salt content in the water had reached 80 grains. However, even 30 grains results in between four and five cwt. of salt to the acre being included in each irrigation. As the irrigation properties are in low rainfall areas and salt is one of the biggest problems, it can easily be understood that growers do not relish the use of water which increases the salt content of their land to the extent indicated. I know that the responsibility of setting up an advisory committee is entirely one for the Minister, and I respectfully suggest that he seek representation from the agricultural bureaux in the districts concerned. To the best of my knowledge each of the settlements along the Murray has a very active bureau. They should be asked to nominate a representative to sit on the committee and act as the contact between the department and the men on the land who often suffer from decisions made in the city over which they have no control. I think the Minister's suggestion is a better one than mine and therefore I will not press for a division, but allow the motion to lapse.

Motion negatived.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 24. Page 643.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—When speaking on the Bill last week I indicated that I desired to get evidence in support of my contention that the Bill was the outcome of a conservative outlook. Since then I have communicated with a number of people who will be affected by a change in the legislation. I had sought the views of people who were employed in Adelaide but travelled from hills districts, leaving home prior to 6.30 a.m. and returning after 5.30 p.m., and I have yet to find anyone who asserts that the proposed amendment is necessary. Although I do not live in the district concerned, I was actually born in the locality. Some people from Stirling were rather critical of my attitude to the Bill and said I did not appreciate the position, but they admitted there were not many who desire the amendment and that those who did were bodgies, widgies, or halfies. For instance, I heard remarks about my type of hair-do. I, have in mind a clever explanation to the effect that one's type of hair indicates one's character. I was told that my hair had some of the characteristics of lambs wool, and, as everyone knows, a lamb is an innocent little animal. It is noticeable that the hair-do of the sponsor of the Bill shows very clearly wrinkles on the neck. I wish to correct an inference that may have arisen from what I said last week, that the Bill is applicable to the whole State. I understand now that it applies only to proclaimed areas. I want to make this quite clear, because I was rather critical of the claims made in respect of rural areas. I am reminded of a statement made by the Hon. E. Lucas in the Legislative Council in 1911 when speaking on the Early Closing Bill. He said:—

The man or woman who had not experienced the joy of work had not begun to live. He did not care whether he was a shopkeeper, machinist, bootmaker, or anything else. "By the sweat of thy brow shall thou eat bread," was one of the most beneficial commands to mankind. It was the fact that sport took the first place in the life of the community that accounted for the Bill.

The same sentiments led to the introduction of this Bill. The same view was expressed by the member for Rocky River—that we should do more work. Experience has proved that it is necessary not only to shorten our working hours, but to permit more leisure. It is significant that the remarks I quoted were made in

another place, but they could not very well have been made there this session because I do not think it has sat beyond 40 hours so far. The opinion of a certain element in our community has led to the introduction of the Bill in this Chamber, but it is still the old, old story. The member for Rocky River thought we should work longer hours as we would be more happy and healthy, but this argument was brought forward in 1903, when Mr. Mitchell stated:—

It was his firm conviction that it was the outcome of a desire on the part of men and women who thought they were happiest when only working a short time every day. They had passed into a condition when work was considered a curse and the desire was to shorten the hours of labour and lengthen those of leisure.

The member for Onkaparinga complained because the hours were so short in his electorate that he felt constrained to protect those who worked long hours. It seemed that he was arguing in one breath that the hours were too short and in another that they were too long, but one cannot extend the hours in an industry without also extending the hours of the employees. It is strange that members opposing progressive legislation to give greater leisure to employees will support a measure of this nature. On this Bill the member for Onkaparinga argued that it was necessary to give a better service to farm labourers, but last year when a Bill was before the House to enable those people to secure an award the members for Onkaparinga and Rocky River strongly opposed it. Mr. McDonald, in 1911, speaking in this Chamber, adopted the same attitude as members opposite. He said:—

There were many elderly people able to make a few shillings in their shops after 6 o'clock when the bigger shops were closed. Perhaps the husband would be away during the day, and the wife could not leave her children to do her shopping.

We find the same kind of argument put forward today. In 1911 Mr. Senior referred to the hours employees were compelled to work before the operation of the Early Closing Act. He said:—

As a young man he had been a shop assistant. He had taken the shutters down on week days at 7.30 a.m. and put them up at 10 p.m. On Saturdays he was lucky to get them up by midnight.

Nowadays both employers and employees are working long enough, and we would be giving no real service to the community by passing this measure. Perhaps people in the past took the opportunity to shop at leisure and did not arrange their business in an orderly manner,

thereby showing no consideration to others. So far we have had no proof that it is necessary to pass this measure; in fact, I submit that any thinking person would be convinced it is undesirable to disturb the present happy arrangement. I urge the House not to pass the Bill.

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—I support the Bill. During the past 10 or 12 years we have had much legislation before us of a restrictive nature, and it is refreshing to have something a little in the other direction. In many countries in recent years moves have been made for a shortening of working hours. This may have been desirable where employees were working excessively long hours, but in many cases it has not led to the happiness and contentment of the people, or any great improvement in their lives. In giving people greater leisure we have to ask whether they appreciate it and use it to the best advantage. It will be argued that many people work about their homes in their leisure time, but many people do not use that time to the best advantage. As responsible citizens, we have a duty in this respect and we should see that the increased leisure hours are used to the best advantage.

Mr. O'Halloran—What do you mean by that?

Mr. GOLDNEY—There are many ways in which leisure can be used to advantage. For instance, there is the opportunity to increase cultural knowledge and to do something for the community. Let me give a simple illustration. In some country towns trees grow in the streets in front of the homes of some of the residents, and at times they are surrounded by weeds. Some of the leisure hours of people living nearby could be used by clearing away the weeds, but we seldom see it done. The provisions of the Bill apply to country towns only. Many country people now find difficulty in getting a service from the hairdresser, particularly during the day. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I commend Mr. Shannon for introducing the Bill for it will overcome a difficulty in many country towns and enable an important service to be provided. In the average small country town there is only one barber, and because of the restriction in his hours of business he cannot employ an assistant. People do not go without haircuts, although they might wait two or three weeks longer before having them. Perhaps they cut each other's hair, without doing a good

job sometimes, and then there is the backdoor method, which is prevalent in some country towns. Why not allow barber shops to remain open longer? At present the farm labourer has to take half a day off to get his hair cut. We have heard members in this place quote from articles by Barbara Ward. In a press article today she says that only work creates new wealth. Because the employee has to take half a day off his value to the farmer is reduced. The barber in the small country town would not keep his shop open every night, but if he could remain open on the nights on which dances or other functions are held he would be able to provide a necessary service. Administrative difficulties could be overcome. I support the Bill because it will provide a real service to small country towns without harming anybody.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I support the Bill. Mr. Shannon has done a good service to country people by introducing it, and it should be favourably considered. The Early Closing Act is an unusual type of law. It was framed principally to make life comfortable and secure for the person giving a service without in anyway helping the customer. I read several days ago that an American in Australia complained that out here the customer is always wrong. I think the Early Closing Act is based on that viewpoint. If it were amended to allow some country hairdressers to operate after normal working hours a service would be rendered to the customers, and also to the hairdressers themselves, because after all it does not take long to have a haircut and a man may happen to be in town during the evening. I can imagine only a very few countries where a service of this nature would be prevented at such times, and I consider that Australia is probably out on a limb in this respect. I support the second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Minister of Industry and Employment)—I have given this Bill some consideration and have obtained reports from two departments. The first, from the Chief Inspector of Factories (Mr. McColl), deals particularly with the provisions of the Bill, and states:—

Originally, hairdressers' shops and saloons were exempted shops, and, as such, could be kept open at all times. In 1913, as a result of a petition from shopkeepers and shop assistants in the metropolitan shopping district, such shops ceased to be exempt shops in that shopping district, and the following normal closing times were fixed:— Mondays to Thursdays, 8 p.m.; Fridays, 9 p.m.; Saturdays, 1 p.m. Following a further petition in 1939, the 8 p.m. closing on ordinary week nights in the metropolitan shopping district was altered to

7 p.m. Similar petitions from several country shopping districts were also received from time to time, as a result of which hairdressers' shops and saloons ceased to be exempted shops and closing times were fixed for them in the following districts:— Gawler, Mount Gambier, Pt. Augusta, Pt. Pirie, Wallaroo-Kadina. In 1945, at the request of the Master Hairdressers' Association of S.A. the Early Closing Act, 1926-1940, was amended by—

- (1) Removing 'hairdressers' shops and saloons' from the list of exempted shops; and
- (2) Fixing the following normal closing times—day of half holiday, 12.30 p.m.; all other week days, 6 p.m.

This amendment had the effect of requiring all hairdressers' shops and saloons throughout all shopping districts to be closed at the above times, including those in the great majority of the country shopping districts where the business hours of this class of shop were previously unrestricted. (At the same time, the closing times of tobacconists' shops were made uniform with the hairdressers' new closing time.)

Apart from the case quoted by Mr. Shannon, M.P., in his letter of 18/1/52 (herein), I have no recollection of any complaint being received as to the ill-effect of the restricted hours. In many of the larger towns in primary producing districts such as Mt. Gambier, Renmark and Millicent, the absence of any complaint or objection would not appear to indicate that any great disability is being experienced by the public engaged in primary production. On the question of the effect a proclamation such as proposed by section 3 of the Bill would have, I would point out that practically all male hairdressing saloons are conducted in conjunction with tobacconists' shops, consequently the shopkeeper would then have to partition his premises in such a manner that the tobacconists' section could be locked up at the appropriate closing time for tobacconists' shops and at the same time allow access to the saloon. In regard to the application for such a proclamation, the question is by whom the application or request is to be made, and this then raises a further question of whether provision should be made for the application to be made by means of a petition signed by electors residing in the shopping district or part thereof in which it is desired the proclamation will operate. It appears to me that the wishes of the general public should be given some consideration and as there is unlikely to be any organization competent to express the views of the public, it would be difficult to assess the extent of the public desire unless it is by form of petition. Should the Bill become law and a proclamation is issued, there is the possibility that a hairdresser may be tempted to trade in tobacconist's goods from his saloon after hours to the disadvantage of the other retailers of such goods in the town.

The second report, from the Secretary to the Minister of Industry and Employment (Mr. Schumacher), states:—

The Chief Inspector of Factories has reported herein on the Bill to amend the Early Closing Act, 1926-1945, introduced by Mr. Shannon, M.P. He refers, *inter alia*, to the difficulty

that would be created where a hairdresser was also a tobacconist, as regards partitioning of his goods. At present the closing times in proclaimed shopping districts of hairdressers' shops and saloons are prescribed by sections 35 and 36 of the Early Closing Act. The closing time is 6 p.m. on all week days, except on the day of the weekly half holiday, when it is 12.30 p.m. The Bill introduced by Mr. Shannon is intended to remove these restrictions on the hours during which hairdressers' shops may be open in any shopping district or part of a shopping district specified by proclamations. The present provisions were inserted in the Act in 1945 by an amendment introduced by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. R. S. Richards, M.P.). The particular provision relating to hairdressers' shops and saloons was inserted in the Bill in Committee on the motion of the Hon. R. S. Richards, who stated that he had been approached by hairdressers on the matter. Although the members of the Government voted against this clause, it was carried by 18 votes to 14. Prior to that session of Parliament the then Chief Inspector of Factories had recommended that the closing times of such shops be fixed by Statute, and this was supported by the Parliamentary Draftsman. In January of this year, Mr. Shannon made representations in the case of a hairdresser at Aldgate who had not observed the closing times prescribed by the Act until advised by officers of the Factories Department of the provision of the Act. Apart from this instance, the Chief Inspector of Factories reports that he has no recollection of any complaint being received as to the ill effect of the restricted hours.

The Chief Inspector has suggested that a provision should be inserted in the Bill to the effect that before a proclamation could be issued extending the hours the views of the general public should be obtained. He considers that the best way of obtaining the public's views would be by petition. By virtue of section 95 of the Act a fee of £3 3s. is payable on the presentation of a petition. It is difficult to see, however, how the extension of hours could be contrary to the interests of the general public, although a reduction of trading hours could be. Last year a petition signed by five chemists and nine shop assistants, employed in their shops, was presented pursuant to section 67 (2) of the Act requesting that the chemists shops in the Port Pirie district should close on Sundays. This was undoubtedly a matter which affected the public interest, but nevertheless, as the Act contained no provision for obtaining the views of the residents of Port Pirie, you had to issue a notice fixing the closing times as set out in the petition. On August 24, 1944, the Parliamentary Draftsman in D.I. 88/41, at the request of the then Minister of Industry and Employment, furnished a report regarding the protection of the public interest in matters of this nature. The views of the Honourable the Minister are contained in this docket. I consider that the Minister should not be obliged to accede to a petition reducing trading hours, as was the case of the Port Pirie chemist shops, but that he should have the right to

consider the interests of all persons concerned, and grant or refuse the petition as he might see fit. The matter is, however, submitted as one of policy.

It will be seen that, apart from the matters raised by the honourable member, there is a background which I believe should be examined by the House. As was stated in the report, there was an alteration in the hours of chemists' shops at Port Pirie on the petition of five chemists and nine of their employees, and as Minister of Industry I had no power under the Act to discover what the public interests were.

Mr. Shannon—That should be altered.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Bill touches on the fringe of a problem which is more far-reaching than the Bill indicates. The Minister has no right to refuse a petition such as the one referred to. That means that the public's interests in these matters are never considered.

Mr. Macgillivray—The whole thing is just too silly.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In my opinion the position requires examination. There are a couple of things I should like to make sure about before the Bill is taken through Committee. More difficulties arise in policing this legislation than any other that comes under my control. Apparently there is a need to amend the Act because of the large number of infringements which continually take place. This shows that the public's convenience is not always studied. The question of the sale of tobacco, for instance, is giving me great concern, because I find that many people who themselves may enjoy the advantages of early closing do not hesitate to buy a packet of cigarettes after hours. The law provides that all non-exempted goods must be kept under lock and key after hours, although a shop is allowed to remain open to sell exempted goods. That provision is one upon which prosecutions are continually being launched. When a person wants a packet of cigarettes he does not hesitate to ask a shopkeeper to supply them in contravention of the law.

Mr. Pattinson—What great harm is that to the community?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I feel that we are making people criminals for something which is of no advantage to the community. In any case the shop is open, and yet we say that it must not sell certain goods to meet the public's convenience because of some special proclamation. I want to examine the

Bill further to ascertain whether, on the issue of a proclamation, a shop could sell, after hours, exempted as well as non-exempted goods, and whether the issue of a proclamation would enable the hairdresser concerned not only to cut hair but also to sell non-exempted goods.

Mr. Shannon—I did not ask for that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I should like to check up on that particular point. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage this afternoon I should like the honourable member to report progress to enable me to make investigations. I should like to give consideration to the general question whether there should be some way of studying the public interests in such cases as that relating to Port Pirie where, as the result of a petition from 14 persons, a service formerly available to 14,000 people became unavailable, and this without necessarily providing an alternative service in the event of emergency. There are likely to be administrative difficulties under the Bill. I can see no reason why the barber to whom Mr. Shannon referred, and who has no competitor in the district that would be placed at a disadvantage, should not be allowed to do as proposed. If I desire to do some work in my orchard, or Mr. Macgillivray wants to do some pruning on his block, after 5 p.m., there is nothing to stop us.

Mr. Quirke—He certainly would not want a haircut!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the public do not want to go to the hairdresser after hours they need not patronize him.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What about the local grocer? The hairdresser would have an advantage over him.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I admit there are some difficulties in administration, because it places on the Minister the obligation to determine where the public interest lies in a particular case. He has to determine that largely without the aid of petition or without being able to secure the vote of the public. Notwithstanding these facts, I believe Mr. Shannon has made out a case, and I am prepared to support the second reading. However, I want to examine one or two aspects in Committee and, if possible, to widen the scope of the Bill.

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

DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY.

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

(For Motion, see page 643.)

(Continued from September 24. Page 646.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—When speaking on this motion previously I pointed out how futile a Royal Commission on this matter would be. Even when commissions are appointed and make recommendations, each honourable member accepts only that part of the report which presents the views he held before the commission was appointed. I quoted voluminously from the report of a Royal Commission on the very subject matter under discussion. It was appointed by no less a person than Mr. Ben Chifley, and its chairman was a former Labor Premier of Western Australia. All its conclusions were contrary to the very things Mr. O'Halloran has advocated. The cost of a Royal Commission is not inconsiderable. We could have Royal Commission after Royal Commission, but there must be finality somewhere. I suggest that the proper body to determine the policy of any country is Parliament, and we cannot get away from that responsibility by handing it over to outside people.

Mr. O'Halloran—But you quoted extensively from a commission's report yesterday when introducing a Bill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—And when doing so I said, "Of course, as far as these investigations are concerned, we always agree with the matters which we favour." I also pointed out that some of the provisions of the Bill were substantially in line with the views of the committee, whereas others were not.

Mr. O'Halloran—You said it was a most excellent report.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It was, and that is the point I am making. I know that the honourable member may not agree with some of the recommendations, but be that as it may, the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into decentralization is unnecessary. It would not give us any information that we have not already in our possession. We already have the recommendations of a Royal Commission on this matter in our library. It is quite possible that we shall get another volume from the commission appointed by the Federal Government because it did not say whether or not it had made its final report. It produced many volumes and then seemed to go out of operation for want of something

more to say. The chairman of the commission became Premier of Western Australia, and one of the members went overseas selling our wool. The commission merely dispersed. I doubt whether it had a last formal meeting. As far as I can see, its final volume was signed by only one member, who said he did not agree with certain of its recommendations.

Mr. Lawn—We are not dealing with the report of that commission now.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but with the proposal of the Opposition to burden the country with the expense of another inquiry on exactly the same lines. The Leader of the Opposition says an inquiry is necessary because we do not know how to develop our country, and that land settlement is far from satisfactory.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is no doubt about that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—According to the honourable member, the country is going to the dogs. I believe that every week the Premier of Tasmania, the Hon. Robert Cosgrove, broadcasts over the air to the people of his State. The session is called "The Premier Speaks," and he broadcasts over Stations 7EX, 7HT, 7BU, 7AD, 7DY, and 7QT. Tasmania is not a large State, so I presume he has almost universal broadcast coverage. Not long ago he appeared suddenly in South Australia.

Mr. Shannon—*Incognito!*

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, with one of his senior officers. He went into the country areas of this State to investigate land settlement. I did not see him until he paid me a formal courtesy call before departing. When he got home he gave a broadcast on what is happening in this State. He said:—

Undoubtedly the greatest conflict that mortals wage is man's never-ending war with the forces of nature to keep soil under cultivation and production. In the days of world food shortage that struggle takes on an even sterner implication if widespread famine and misery are to be prevented. Tonight I want to tell you something about a trip I had over last week-end to South Australia where I inspected a huge developmental scheme being undertaken by the A.M.P. Society. The area in question is situated in what is known as the 90 mile desert, a tract of country extending eastward and south-east from Adelaide well into Victoria and laying astride the Duke's Highway and the Melbourne-Adelaide railway line, and covering 2,000 square miles. In its natural state this country is nothing less than a vast expanse of slightly rolling country carrying very poor growth of scrub and heath. While not a desert in the general sense of the word, it is most unattractive in appearance, and some idea of its value can be formed from the fact that the rental charged has been in the

nature of one farthing per acre. The society has based its scheme on investigations commenced in 1930 by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. Long and persistent work has shown that production depends upon the addition to the soil of very small amounts of copper and zinc, together with normal amounts of superphosphate. Apart from these necessities the land has much greater natural advantages than one would realize. The rainfall in the area of 1,000,000 acres taken over by the society ranges from 17in. to 22in. per annum, and is both well distributed and reliable. There is also a good clay subsoil which retains moisture particularly well, and although no water or indication of any springs can be seen on the surface, an ample supply of excellent quality can be obtained by boring to depths of between 100ft. and 180ft.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! I am wondering whether the Premier is not a little out of order in reading that statement, which has more to do with primary production than the motion submitted by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not find anything in the motion that directly applies to primary production, although it mentions industries and other matters. Unless the Premier can link up what he is reading with the motion, I am afraid he is out of order.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—With deference to your ruling, Sir, I point out that the Leader of the Opposition, in moving the motion, was given the greatest freedom and dealt with wheat production and acreages and a hundred and one other things. I think the question of decentralization includes the development of agricultural areas in the country.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—If I allowed the Leader of the Opposition to speak about wheat production and acreages I cannot prohibit the Premier from referring to land development.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Premier of Tasmania went on:—

The results which have been obtained from the fairly extensive areas already completed by the Society are nothing less than miraculous. I saw large paddocks in every stage of development and those areas which have been established for anything between three and four years are carrying exceptional pastures of subterranean clover, phalaris and ryegrass. Strawberry clover also seems to thrive, and most remarkable of all were the excellent stands of lucerne covering even the high ridges of deep sand. I could not help being impressed by the healthy condition of the stock. Large frame Merino hoggets being shorn last Monday were cutting 14 lb. of wool, and the ewes and wethers had previously cut 16 to 17 lb. a head. The general indication is that land

which had been under pasture for four years will carry at least two sheep per acre and is equally suitable for beef cattle. The Society has planned to develop 30,000 acres annually, and the labour force for the work has been recruited from prospective settlers. The arrangement is that these men will, after working for five years on the project, be offered a farm completely equipped and on terms which will ensure a reasonable living. For this reason a marked enthusiasm and keenness is evident among all concerned, and this has no doubt contributed quite a lot to the progress which has been made. A scheme of this kind which starts from the native scrub and requires five years to reach full development is obviously not one for the individual farmer. It is only the public spirited outlook and effort of large organizations such as the A.M.P. Society or action by the various governments which can develop and bring into production the millions of acres of similar land available in every State of the Commonwealth. Even in Tasmania we have about 300,000 acres of virtual waste land in the far north-east, north-west, and on Flinders Island which can be developed in a similar manner to a high level of production. That shows than an outside observer has noted the progress being made in this State in the practical development of outside country. He thought so highly of the scheme that he was constrained to make it the subject of a broadcast over the network of Tasmania. That is a good indication that South Australian methods can bear inspection.

Mr. O'Halloran—I thought the methods referred to were those of the A.M.P. Society.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The society is working under a direct charter from this Parliament. My Government fostered legislation to enable the scheme to be undertaken.

Mr. O'Halloran—Didn't the Opposition support it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think so, but it is a South Australian method. I do not want the Leader of the Opposition to think me perverse in this matter: if he brings along a better motion I will support it, but the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into decentralization is not warranted. The honourable member's grounds for the appointment of a Royal Commission cannot stand examination. There has been more decentralization in South Australia during the past few years than in the previous history of the State. Towns have come into existence that will have an important influence on the economy of the State.

Mr. O'Halloran—The population figures do not show that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Whyalla, Leigh Creek, and Radium Hill will play vital

parts in the development of the State. Consider what is happening at Port Augusta and at Port Pirie where a new treatment plant is to be established. At Wallaroo there is an industry that will in due course give a good account of itself. At Nairne there is a new activity, started not by allowing someone to drift in, but through Government enterprise in not only promoting the company but finding most of the necessary capital. I have no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition is actuated by the best of motives, but I believe the motion is unnecessary. In addition, the expense involved is not warranted and I ask the House to oppose the motion.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—There is an old saying that everything comes to him who waits. I have waited patiently and listened with interest to the serial story by the Premier. I hope to make my contribution to the debate in one instalment. It appears to me from the Premier's remarks that he opposes Royal Commissions in general, and the one suggested in the motion in particular. He began his remarks by saying that from one point of view every member in the House would agree to the motion, but I was soon disillusioned. During his long address he accidentally, or possibly deliberately, misunderstood most of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. We seek only an inquiry by means of a Royal Commission. Honourable members can call to mind a number of Royal Commissioners that have rendered great service to the State. We want a "Yes" or a "No." The motion asks for an inquiry into whether industries should be established in the country, what secondary industries should be transferred to the country, what new industries could be established in the country, whether more railway maintenance work could be done, and what housing provision should be made.

Mr. Riches—There is no mention of land settlement.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so. We do not demand anything. We are prepared to abide by the findings of any Royal Commission appointed. We do not want the motion considered as a Party matter. It should not be damned from the start, as motions often are when they come from this side of the House. Much play was made last week on the references of the Leader of the Opposition to pure economics. I do not intend to explain them. I shall leave that to him because he is competent to do it. I thought he explained them plainly to members who either heard what he

said or read his remarks in *Hansard*. The Leader of the Opposition will make the matter of pure economics a little plainer for those who were slow to comprehend. Surely it must be evident that in many cases the test of pure economics is not just plain pounds, shillings and pence. Surely the ultimate good must be the final test. Let us think of a few things. There is education, defence, railways, the Electricity Trust, the new Municipal Tramways Trust, etc. This was not pure profit without heart. This country would not have been developed if we had thought of nothing but pure economics. I would quote a statement by the Hon. R. S. Richards which was quoted several weeks ago by the Leader of the Opposition. Speaking of that happy combination of rural and industrial interests so much to be desired, Mr. Richards said:—

This close association of industrial and rural interests would ultimately break down the existing prejudices between the city and country, and promote a wider knowledge of the total dependence of a nation upon the productive capacity of the land.

These prejudices of city versus country do exist, as has been proved and freely demonstrated in some of the debates in this Chamber this session. It is a dangerous thing when such prejudices are allowed to creep into the deliberations in this place. Surely everyone must realize that conditions must be as good in the country as in the city in order to lessen the drift from the rural to the urban areas, which was so plainly pointed out in the figures given by the Leader of the Opposition, but denied in other quarters. I represent a town and district that has been for many years an ideal example of the happy marriage of primary and secondary industries. It has been in the past, and will be in the future, a great industrial town. It is not generally known that at one time it was the greatest industrial town in Australia. I will give a brief summary of industrial and related matters in the history of Gawler to bear out the point I hope to make. I trust that in doing so I shall not be considered too parochial, and that in view of my former profession I shall not be accused of giving a history lesson. Some members of this House are interested in early history. I remember Mr. Teusner speaking about it on one occasion. I firmly believe that Gawler is an outstanding example of a town that has become industrially great because of private enterprise and industry allied to Government support, and that it lost that greatness because governments of the day failed to realize that the time had come when assistance

from the Government was even more essential. Gawler kept, enshrined in the hearts of its people, its tradition, without which no town can remain great, and that tradition is bound up in its history. Before giving the history I point out that the motion seeks the most suitable way of finding out what can be best done to help the country areas, for the benefit not only of those areas but of the State as a whole. If the Royal Commission in its wisdom decides that nothing is necessary we shall be partly satisfied. We shall not be happy.

We must remember that Gawler is an old town. January 31, 1839, was the date of the Colonial Treasurer's letter acknowledging receipt of the purchase money for land in the Gawler special survey. Early in 1839 Mr. John Reid and his family made the first settlement at Gawler. The remains of the place still stand. In 1839 the first building in the town proper was erected, and strangely enough it was a public house. At present Gawler has a large number of public houses. It is rather amusing that in 1839 the Old Spot Hotel was erected by Mr. Schiebner. In 1844 Captain Sturt passed through Gawler on one of his exploring expeditions. These things give tradition to the town. The people remember and look back on the work of Sturt, McKinlay, and other explorers, as well as the singers and musicians who had links with early Gawler. In 1845 the first industry was established at Gawler, nine years after the foundation of the state. It was the Victoria Flour Mill established in Jacob Street by Mr. Stephen King, and purchased in 1847 by Mr. Walter Duffield. In June, 1848, a most important date in the history of Gawler, Mr. James Martin commenced business as a blacksmith and machinist. The following is a short account of the early work carried out by Mr. James Martin, as recorded in E. H. Coombe's "History of Gawler", published in 1907:—

The beginnings were humble and date from the arrival of Mr. James Martin on June 15, 1848. He came from Adelaide in a dray, which also contained his wife, furniture and a few tools. The latter constituted his whole stock-in-trade. Mr. Martin had already secured a shop from Mr. Henry Calton, the site being almost opposite the present P.O. . . . Gradually the premises extended northwards until the whole block to Walker Place was occupied. Then the corresponding blocks, on the eastern side of Murray Street were utilized. later the corresponding blocks in High Street were secured and it was there that the principal engineering buildings and plant were erected. The High Street buildings had a frontage to that thoroughfare of 637ft. and a depth of 400ft., while the firm occupied the whole area

eastward to Duffield Street (550ft.) for a considerable proportion of the block . . . One of Mr. Martin's first jobs was to cut down a tree and from the timber construct benches and a lathe . . . Mr. Martin began by building bullock drays. When agriculture sprang up in the district he turned out ploughs and reaping machines. At first he made wooden ploughs. It was the extension of the farming areas of South Australia that gave the young Cornishman the opportunity to launch out and he bid for the new trade with all the resourcefulness and perseverance at his command. He studied the wants of the farmers, made improvements and kept his workmanship up to such a state of efficiency that many competitors were beaten and the Gawler firm enjoyed the greater portion of the agricultural machinery trade. But such success, ensuring to Gawler the status of the premier engineering centre of Australia, was not achieved without great trouble. "For the first little while" (said Mr. Martin) "it was a terrible job to get along. Sometimes after paying my men only a portion of their wages, I had not 4d. left to take a letter out of the P.O." This was, however, before the exodus to the Victorian goldfields in 1851.

The struggling young mechanic was full of resource and persistence. Although not a blacksmith, he frequently took anvil work, and made many professed smiths look foolish by the dexterity and skill of his amateur hand. After the outbreak of the Victorian diggings the development of agriculture went on apace, and there was a decided improvement in trade. Much of the success of the firm in regard to agricultural implements was due to its inventiveness. It was ever ready to adapt its machinery to the needs of farmers. The improvements made by Martin & Co. to the stripper alone would make a long list. Among these are the thimble comb and the clutch motion afterwards universally adopted. Jas. Martin & Co. were one of the first to make the stump-jump plough. Single-furrow ploughs were at one time the orthodox implement for cultivation, but single-furrows long since gave place to double, and double to multiple. And so one might go on enumerating the mechanical conquests which Messrs. Martin & Co. made in agricultural machinery. Prices, too, were revolutionized. The first stripper made by Mr. Martin brought £150. Later a better machine could be obtained from the same works for £100 less. It is estimated that the establishment has turned out upwards of 16,000 strippers. Of late years the harvester has come into use, and the demand for the humble and simple stripper has fallen off. When Mr. Martin had won his spurs as an agricultural implement maker he sought to extend the range of his work. He went in for the construction of mining machinery and general engineering. Boilers were turned out in the sixties. The first engine was produced in the seventies, and great was the elation at this achievement. About this time the firm tried the smelting of iron ore, large deposits of which are to be found in this district. This was the first attempt at iron smelting in the State, and, although it was not a success financially, it was mechanically. A portion of the iron smelted now forms a railing in front of the Gawler

Institute. Another portion was put in the first crushing plant erected in W.A.—at the Fraser's gold mine, Southern Cross.

The extension of the operations of the firm was accelerated by the taking of Mr. Frederick May into partnership in 1873. This gentleman's experience of mining machinery and his mechanical skill were valuable factors in the expansion of the firm's work. From the odds and ends of engineering production the works moved on to constructing crushing plants, and then to winding and pumping plants until there was practically nothing in the way of mining machinery that could not be supplied by this progressive Gawler establishment. The Broken Hill boom and the Western Australian boom brought hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of orders for machinery to Gawler, while Tasmania, Queensland and other places were also large customers. The biggest engine turned out was one with a capacity of 500 horse-power. This was for the Golden Horse-shoe Mine, W.A. In the eighties the firm extended its work to the manufacture of railway rolling stock. Contracts were first secured for the construction of goods waggons. In 1888 a contract was obtained for the manufacture of 52 locomotive engines for the S.A. Government, and in 1890 another contract for the supply of 92 engines was entered into. Extensive alterations were made to the premises and plant, and the early nineties saw as many as 700 hands employed in the shops of the company. The output of the establishment was very great. On one day in 1897, 39 truck loads of machinery were dispatched from the works, weighing more than 200 tons, and having a value of upwards of £10,000. When Mr. Martin began operations he had very little capital. In the nineties it took £150,000 to run the business. Towards the close of the nineties, owing to the requirements of the railways having lessened, and owing to the State manufacture of rolling stock, there was a big falling off in the output of the works, and the list of employees diminished considerably. Since that time a few small orders have been received for the construction of locomotives, boilers, and goods waggons for the Government, but at no time during the last 10 years have there been more than 400 hands employed in the works. For a time in the nineties the profit-sharing system was adopted, but it was abandoned a few years later. The lessened demand for the company's manufactures and the increased competition were a great handicap to a concern which had to carry such a large amount of borrowed capital, and in 1907, to the great regret of the townspeople, the company was compelled to go into liquidation. After a time of considerable suspense to Gawler residents, during which the fear of the permanent closing of the establishment was ever present, Mr. Henry Dutton decided to purchase the engineering portion of the works and carry it on under the former title of Jas. Martin & Co. The news of this decision was received with much rejoicing. An important factor in the determination of Mr. Dutton to purchase the establishment was the promise of the Price-Peake Government to give him a contract for ten locomotives and 100 goods waggons.

That is but another proof of the necessity for Government assistance. Later, when such assistance was not forthcoming, industry suffered to a great extent. In 1851, because of a rush to the Victorian goldfields, only four male adults were left in Gawler. The Harrison Bros. established a tannery business in 1853, but this was soon discontinued and the Union Flour Mill was erected in its place. On February 19, 1856, the Gawler Agricultural, Horticultural and Floricultural Society held its first show. In that year the Adelaide to Gawler railway was opened as far as Salisbury. The year 1857 was important because it saw the first election for the Barossa district under the new Constitution. Also in 1857 the Bunyip Printing Office commenced operations, the first town council was elected, the Adelaide-Gawler railway was completed, and the Gawler institute was founded. Fotheringham's brewery began production in 1858 and continued for 36 years. In November 1860, John McDouall Stuart, the explorer, passed through Gawler, thus providing another historical link which goes to make up the tradition of Gawler. The first Gawler Bunyip newspaper was printed in 1863, and in that year 230 reaping machines were made in the town. On December 30 Jas. Martin, by this time Mayor of Gawler, won a reaping competition with one of his machines. A timber yard and sawmill was opened in 1864, and today that business is operated by William Dawkins & Son. On November 1 of that year an order for 300 reaping machines at a cost of £20,000 was placed with Jas. Martin. In the following year Mr. Martin was elected to Parliament. Duffield & Company's two mills ground 14,000 bushels a week in 1867 and exported 15,000 bushels monthly from Port Adelaide. In those days mutton was selling at 2d. a lb., whereas I believe that today it averages 1s. 9d. Sheep carcasses sold from 6s. to 7s. each, whereas today's price is about £5. On the basis of those comparative values the order worth £20,000 placed with Jas. Martin in 1864 would be the equivalent of possibly £200,000 today. That shows the importance of Jas. Martin's business to the State in general and Gawler in particular. The Victoria mills were destroyed by fire in 1868, and in that year there were 2,500 gold diggers on the Barossa goldfields. In 1869 the railway was continued as far as Roseworthy, and in the following year the Eagle foundry commenced production under David Thompson. That

foundry still operates in a small way. A soap factory was started, but three years later it closed following a petition which claimed it to be a nuisance. The first eight-hour celebrations and procession were held in Gawler in 1873. The Gawler flax mill was destroyed by fire in the following year. Three years later the Victoria mill, which had been rebuilt was again destroyed by fire, but recommenced operations in the following year. On April 12, 1877, the foundation stone of the Gawler primary school was laid. Its cost was £4,695, whereas for the same type of building today it would probably be over £40,000. We are told that in 1879 Jas Martin's business employed 230 people—a not inconsiderable portion of the town's population of 1,800. Another traditional link was forged in 1880 when an Australian Eleven, returning from abroad, played a South Australian country twenty-two, the Australian Eleven winning very easily.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! What the honourable member is telling the House may be very interesting, but he must link up his remarks with the motion. If he is using his facts to say that the same things should be done in other country towns, he is in order, but if he is only relating the history of Gawler, then he is out of order.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I am saying that what was allowed to happen to the industries and population of Gawler need not have occurred and should have been avoided. In 1881 a contract for the construction of 200 railway waggons was given to Jas Martin, and in the same year a glucose and starch works was commenced in Gawler. At that time at least 15 teams were carting wood from Williamstown and making three trips a week. A cement works commenced operations in 1882, and in the following year the Smithfield institute was opened. July, 1885, was a very important month for Gawler, as it was then that Fred and Alf May commenced production in their foundry. Regarding this business, Mr. Coombe states:—

The works were started in July, 1885, by the late Mr. Frederick May and Mr. Alfred May. The brothers helped to erect their first shop just opposite the railway station, on its eastern side. The building was 130ft. long by 80ft. wide, and about 20ft. high. The brothers began operations in October of the same year with four or five men, but their reputation for mechanical skill, especially in regard to mining machinery, soon brought them plenty of orders. The shop they erected seemed to them to be large enough for a lifetime, but just as a young and vigorous tree will throw out fresh branches

and increase its wood and foliage, so the virile and go ahead establishment of Messrs. May Bros. increased. Acre was added to acre, building to building; the number of employees extended from tens to scores, and from scores to hundreds; and the output grew from strippers and seed sowers to jigs and boilers, and from jigs and boilers to smelting and crushing and pumping and winding plants until practically any farm or any mine in Australia could be equipped right through with all the latest and most efficient machinery for the exploitation of the wealth of its soil.

That was a grand thing for our country districts, particularly Gawler, and it is the sort of thing we would like to see again instead of most of our industries concentrated around the city.

Mr. Coombes book states further:—

Thoroughness was the motto of the two brothers who started the concern, and thoroughness marked the continuance of the business. The characteristics of their manufacturing—efficient design, the best material, and the best workmanship—caused orders to literally flow into the offices of the firm.

This firm provided practically all the new machinery required at the time by the Broken Hill Proprietary Ltd., having received its first order in 1897. It supplied most of the iron-work for the softening and refining furnaces of the company, and also provided all the crucible columns and waterpipes of the 120-ton smelters at Port Pirie, as well as the water jackets for four of them. These things stand as a memorial of what can be done in country towns. We on this side of the House are thinking of the future, a future associated with the heart and not with pounds, shillings and pence. I am trying to show the happy combination provided by secondary and primary industries. The Roseworthy Agricultural College was established in 1885 and that grand institution has turned out some splendid men who have gone on the land. In 1887 a purse of sovereigns was presented to Mr. Wm. Riggs for his services as the conductor of the successful Gawler band. On October 7, 1887, James Robinson began a foundry at Gawler West and it is still flourishing under the name of Anders and Son, sending plough shares and other agricultural needs all over the Commonwealth. In 1888 James Martin gained a contract for 47 locomotive engines valued at £167,000. At the same time agriculture was flourishing in the district and the Wasleys Farmers' Club held its first meeting. It is still flourishing, but in a slightly different form. The St. John Ambulance also established its operations in Gawler, and is still operating. There was a great demonstration in 1890 on

the delivery of the first locomotive by Messrs. Martin & Co. The Governor, Lord Kintore, attended and there was a fireworks display, 430 employees being present. It will be noticed that there was a happy comradeship existing between the employer and his men. The first fire brigade under the Fire Brigades Board was established at Gawler in 1890, resulting in a marked decrease in the number of fires.

Tradition, which cannot be built up in a few years, should not be allowed to die in any country town. On the contrary, an attempt should be made to restore country towns to their former prosperous state. In 1892 was held the first public performance of the Gawler Orpheus Society, which is still in existence under the conductorship of Mr. George Davis, and we also have the Gawler Choral Society, conducted by Mr. Boyd Dawkins. Although Gawler may have suffered industrially, tradition still remains, and we should do everything in our power to bring prosperity not only to primary industries but also to the secondary industries in country towns.

In 1892 a number of workmen's blocks were allotted at Gawler, 630 acres having been purchased by the Government. In 1894 May Brothers, of Gawler South, was a flourishing concern, having expanded considerably in the manufacture of farming machinery. In the same year an English cricket eleven played against Gawler and district, and Mr. E. H. Coombe, later a member of Parliament, made top score, 46. In 1894, James Martin & Co. held a social for employees on the occasion of the completion of the 100th locomotive. It was an occasion worth celebrating. May Brothers opened a new foundry in 1895, and in 1896 received a large order for mining machinery from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. On December 23, 1896, James Martin & Co. celebrated a record output, and 39 truckloads of manufactured goods were dispatched. In the following year the firm began the manufacture of a 350 h.p. engine, the largest made in Australia up to that time. In 1898 the Barossa Reservoir scheme was passed by Parliament, and in 1899 Gawler suffered the loss, through death, of the Hon. James Martin, M.L.C. His death was not altogether the cause of the prosperity of his firm's foundry gradually declining. Prosperity declined because aid which could have been given by the Government was not forthcoming.

Mr. Teusner—Did not the *Song of Australia* have its origin in Gawler?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes. In 1901 John Darling began a compressed fodder mill and

in one day exported 1,500 tons. In 1903 orders totalling £30,000 for James Martin & Co. were received from Western Australia, and 1904 marked the delivery of the last 10 engines built by the firm. On December 6, 1907, the business was purchased by Mr. Henry Dutton, of Anlaby, near Kapunda. A contract for 10 engines and 100 trucks was promised by the Labor Government. The Turretfield Estate was purchased by the Government in 1908 and used as an experimental farm. It is still flourishing. On August 19, 1908, a large marine boiler constructed by May Bros, for the *Jessie Darling* was sent away. It was the largest boiler of its kind made in Australia up to that time. I will not submit details of the darker side in industry. I have given the bright side when the Gawler town and district were flourishing industrially. Unfortunately, those conditions did not continue. Harder times came and money was short. It was unfortunate that Government engine contracts went to Queensland. Some of the older people in Gawler try to tell you that that was the first step in the gerrymander. If that were so, it did not have much effect, because Gawler was fortunately situated in that many of its men could travel to the city in search of employment. The Perry Engineering Company took over Martin & Company and later removed the business to their works at Mile End. After the death of one of the brothers, May Bros. went into liquidation, as money was withdrawn from the firm by the legatees; the last of the brothers withdrew their money from the firm and gradually it faded out of existence. For years only ruins and vacant paddocks were left as a memorial. Recently, some of the land has been taken over by Jeff Bros.' Mills and they have converted an old building into a fine modern one. The Gawler Ice Works now occupy part of the site of Martin's. The Federal Spring Works propose to establish large works in a rebuilt section of the remainder of Martin's. The Eagle Foundry still continued in a small way, and E. Anders & Son is flourishing. Jeffs Brothers' Golden Crust Flour Mill is expanding and is prosperous. Taylor Brothers' butter factory, one of Gawler's oldest industries, is now under the South Australian Farmers' Union Limited and is doing big business, and the Gawler egg factory is busily engaged.

Some new industries have recently been established at Gawler, including the Gawler Manufacturing Company, a subsidiary of the Myer Emporium Ltd., which is expanding

rapidly. There is also the Century Electric Coy. which is doing very well, the Gawler Tile factory and others. There would be even more if we had a dual highway and if sewerage were provided. I submit that other industries would have been established at Gawler if a dual highway had been constructed to Gawler and a sewage scheme provided. In speaking to the manager of one of the Gawler factories recently, I was told that a number of industries had been discouraged from establishing there because of the difficulty of getting rid of their industrial waste. I think that what I have said shows that private enterprise is realizing the advantages of decentralization, even if the Government has not. Although the present Government has had a majority in both Houses for the past 14 years, it has made no serious attempt at decentralization. From what I have heard since being a member of this House I do not think it is interested in the subject; possibly, it involves too much pure economics. The Gawler district is typical of other rural districts. It has certain advantages because of its proximity to the city, and has the amenities associated with local government, churches, halls, hotels, and sports areas. Additional sports areas are necessary, particularly in those parts where new housing areas have been established. Gawler is provided with a reasonably good railway service and has a splendid water supply, and because these amenities are available it is opposed to the establishment of the satellite town near Salisbury. It is the centre of an important agricultural district, producing in increasing quantities hay, wheat, sheep, pigs, poultry, cattle, vine products, and other fruits. Lyndoch is within the district and is often spoken of as the entrance to the prosperous Barossa Valley. Already much garden produce is grown in the district and this production could be extended. Large quantities are forwarded through Gawler to Adelaide and then sent to other country districts. This raises the point whether it would not be advisable to establish a fruit and vegetable market at Gawler itself. Surely, this would have its effect on the economic wealth and stability of the State. We should strive to establish stable country towns which would add to the real economic wealth and stability of the State. They could then become the real economic trading and cultural centres of their district. I have shown, or tried to show, that towns such as Gawler with a long and noble tradition are entitled to be more than a mere feeder of labour and a sleeping dormitory for the city.

Tradesmen and engineers who served their apprenticeships at Martin's and May's are holding important technical positions at Whyalla, Leigh Creek, Broken Hill, Port Pirie, and other States. About 1,200 people in Gawler are forced to travel up to 60 miles a day to get to and from their employment, without any compensation if they are injured while travelling. This means that 2,400 man hours are lost each day, or 12,000 a week. I do not say those people would be working during that time, but even if they were only digging in their garden or reading a book they would be doing something worthwhile and saving two hours each a day instead of merely sitting in a train and getting tired.

Let us examine the various sections of the motion. I have tried to show that Gawler is a striking example of how the establishment of industries ancillary to primary production can be successful. Of course, the same applies to many other towns, but I am more familiar with Gawler. I do not commend the political activities in Victoria, but that State can give us a lead in the right direction. It has a decentralization division under a Minister of State Development. Its avowed aims are to encourage and facilitate the establishment of secondary industries in towns outside the metropolitan area. Particular attention is given to industries associated with the processing of local products or resources, or which are likely to serve the needs of any particular area. This has an important bearing on the second and third sections of the motion. For the establishment of new industries in the country a concerted Government effort is necessary.

Recently in Gawler a Greater Gawler Committee was established because of the desire of citizens in the town and district to bring back to Gawler some of its former prosperity. It is by no means a political committee, but is working with the very aims I mentioned this afternoon. It has finance, housing, industrial, and town planning committees. That shows that people in the country are imbued with the idea that country towns must not keep on losing residents to the city. I think last Saturday the *Advertiser* published a letter by Mr. C. L. Alexander, president of the South Australian Institute of Surveyors and councillor of the Town Planning Institute, Adelaide division. He appealed to the Government to establish a body to prepare a master plan for the future development of Adelaide and our country towns. He is not a political figure, but a professional man with specialized know-

ledge aiming for the betterment of the State. He said:—

Take your industries to the water . . . Gawler and Murray Bridge are amply supplied in this direction. Let us build them into centres of population and industry. It is necessary in this atomic age.

The next section of the motion deals with railway construction and maintenance work at country railway depots. This is urgently necessary for defence purposes, and is just common sense. Mr. Alexander's remarks can be applied to this section, too. I admit that good progress has been made in housing, but many more houses are required. The Housing Trust recently purchased 60 acres in Gawler, but I know of 100 more that could be bought if wanted for housing or industry. A Royal Commission could go further into housing requirements and make definite findings.

Surely an inquiry into these matters is urgently needed. I have particularly stressed Gawler because I know the town and district very well and because it is such an outstanding example of a once great industrial town, in the heart of a rich agricultural district, which is gradually fighting its way back to its former industrial prosperity; indeed, it is determined to do so. Gawler should be to Adelaide what Geelong is to Melbourne—a mighty town in its own right, with a large population. Indeed, architects and town planners are now at work on a fully planned project envisaging the future population of Gawler at 20,000. They are not Gawler people, but are undertaking this work because they think it a worthwhile project and because they believe Gawler to be an ideal place for planning. Primary and secondary industries should work hand in hand. The group is led by Mr. Gavin Walkley, head of the architectural school of the School of Mines. It is significant that a committee such as the Greater Gawler committee has been formed in a town like Gawler. The chairmen of the local branches of the Labor and Liberal Parties are members. The committee consists of representatives of most organizations in the district, and the members are fighting for the very things mentioned in the motion, such as the decentralization of industry and the development of country towns. These objects have always been strongly supported and advocated by the Party which I have the honour to represent. The motion should not be considered as a political question, but as one of real benefit to the State. The establishment of the Greater Gawler Committee shows that residents of country areas, irrespective of their

political affiliations, are awake to the fact that motions such as this transcend Party politics and are in the best interests of the people of the State. I support the motion and trust that it will be carried.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I think that when the member for Gawler reads his proof tomorrow he will feel disposed to say a word of apology to the Premier. True, the Premier also quoted at some length, but his material had a bearing on the motion. I fail to see how the member for Gawler can link up the history of modern Athens with the problems facing us. He said that many of the residents of Gawler had to travel long distances to their employment, but if he had told us what happened in the 1900's, we may have had some information to put us on the right road so as not to repeat mistakes similar to those apparently made by Gawler. What happened in the early nineteenth century cannot disclose a remedy for the troubles of the twentieth century.

I commiserate the Leader of the Opposition for the paucity of support from his own Party, but the motion has all the appearances of electioneering propaganda. I see no reason for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into matters that this House deals with week by week. Therefore, it must be concluded that there is some ulterior motive behind the motion. If so, the Opposition has shown lack of wisdom in choosing this ground on which to fight an election. I do not know of any large body of public opinion that favours any inquiry, whether by a Royal Commission, Select Committee, or by any other method, shouldering the responsibilities of Parliament on a small body with no responsibility to the electors.

Mr. Quirke—I cannot imagine anything sillier than that statement.

Mr. SHANNON—I think that on reflection the Opposition will realize that this is not a good ground on which to fight an election. The appointment of a Royal Commission would not find any great support amongst the people. The motion mentions matters that this Parliament has dealt with. It urges the establishment of industries ancillary to primary production, such as meat works and factories for treating hides and skins. The Premier made it clear that we have tried to establish country meat works and pointed out that Wallaroo and Naracoorte had been considered in this regard. The works established at Port Lincoln have cost the taxpayer large sums. This is evidence of

whether the State can support country meat works. I have in my own electorate an establishment for treating by-products, such as hides and skins. It has been taken over by another company but is still known as Paltridge's, although the Paltridges no longer have any interest in it. During the war the factory was reconstituted and by virtue of assistance, both monetary and directive, it gradually got on its feet. But for the activities of the Hide and Skin Board in directing certain hides to certain tanneries the factory would have been squeezed out, and the Hindmarsh factory would have gone too. The eastern States had a stranglehold on the tanning business and the leather trade. There has been a hard fight to retain the boot manufacturing trade in this State. It was retained because of Government activity in putting the company on a proper footing and seeing that it was properly managed and got the necessary raw materials. The company is expanding its business and doing an excellent job. It could not have done so but for the activity of the present Liberal Government. This was one of the effective steps taken by the Government to improve the position. The Premier and his Ministers are responsible for the development of the local co-operative cold stores to handle fruit in the hills areas. A number of these small businesses operate. Some of them had to get assistance in the early days, but others managed to get on their feet themselves. In one or two cases but for Government assistance these co-operatives would not have succeeded. It is a good move to keep industries in areas where the produce is grown, and no inquiry could improve the position.

There is only one way to establish secondary industries in country areas, but it was not effective in Gawler, although we provided that district with an adequate water supply. This is an important factor in the establishment of secondary industries, and, in addition, there must be power available at a reasonable rate. No inquiry can alter the fact that at Port Augusta we have a power station, the first part of which will be in operation in two years. It will be a great incentive to the decentralization of industry, and the establishment of new industries in the country. Power will be available, as well as River Murray water. In the establishment of secondary industries geographical factors play an important part, and that is something that an inquiry by a Royal Commission could not alter. Industries established in the north will provide goods for the population in the area. No big

industry will be established at Port Augusta, Port Pirie or Whyalla to provide goods for the whole of the State. The Government has extensive plans for the development of Upper Murray districts where a big increase in population is certain to come within the foreseeable future. It is an area of high productivity and water is available. It has been proved that the land adjacent to the river will grow practically anything, and the area could provide food for a large population. There is no reason why the fruit grown in the area should not be processed there. It would mean a large saving in freight charges.

Mr. Macgillivray—You think it would be a good thing if the wine grapes grown in the area were processed locally?

Mr. SHANNON—It would mean the production of better wine, because the grapes would not have to be carted so far. After picking the condition of grapes deteriorates rapidly. The real answer is not better road transport, but the further development of industry in the area. One necessary factor is the provision of cheap power from Port Augusta.

Mr. Macgillivray—I do not think it is right to talk about cheap power.

Mr. SHANNON—It will be cheap power compared with what has to be paid for power supplied from local sources. It may be said that the present Renmark Irrigation Trust is providing power more cheaply than the Electricity Trust can supply it.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is true.

Mr. SHANNON—We must wait until the Port Augusta power station is operating before we know the price of power supplied to the river areas. No inquiry could help in this matter. It cannot be said that country areas should be left to their own resources in the supplying of power. The use of local power would not mean the establishment of many industries. Probably the limit has been reached in the quantity of power they can supply. There must be a supply from another source, and it will come from Port Augusta. The Government is painting as clearly as possible the picture of decentralization of industry. The Leader of the Opposition asks for an inquiry into which secondary industries can be transferred from the metropolitan area. Is it to be a compulsory transfer? If it is not, the only way to get city industries to transfer is to offer them better facilities elsewhere, or something they cannot get at present. The Government is doing its best to provide facili-

ties for industries to be established in or transferred to the country, and no inquiry could alter the position.

In his motion the Leader of the Opposition had a crack at the Railways Department for its failure to carry out a general overhaul of rolling stock in the north. It must be remembered that the department must operate in conformity with money voted by Parliament, and that it must work as efficiently as possible. Parliament has given the system many burdens to carry. We have constructed many developmental lines into distant parts. I do not criticize that because it was necessary, but it created difficulties for the department. No body of inquiry could suggest that certain rolling stock maintenance work should be done here, so much there, and so much elsewhere. That is something for men who have been trained in transport matters. We would be asking for trouble if we told them where they had to carry out their ordinary maintenance work. I would be the last to say that we should scatter the work throughout various country centres, and a Royal Commission would not even suggest such a policy. As regards housing, obviously houses will not be provided until sufficient workmen in the area concerned want them. The Government, through the Housing Trust, has made homes available for workers permanently employed at Port Augusta, as Mr. Riches must admit. The Government has provided homes in the South-East for its forestry employees. It is only begging the question to suggest that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into housing. Steps will be taken to cope with any future developments through the efforts of private enterprise. Members are aware that houses have been provided for workers at Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla. Today the member for Gawler gave the House an historical record of that township's activities in support of the motion, but I have yet to learn what they have to do with the motion.

Mr. O'Halloran—He was as good as the honourable member in putting his case.

Mr. SHANNON—I think I have dealt fully with the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, and oppose his motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I support the motion and am surprised at the remarks of the Premier and Mr. Shannon in opposing it. Speaking on the motion on August 20 the Premier opposed the appointment of a Royal Commission, as suggested by Mr. O'Halloran and today he said if such a commission were

appointed and made a report members would still disagree with it. Yesterday we were asked to treat as urgent a Bill introduced by the Government following upon a report presented by the committee which inquired into the control, administration and management of the Municipal Tramways Trust. During his second reading speech he said it was intended to appoint another committee of which he hoped the chairman would be Mr. W. C. Gillespie, S.M., so he is inconsistent in saying it is useless to appoint Royal Commissions or committees of inquiry because members had views different from their recommendations. The Premier's speech is recorded on pages 478-484 of *Hansard*. On six of the seven pages he quoted extensively from a report of a Royal Commission.

Mr. Whittle—You could not have got a better report from any Royal Commission.

Mr. LAWN—If that is so what objection is there to the appointment of a royal commission on this matter, as sought by the Leader of the Opposition? I hope Mr. Whittle will support the motion. Although Mr. Shannon opposes the appointment of a royal commission he too quoted from the report of a royal commission. He drew attention to the excellent speech made this afternoon by the member for Gawler and said that the honourable member failed to connect his remarks with the motion. I followed his remarks closely and believe he tried to link up the history of Gawler with the motion in an endeavour to avoid past mistakes in future. He pointed out what had happened to industries and workshops in Gawler over a long period. The object of the motion is to ensure that industry, on a properly organized basis, will be encouraged to transfer to suitable country centres and that there will be no likelihood of any industry going out of existence. There is no desire to see industries established in a haphazard manner.

Mr. Shannon said that the motion dealt with things with which the House was more competent to deal. He must have something to hide if he believes that the motion is designed for the purpose of dealing with matters which are dealt with by the House from week to week. In the main, the business before the House is introduced by the Government, Wednesday afternoons being set aside for private members' business. It is not possible for a private member to introduce a Bill for the decentralization of industry. Mr. Shannon contends that a proper, well organized form of decentralization is

being carried out in South Australia by means of Bills introduced by the Government.. I say that that is not so, and if the honourable member has full confidence in the Government's policy I challenge him to support the motion, for otherwise he must fear that the report of the commission would be unfavourable to the Government. He then went on to say that he did not think the appointment of a Royal Commission to deal with matters which should be dealt with by Parliament would find support from the electors. The honourable member must have forgotten the Bill before the House which arose from the findings of a committee. Will he say that the electors object to that report? The inquiry was sought by the municipal councils and by the Tramways Trust itself, and I think the honourable member must have forgotten that. He will probably support the appointment of the committee which the Government proposes to inquire into certain traffic matters, but if they are not matters which are the responsibility of this House I should like to know what are. The transportation of the public is the responsibility of Parliament, yet that is to be submitted to a committee of inquiry. Parliament has delegated some of its authority over public transportation to municipal councils, but they are still required to lay their regulations upon the table so as to afford Parliament an opportunity to disallow them, so the final responsibility is Parliament's. I do not see how Mr. Shannon can claim that the public did not support the appointment of the committee of inquiry on the tramways. He then went on to say—I claim in support of the motion—that if it had not been for the Government's action some of the co-operatives in the country would not have commenced or remained in business. He also referred to a certain tannery at Hindmarsh, the establishment of which was assisted by the Government. If he believes in a State Government encouraging industry—

Mr. O'Halloran—In the city, though.

Mr. LAWN—If he believes only in encouraging industries in the metropolitan area he might have some grounds for opposing the motion, which has for its object the establishment of industries in certain parts of the State, but he did not say he opposed the Government's action in regard to the co-operatives or the tannery.

Mr. Whittle—He was referring to a tannery at Mount Barker.

Mr. LAWN—He specifically referred to a tannery at Hindmarsh, and he made it quite clear that he was supporting the Government's

action in encouraging this tannery in the metropolitan area and the co-operatives in the country. If he commends the Government in this instance he surely cannot oppose the motion, which simply asks the Government to encourage industries in other parts of the State. Mr. Shannon also said that he believed all railway maintenance work should be centralized in the metropolitan area and not scattered throughout the country.

Mr. Whittle—Be fair. He said that in the event of its being all one gauge.

Mr. LAWN—Very well, I accept that. I have visited the various States and have seen their railway workshops. The eastern States, which have considerably larger populations than we have and have been developed over a longer period—

Mr. O'Halloran—And have greater railway mileages and uniform gauges within the States.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. They are States which now have what I hope we will have, namely, greater population and a uniform gauge, and they have country railway workshops on a very large scale indeed. Fancy our bringing all our freight waggons, carriages and locomotives requiring repairs and maintenance from Peterborough, Quorn, Port Pirie, or Mount Gambier and having to send them back again. Members opposite are always loud in their praise of private enterprise, but I suggest that private enterprise would not do what the honourable member suggests, and bring everything to the city for repairs, for it would require a plant larger than that of General Motors-Holdens to cope with all the repairs and new work required for the State, and it would be a waste of taxpayers' money to have all the work centralized in the city.

Mr. Whittle—I quite agree with you.

Mr. O'Halloran—The honourable member has made one convert.

Mr. LAWN—I have heard the Premier say on a previous occasion that the Government's action was wholly responsible for the establishment of the British Tube Mills in South Australia. He also told me during the Address in Reply debate that the proposal by one of the large motor firms to build a complete car in Australia is the result of his negotiations two years ago. Apparently there is nothing wrong with the Government's endeavouring to establish industries in the metropolitan area. Members opposite claim that this Government has made South Australia a much more industrialized State than it was prior to World War II. However, all that we ask is that

some inquiry be made into the possibility of establishing other industries—but not in the metropolitan area. Why should members opposite oppose it? Do they think that if the wage earner goes out among the wheatgrowers and graziers he is likely to pollute the air and change the political beliefs of those people as they were changed when those country people came to the city to work during wartime? If that is their belief let them come out into the open and say so. The honourable member suggested that this motion was merely window dressing for the next State election, and I can only say that I thought he had greater ability than to have to rely on such a weak statement, for decentralization of industry has been the policy of the Labor Party for many years. I do not think this is the first time that a similar motion has been moved from this side of the House, just as I have no doubt it will be moved again if the prophecy I made during the debate on the Loan Estimates comes true. If this motion is defeated, members on this side will next year have the opportunity, as a Government party to appoint a commission to inquire into this matter, but, if members opposite have nothing to fear, then in the interests of the State they will support the motion.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I oppose the motion for I do not feel that a case has been made out for the appointment of a commission to inquire into the decentralization of industry. Not only in Australia but all over the world people are crowding into cities from rural areas. During its term of office this Government has done much more than Governments in other parts to bring about decentralization.

Mr. O'Halloran—Population figures do not support your argument.

Mr. MICHAEL—The city population may have grown more rapidly than our rural population over recent years, but that does not prove that this Government has not done a great deal to encourage decentralization, for many other factors bear on this question. Many industries have been encouraged to come to South Australia, but it has been extremely difficult, if not impossible, to induce them to become established away from centres of population. Another factor is that today more work is done in country areas with less manpower than was the case years ago. We have been repeatedly told by the Premier and have also read in the press of the difficulty that is experienced in inducing secondary industries to go into country districts. For instance, when

the war ended and the buildings formerly used for the production of munitions at Finsbury and Hendon became available, it was easier for new industries to move into those areas than to go to the country. Over the years this Government has done much to encourage decentralization of industry. In these days amenities must be provided for workers before they can be expected to go into country areas, and this Government has done much by providing water supplies in low rainfall areas. In commenting on South Australian water supplies, Mr. Brunson Fletcher, a former editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, said that more had been done in this State than in any other part of the world to take water to the people by means of pipeline. It is very important that country people should be supplied with electricity, and this Government has done and is doing much to provide this service in country areas. I do not know where else in Australia one could find a project to compare with the powerhouse that is being built at Port Augusta so that country areas may be supplied with electricity. Reference has been made to the establishment of industries on the River Murray, but I remind members that this year electric power will be available at the Loveday pumping station and will prove a great boon there because the wood supply along the river is gradually being used up and a new source of fuel will be necessary in those areas.

The member for Gawler made a long speech much of which had little to do with the motion. He said that this Government had done little in the past 14 years to bring about decentralization, but I point out that in my own electorate there are several industries. In Kapunda, Hawke & Co. Ltd. manufactures scales and weighbridges, and there is probably only one other comparable scale-making firm in Australia. Its products are exported to such parts as South Africa, New Zealand and even Cyprus. A few minor difficulties have arisen from time to time with regard to its operations, but in the majority of cases they have been overcome. The operations of that firm have increased over the years and I suggest that what can be done in that case may be done in others providing the workers are willing to go into the country.

Mr. O'Halloran—Has Kapunda a sewerage system?

Mr. MICHAEL—As yet it has not been possible to sewer country towns, but investigations have been made with regard to several, including Kapunda, and it is hoped that those plans will be put into effect in the near future.

I do not say there are only a few more facilities to be provided in country areas, but no case has been made out in this debate for the setting up of a Royal Commission to inquire into decentralization. I am as keen as any other member to see greater decentralization of industry, but I believe this Government has in the main done everything possible to bring that about. In Freeling a firm is manufacturing plough shares of various kinds for distribution all over Australia. At Kapunda the Barossa Knitting Mills provide employment for some workers in that area. In other parts small industries have been started by ex-servicemen since the war, and in Eudunda another industry is doing a wonderful business making parts for machinery firms in Adelaide—a true example of decentralization.

The member for Gawler said much against the proposed satellite town, but he failed to convince me on the matter. He said that it should not be built at Smithfield, but that Gawler should be enlarged, but I believe that Gawler has a slightly better rainfall than Smithfield and that land in that vicinity would be better used in agricultural pursuits than for home building. In other respects much has been done by this Government in regard to land development, especially in the South-East since the end of the war. I have had the privilege of travelling on about 30 trips with the Land Settlement Committee, and have seen the great change that has taken place in many parts. Much of the land on which work has begun is not yet fully developed, but a start has been made by this Government on land development which will lead to greater decentralization of our population. The Premier quoted a statement by Mr. Cosgrove, Premier of Tasmania, made during his recent visit to South Australia, but I point out that he is not the only Tasmanian who has recently visited this State, for just prior to his visit the Tasmanian Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Dwyer, V.C., and the Tasmanian Director of Agriculture visited South Australia and inspected land development work on Kangaroo Island. They inspected the great development taking place on Kangaroo Island. Towards the end of July the *Advertiser* mentioned the visit of Mr. Dwyer and Mr. Hicks, but I remind the House that this was not their first visit to this State. The article in the *Advertiser* stated:—

Three years ago, when the Tasmanian Minister of Agriculture (Mr. J. J. Dwyer, V.C.), and Director of Agriculture (Mr. F. W. Hicks) inspected Kangaroo Island land to be developed for soldier settlement, they said it

"wouldn't even run a bandicoot." Yesterday, after another inspection, they commented: "The settlers on this land have a winning ticket in Tatts—and they didn't even have to buy the ticket." "Development since we last saw the island has been phenomenal," Mr. Dwyer added. "About 60,000 acres of scrub has been sown to pasture and many thousands of acres are settled with people living on their own farms. In any agricultural language this is no mean achievement in three years. It reflects great credit on the Minister of Lands (Mr. Hincks) and Mr. Rowland Hill, chief executive officer of the Department of Lands. In 10 years time the island should be supporting 250,000 fat lamb ewes." Mr. Hincks said that the strike of clover and grass on Kangaroo Island has been excellent. Incorporation of mineral elements, such as copper and zinc, had had a remarkable effect. If country, which previously produced next to nothing, could be converted into good farms capable of carrying at least two sheep to the acre, it must be regarded as work of national importance.

If Ministers of another State, Government made a statement such as that we can be sure that our developmental scheme on Kangaroo Island is a worthy project. They must have been convinced that the undertaking was worthwhile. A great deal has been done by the Government in decentralization, but many other plans for this purpose are only in the making, whilst many others have not yet been completed. Projects to carry water to country districts, the extension of electricity power lines, and land developmental schemes are still going on. Further, many industries are being taken to the country. The member for Adelaide criticized the small amount of work being done in railway workshops in the country compared with what is being done in other States, but the railway systems of other States are much larger than those of South Australia, consequently it is more difficult to decentralize railway maintenance and construction work here. I have no doubt that the Government will increase railway maintenance work in our country depots as soon as it is economical to do so. A good case has not been made out for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into decentralization. This House has ample opportunities to study the question and members can express their views. The Government has always been ready to listen to members' views, and its officers have done as much as possible to encourage decentralization. The appointment of a Royal Commission would not serve any useful purpose.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PORT AUGUSTA SUB-BRANCH R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. (PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill makes several amendments of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. They deal with a variety of topics, but the majority of them arise from the report of the committee appointed by the Government to investigate and report on the appropriate methods of dealing with sex offenders. This report is now before members. The committee consisted of Dr. H. M. Birch (Superintendent of Mental Institutions), Dr. Frank H. Beare, Mr. R. R. Chamberlain, K.C. (now Crown Solicitor) and Mr. C. J. Philcox, a barrister with a long experience of criminal cases. The report is a sound, moderate, and well-reasoned document. It makes very clear the difficulties of the problem of sexual offenders and indicates that there is no simple solution. In particular, the committee discounts the idea that the problem of the sexual offender can be solved by medical treatment. In some cases medical and psychiatric treatment can achieve good results, but it is a misconception to think that sexual offending in general can be cured by this means. The committee devoted itself to ascertaining what could be done to lessen the incidence of sexual offending, and to improve the existing law and practice as to the punishment and treatment of offenders. This Bill gives effect to almost all the recommendations of the committee as to amendment of the law. In addition it contains some other amendments recommended by the Judges and the Crown Prosecutor, or found necessary in the course of legal practice.

It will be convenient to explain the provisions of the Bill in the order of the clauses. Clause 3 deals with the law as to causing death by negligent driving. A person who kills another

by such driving may be charged either with manslaughter, or with killing by negligent driving contrary to section 14 of the Act. Clause 3 provides that if such a charge is laid and the jury does not consider the accused guilty of the offence charged, but does consider him guilty of careless, reckless or dangerous driving they may bring in a verdict to that effect. Thereupon the Supreme Court may punish the accused by a fine up to £100 or imprisonment for not more than six months. He may also be disqualified for holding a driver's licence. It has been found, in practice, that juries are often unwilling in these cases to convict of manslaughter or of causing death. No doubt they are influenced by the fact that the accused had no intention of killing anyone. In addition there is sometimes a doubt as to whether the negligence of the accused was sufficiently serious to support a conviction for manslaughter, and sometimes questions arise as to whether the accused's negligence was the substantial cause of the death. These doubts may arise, even if there is no doubt that the accused was guilty of an offence of careless or dangerous driving; and it would be convenient and in the interests of justice if the jury were allowed to find him guilty of such an offence. The clause will enable this to be done. In addition to punishing the defendant by a fine or imprisonment, the Supreme Court is empowered by the clause to disqualify the defendant for holding a driver's licence.

Clause 4 is consequential on clause 3. Clause 5 enacts a provision similar to clause 3 applicable to the case where a person is charged with causing bodily injury by negligent driving. In such a case also it is provided that the accused may be found guilty of careless or dangerous driving and punished accordingly by fine, imprisonment, or disqualification.

Clause 6 deals with the offence of common assault. Under section 46 of the Act it is provided that this offence may be dealt with summarily when the charge is laid by the person assaulted, and that compensation may be awarded to the injured person, but there are some unsatisfactory features of the present section. Compensation cannot be awarded if the court decides to imprison the defendant. The maximum fine of £5 and the maximum term of imprisonment, two months, fixed by the section, are too low. The maximum term of imprisonment—two months—which may be imposed in default of payment of a fine or compensation is also too low, and is inconsistent with the

Justices Act. These and other small anomalies have rendered it necessary to redraft the section, so as to impose appropriate penalties and give the court wider powers to award compensation, or to refrain from giving a decision on the question of compensation, if it feels it is not in a position to decide this matter.

Clause 7 contains consequential amendments.

Clause 8 makes important amendments of the law relating to the offence of carnal knowledge of females under 16. These were recommended by the committee. A feature of this offence is that the consent of the female concerned is no defence, except in special circumstances laid down in the Act. Similarly, in cases of indecent assault on females under 17 the consent of the female is no defence except in special circumstances. The offence of carnal knowledge covers some of the more serious cases of indecent assaults on girls, but in several respects the law as to carnal knowledge is more lenient and places the defendant in a more favourable position than the law as to indecent assaults. The result, in practice, has been that defendants are charged with indecent assault when the offence should more properly be described as carnal knowledge. The anomalous differences between these two classes of offence are as follow:—

- (a) The section dealing with carnal knowledge only protects girls up to 16. Under the indecent assault provision girls up to 17 are protected whether they consent or not.
- (b) Charges for carnal knowledge must be laid within six months after the commission of the offence. There is no similar rule for indecent assaults.
- (c) In indecent assault cases where the girl consented the defence that the accused believed on reasonable grounds that the girl was of the age of consent is only available where the girl was 16 years old or more. In carnal knowledge cases this defence is available irrespective of the age of the girl.

It is proposed to abolish these differences between the two offences. The offence of carnal knowledge will be extended to girls up to 17 years old; the six months' time limit for bringing prosecutions will be removed; and the defence that the accused in a carnal knowledge case believed the girl to be of the age of consent will only be allowed in cases where the girl was at least 16 years old.

Clause 9 enacts two further provisions respecting offences against girls. The first is contained in the proposed new section 57a.

This section will permit the justices on the preliminary hearing of a charge of carnal knowledge or indecent assault to take a plea of guilty and commit the defendant for sentence without taking evidence. At present the plea of the accused can only be taken at the close of the evidence for the prosecution. The object of the amendment is to make these prosecutions less onerous for the girl concerned. The committee gave a good deal of consideration to the harmful effects suffered by relatively young children as a result of having to repeat the story of the assault three times, as often happens at present, and was desirous of finding ways of avoiding this repetition. It recommended section 57a as one method of achieving this result. Another method is indicated in the proposed new section 57b which creates a new offence of indecent interference with a child or women. This offence can be dealt with summarily by a magistrate in the police court. It is contemplated that minor sexual offences will be dealt with under this section, thus sparing the child or woman concerned the embarrassment of appearing before a jury.

Clause 10 provides a time limit of three years within which charges for sexual offences must be laid. At present there is no time limit, except in the case of carnal knowledge where the limit is six months. The reasons for this amendment were fully explained by the committee in paragraphs 16 and 17 of its report. One justification for such a time limit is the prevention of blackmail. Another is that unnecessary harm can be done, without commensurate benefit, when sexual offences are brought on for trial and made public years after they were committed, when the circumstances of both the offender and the victim have changed.

Clause 11 makes some important amendments to the law respecting the medical examination, detention, and treatment of convicted sexual offenders. Under the present law, as laid down in the Act of 1940, when the court orders that a convicted person be examined to determine whether he is incapable of controlling his sexual instincts, the examination must be conducted by two medical practitioners. They are required to conduct the examination themselves. The committee recommended that they should have the right to call in the assistance of a psychologist, a social worker, and the probation officer. Clause 11 will enable this to be done. Secondly, the clause widens the classes of persons who may be detained in an institution for treatment during the Governor's pleasure.

At present those who are found incapable of controlling themselves, or who are mentally subnormal may be so detained. The committee recommended that a third class of convicted persons should also be subject to such detention, namely, those who, though not incapable or subnormal, need treatment, but whose offence is too serious to warrant their being released under bond. For this reason it is proposed to empower the Supreme Court to order the detention in an institution during the Governor's pleasure, of any person convicted of a sexual offence, if the court is satisfied that it is expedient that such person should be so detained. Any person so detained may be discharged when the Governor is satisfied that he is fit to be at liberty.

Clause 12 enlarges the powers of the Supreme Court to punish convicted persons. By section 313 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act the court is at present empowered to fine or release on bond any person convicted of a misdemeanour. This punishment can be imposed in lieu of or in addition to any other punishment prescribed by the Act. Magistrates and justices have a somewhat similar power under the Justices Act. The power in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, however, does not apply to persons convicted of felonies. There is now no reason for distinguishing between misdemeanours and felonies in this matter, because many misdemeanours are serious offences, and some misdemeanours are more serious than some of the felonies. The judges have asked for a general power to fine, or release on bond in the case of all felonies and misdemeanours except treason and murder. Clause 12 grants such a power which will be available in all cases except treason and murder, and except where the power is expressly taken away by any particular enactment. The clause also empowers the Supreme Court, when imposing a fine, to grant time for payment, allow payment by instalments, and fix a term of imprisonment in default of payment.

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

Sitting suspended from 5.55 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 694.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This is undoubtedly a very important Bill. Members listened with great interest to the Premier yesterday when he dealt

with the history of the municipal tramway undertaking with its successes and failures and its present difficult position. Finally, he appealed to the House to give the measure the most expeditious consideration possible. I confess that on a question of such magnitude I am at a disadvantage in doing that. The Bill is the result of more than three months of consideration and negotiation in respect of certain proposals arising out of a committee inquiry over a long period. With the very little time at my disposal since yesterday I have tried to consider the important aspects of the two major points in the Bill. Although, so far as I can see, there are only two major points, there are so many subsidiary points bristling with importance that it is quite possible I shall miss a number of them in the course of my remarks. I am not excusing myself, because I feel quite sure that if I miss any points there are very competent members on this side who will be able to deal with them later in the debate.

I desire to deal with one matter immediately, namely, that the Bill on the files differs in one respect from the one circulated yesterday. I am prepared to admit it is not a very important aspect and the alteration is one I am prepared to accept. Clause 8 relating to annual reports in the Bill circulated yesterday contains the following:—

The Minister shall cause such financial statement to be laid before both Houses of Parliament as soon as practicable after the receipt thereof.

The Hon. T. Playford—I can explain the position. The Bill which was on the files had not been checked with the copy that was introduced.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I accept the explanation, but this only emphasizes what I said earlier regarding the haste with which we are now expected to consider the Bill—a haste undoubtedly warranted by the unfortunate circumstances in which the undertaking finds itself. However, it makes it more difficult for me to give it that mature consideration to which it is entitled. I am not complaining, and I am prepared to accept the invitation of the Premier to give it the most expeditious consideration possible in order to bring about the relief desired as early as possible.

The Bill is the result of negotiations which have taken place over a period of more than three months between the Government and the various constituent bodies comprising the Municipal Tramways Trust. These negotiations, in so far as I can understand them

and from what appeared in the press and from the Premier's second reading speech, were based upon three proposals he submitted to a meeting of these bodies more than three months ago. According to the report which appeared in the *Advertiser* they were:—

(1) That the trust continue under the control and management of metropolitan councils; (2) that a more efficient type of control be established, but local governing authorities to continue to have a voice in the management; (3) that the local governing authorities divorce themselves from all forms of transport considerations and a State central authority be established. As I understand it, if proposal No. 1 had been adopted that would have been the end of it so far as the Government and Parliament are concerned. The Premier was prepared if either proposal No. 2 or 3 were adopted, to recommend to Parliament that certain financial assistance be provided to assist the trust over a period of years. In considering this Bill we can discard proposal No. 1 and concentrate our attention on the other two. That reminds me that the title of the Bill is "An Act to amend the Municipal Tramways Trust Act, 1935-1949 and for other purposes." If the Bill is carried, for all practical purposes the trust apparently will cease to be a municipal tramways' trust, and it might very well be called "a metropolitan tramways trust," because I cannot visualize that we shall be extending the activities of this organization to any other part of South Australia within the lifetime of any member of the House. However, if it becomes necessary to extend its activities, we can overcome the difficulty by striking out "metropolitan." That is a point worthy of consideration. As I understand the position, the proposal now before the House is a compromise suggestion based upon proposal No. 2.

Mr. Pattinson—It is really about 2½—something between 2 and 3.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is really. Proposal No. 2 provided for a more efficient control being established, the councils to continue to have a voice in the management, whereas proposal No. 3 provides that the councils divorce themselves from all transport and traffic considerations, a State central control authority to be established. Proposal No. 2, as embodied in the Bill, provides that councils are effectively divorced from any share in the management of the trust in future—that is, assuming that the Bill is passed. Where it differs from proposal No. 3 is that the councils

will still retain their rights of control over ancilliary forms of transport other than bus transport, which is now subject to control under the present Act, and which control is continued under the Bill.

The history of the negotiations makes very interesting reading. I do not wish to weary the House with a long historical record of what took place, but if I desired to do so I could have quoted from a file of newspaper reports which would have either entertained or bored the House for a considerable time. Apparently, in the early stages a great majority of the people concerned favoured proposal No. 3. I submit, and I shall give reasons, that that was the proposal which should have been brought to the House. For some reason that was not done, and I suspect that the influence of the Adelaide City Council was not without some effect on the negotiations. Conference after conference was held and the desire of the majority of the councils that proposal No. 3 should be adopted was gradually worn down and at the final meeting the Kensington and Norwood Council stood out. At one stage I had a great deal of admiration for the firm stand taken by the member for Norwood, Mr. Moir, but I regret that finally even he forgot the past and decided that the proposal in the Bill should be accepted rather than the one which the majority of his council was still holding out for and which it had held out for through the whole of the negotiations. The Bill provides for a trust to be appointed by the Government to replace one appointed by metropolitan councils. I support that proposal as I believe it is necessary if we are to secure the efficiency deemed desirable in the Inquiry Committee's report quoted extensively by the Premier yesterday. It is in accordance with my policy as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough and I would have been much more happy if proposal No. 3 had been adopted.

Under the proposal councils are to be deprived of their powers in the management and control of the tramways. For some reason we still profess to retain the provisions of the old Act which render councils responsible for losses on tramways operations. That provision is not to be repealed by the Bill. I ask, with much emphasis, if we pass this Bill, as I believe and hope we will, what virtue is there in retaining that provision in the Act? Once we take control of the undertaking away from the councils which, as the Premier went to great pains yesterday to assure us, were the real

owners of the undertaking, it will be politically and practically impossible in future to collect any share of the losses on the tramways system as the result of making a charge on council rates.

Mr. Shannon—That particular provision has never operated.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Exactly, but it could have operated on several occasions during the trust's history.

Mr. Pattinson—Would you venture a little prophecy and say that it will never operate?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have already said so. Once we pass the Bill it will not be practicable to levy a charge on council rates in order to make good any future losses on the system. I am not sorry about that, notwithstanding what the Premier said yesterday. The history of the undertaking dates back to the early 1900's. Negotiations took place between 1900 and 1906 when, I think, final agreement was achieved with the passing of the present Act. I remind members that conditions then were entirely different from what they are today. At that time the motor car was scarcely known and any form of public street transport which was an improvement on the horse trams was obviously attractive. In the view of those concerned with the problem at the time the undertaking was likely to be a most successful investment. There was a feeling that, rather than have a Government instrumentality, it should be a municipal one and that the profits, if any, should be available to councils that constituted the trust. That point of view is understandable, but I do not think it was the correct one. My conception of the duties of councils is that they should deal with matters of public interest within their own boundaries. Once they amalgamate into a group in order to conduct something for that group they are, in principle at any rate, exceeding their duties as local governing authorities. I do not think that fact was sufficiently appreciated when this matter was considered nearly 50 years ago.

Mr. Shannon—They have amalgamated in health matters and done a good job.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The Metropolitan County Board has done a good job, but no financial risks are involved in that. Public health should be the concern of every citizen and every body and everything possible should be done to organize in the interests of the people.

Mr. Whittle—The Metropolitan Abattoirs was a good undertaking to take over.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It was such a success that a Liberal Government wiped out municipal control and took over, lock, stock and barrel, in the same way that I suggest it should take over the tramways system. If it was proper for the Butler Government about 17 or 18 years ago to take over the Metropolitan Abattoirs it is perfectly proper for the Playford Government to take over the whole metropolitan transport system in 1952 and subject it to proper control. There is another aspect of the position, namely, the idea that councils should be levied to make good certain losses. This arose from the fact that at the time we had a coalition Government, the Price-Peake Government, which was predominantly Labor. I think there were nine members who were classed as Liberal Democrats but who were really country Laborites, and 16 Labor members who had been elected for various constituencies. My supposition is based on what was Labor's policy at the time. It is still Labor's policy, namely, that the metropolitan area should be developed by the creation of a public service and that land which was developed and bettered should meet some of the cost of that service. Had that principle been applied from the beginning it would have prevented the position we are faced with today from arising. But what happened? Undoubtedly, as the result of development of our metropolitan tramways system—and I have seen it grow in the last 35 years—broad acres and vacant paddocks in various parts of the metropolitan area became thriving and prosperous suburbs after tram services were provided. If only an infinitesimal part of the value added by this development, which was created by the tramways had been taken to meet the capital cost of the tramways we would not have been in our present position.

Mr. Quirke—That is what is proposed to be done with a drainage system in the South-East.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is a sound policy, but in 1918 when we asked for that policy to be applied to the tramways, railways and drainage schemes we could not get the Liberal Party to agree. Had it done so many of the difficulties which South Australia is facing today, including the one before us, would have been minimized if not entirely avoided. The Premier made some play about the responsibility of the Adelaide City Council. He stated that the council was, theoretically, responsible for losses on the tramway system. Why was that system devised? It was introduced to bring people from the metropolitan area into the city for business reasons and was deliber-

ately designed, in most instances, to prevent the growth of suburban business areas. As a result a tremendous value has accrued to city properties. Although theoretically the Adelaide City Council has to accept one-third of the losses, the benefits conferred on city property outweigh anything else, even if that obligation were imposed on it. As I said before, had we had a betterment rate from the inception in connection with improvements to land values and capital holdings brought about by tramways development it would have been perfectly sound policy. It would be an untenable proposition today, after nearly 50 years have elapsed, after the cream of the value created as a result of the inauguration of the tramway system has been skimmed off by those who have since sold their properties and in doing so have sold part or whole of the value brought about by the tramway system. It would be iniquitous to expect the present generation of ratepayers, who bought this land in good faith and who now are helping, but not succeeding, to make the tramway system pay by means of the high tramway fares, to meet the losses by a further levy. Consequently I suggest that we may as well abandon any idea of imposing a charge by way of rates.

Mr. Macgillivray—What would be the effect on land values if the tramways ceased to function?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is a moot point. I think there would be a substantial accretion of values in the outer suburban areas, some increase in the middle areas and undoubtedly a diminution of values in the city of Adelaide.

Mr. Whittle—Buses could provide the service.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I shall have plenty to say to the honourable member if he believes that the tramway system should be allowed to lapse and its place taken by private motor buses.

Mr. Whittle—I did not say that.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Then what is the purpose of the honourable member's remark? I am not here to try the state of member's minds, but to make my own position clear—with very great difficulty—and I welcome any assistance I can get from any member, including my learned friend from Prospect whom my former Leader once referred to as Sir Oracle. There is one section of this Bill with which I entirely agree, namely, clause 5, which provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, fix a day on and after which the trust shall be reconstituted and the newly appointed board take

over, but I see no purpose whatever in the proviso attached thereto which reads:—

Provided that no such proclamation shall be made if within seven days after the day on which the Municipal Tramways Act Amendment Act, 1952, is assented to, any metropolitan council presents a petition to the Minister of Works praying that the trust shall not be reconstituted as provided in this Act.

I do not think that should be in the Bill and I shall endeavour at the appropriate time to have it removed.

The Hon. T. Playford—Is that a threat or a promise?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is a promise. As I pointed out before, this matter has been subject of a great deal of negotiation. I suppose that Parliament will accept the terms included in this clause but surely it should not be within the power of one metropolitan council to stultify the result of all the negotiations carried out by the Premier, or the result of the deliberations of this Parliament for if the Bill is stultified as the result of any council rendering this clause inoperative I venture to say it will be difficult for the present or any future Premier—I certainly would not like the task next year—to get Parliament to agree to a vote of money to a tramway system in which it had no control. Therefore I ask why is that provision included? Is it inserted as a sop for someone, or is it for the purpose of sabotaging the Bill?

Mr. Quirke—It is put there for the Opposition to take out.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have not learnt that the Government is in the habit of putting things in Bills, more particularly in the last session before an election, to enable the Opposition to display its pertinacity and strength.

Mr. Quirke—It all depends on what the far-reaching results are.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I should say that if this proviso remains in the Bill and as a consequence the personnel of the trust is not changed it will be very difficult for this Parliament to justify a grant to keep the trams running, and that in a very short period the system as we know it will cease to function; then, like the famous story of an illustrious Australian statesman of many years ago, "The fat will be in the fire."

We had some discussion last night in the course of the Premier's speech, mainly by way of interjection by the member for Prospect who was a member of the trust for a number of years, but the position was not quite as good as the honourable member alleged. Members will recollect that I contested this point

at the time. I suggested then that the financial history of the trust had been unsatisfactory, as a cursory glance at it will reveal. Some years after its inception it was found that it was making no provision for the repayment of debentures and legislation had to be passed to provide for this. That was the first financial reconstruction. In 1928 an accumulated deficit of £263,000 was written off by reducing the sinking fund. In 1935 there was an accumulated deficit of £213,000; of this £161,000 was transferred to developmental expenditure; that is, working expenses were converted to capital expenditure. In 1949 legislation was passed to put the finances of the trust on a better footing by adopting the system of repayment of loans as set out in the Financial Agreement. Thus it will be seen that even then the financial affairs of the trust were not as satisfactory as they should have been. I suggest now, as I suggested many years ago on the occasion of one of those adjustments that the question should have been tackled at its source.

Mr. Whittle—The honourable member has not mentioned that prior to 1925 profits of £1,639,610 were used in the enterprise.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Then how does it come about that in 1928 there was an accumulated deficit of £263,000?

Mr. Whittle—That was owing to unrestricted bus operations.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It may have been, but the point is that there have been these periodical readjustments of the finances of the trust and I do not think they were satisfactory. A decision should have been made at one of those periods and the undertaking put on a firm basis once and for all. The losses over the last five years have been progressive and very great. In 1947-48 they were £94,000; in 1948-49, £138,000; 1949-50, £236,000; in 1950-51, £313,000 and in 1951-52, £529,000 or a total of £1,332,000 in five years which, especially in view of the progressive increases in fares in the last three years, is stupendous indeed. The councils have not been called upon at any stage, and I believe that if they had been it would have brought the matter to a head many years ago.

There has been a serious decline in the number of passengers carried by the trams in the last few years due largely to the availability of alternative transport. Plenty of motor cars have been available with ample petrol to run them and, in the case of many of our more fortunate fellow citizens, enough

money to purchase motor cars. I believe that the impact of the private motor car has been even greater in this present period than was the impact of unrestricted bus competition in the late 1920's. Of course nothing can be done about it unless we have complete control of the metropolitan transport system. With that we could probably do something by the introduction of parking facilities and laws. I do not know why the Adelaide City Council should have to provide free parking space, as it does in the various streets of the city, for the private motorist. That did not happen even in the old horse and buggy days, for one could not tie up a horse in the street, but had to take it to a livery or hotel stable when one came to town.

Mr. Whittle—The horses had to be fed.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, but they could be fed in the street because nosebags were not unknown at that time, but today it appears that we must provide parking facilities for motorists whether it is essential that they should drive their cars or not.

Mr. Pattinson—That is not done in many other cities.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I agree. The motorist who must drive his car for business reasons should be permitted to park it within a reasonable distance of his place of business, but I see no reason why people living on or near tram routes should be permitted to drive to town day after day in their own motor cars mainly because such a practice builds up face. A large section of the community, the workers essential to industry, can never hope under present social conditions to afford a motor car and they must use public transport facilities. Every time passengers are lost to public transport as a result of the circumstances to which I have referred the fares of the people compelled to use public transport must be raised in a futile effort to solve the problem; therefore, I believe we are only half tackling the problem by means of this Bill, for we should be considering the Premier's No. 3 proposal for State control of the tramways.

This evening I am saying nothing that I have never said before. I saw this problem years ago and made a number of statements on it, one of which will bear repetition. In a broadcast on February 16 of this year I said:—

The unfortunate position of the tramways is, of course, closely bound up with the whole transport system. It is not merely a matter of rising costs, although this is an important aspect. Transport should be brought under one authority, at least for the metropolitan

area; and it is of such great importance that nothing less than complete nationalization of the tramways will solve the problems with which the trust is confronted. It is quite clear that the trust itself is unequal to the task, and it should be relieved of its authority and responsibility. I suggest that the Municipal Tramways Trust Act should be amended to provide for the control by a board of three members, one of whom would be the General Manager, as Chairman, appointed by the Government, one would represent the interest of the community (also appointed by the Government) and one elected by employees. I would make this board directly responsible to a Minister, who would be the connecting link between the board and Parliament.

I made those suggestions before any report had been made by the Committee of Inquiry and to some extent they are incorporated in this Bill, but the Bill does not go far enough, for I believe all transport should be co-ordinated under a Minister of Transport, who would be responsible to Parliament, and that there should be a board to control the tramways and probably one to control the railways. There should be an overall form of control and co-ordination. We should not refuse a charter to private enterprise to furnish our transport requirements in those areas where it can furnish it more efficiently and cheaply, for I believe that, in order to efficiently meet public demand, there is room in our transport system for public and private transport provided they are properly co-ordinated. Such co-ordination, however, is not altogether a job for the Tramways Trust but rather something about which this Parliament should have the final say. It might be administered by the trust but the Minister of Transport, a person responsible to this Parliament, should have the final say in determining high policy on these matters.

I know that it is intended that the present powers of the trust to license private buses on certain routes are to be continued and be vested in the new form of control. As far as it goes that is quite a worthy object, but the report of the Committee of Inquiry stated that we might recognize there were certain areas where the density of traffic was not great enough to warrant public transport and where we might consider permitting private transport to operate. Although I am not sufficiently conversant with conditions in the metropolitan area to express any dogmatic opinion on that point it is worth considering, but it cannot receive consideration unless the Government has the final say in the control of all forms of transport. I welcome the Premier's promise that the control of ancillary transport, that is transport other than trams and buses as provided

for in the Bill, is to be the subject of an inquiry, and I hope that he will be able to secure the services of Mr. Gillespie, S.M., to conduct that inquiry, for I consider that that gentleman, with any competent assistants who might be appointed by the Government, will be able to bring to bear on this vexed question an able unbiassed judgment which will result in something of lasting benefit to the community. Therefore I have hopes that as a result of such an inquiry, which I hope will be instituted at an early date, the problem regarding ancillary transport will be solved in the near future. In his second reading speech the Premier admitted the importance of that matter, at least in the eyes of the municipalities with whom he was negotiating, and said that at the conference it seemed that the concern of the majority of those in attendance was not what happened to the tramways but what happened to the ancillary forms of transport; therefore it is vital that this matter should be tackled at the earliest possible moment.

In my broadcast to which I have referred I said there should be an employees' representative on the board of three to control the municipal tramways system, and this House should seriously consider an amendment of the clause under which the Governor will appoint the new trust so that at least one member will be a representative of the employees in the undertaking, for much good would come from such an amendment. Firstly, it would result in better relationships between the management and the men who must do the real work of running our transport system, and, secondly, it would be a step towards the adoption of a principle which I have believed for many years must ultimately be incorporated in all our industrial activities, namely, that the workers who in the final analysis are the most important section of the community, should have a real share in the management of our industrial undertakings. At the appropriate time I will move an amendment on those lines.

Although I had hoped that this problem might have been tackled in the more comprehensive way suggested in the Premier's No. 3 proposal, apparently there are four-wheeled brakes preventing action along those lines, but I am prepared to accept the main provisions of the Bill because they provide that the control shall be taken out of the hands of those from whom the Committee of Inquiry said it should be taken and vested in a board of control for

the appointment of which the Government and in the final analysis Parliament will be responsible. Parliament will have to be mindful of the proposal in another part of the Bill that the Treasurer may from time to time make grants to assist in meeting the expenses of the trust, and that should make Parliament jealous of the fact that it is responsible for the control of this undertaking and realize that it is in the interests of the taxpayer and the community generally that that control should be the most efficient possible. I note that it is intended that the members appointed to the new trust shall be paid in accordance with amounts to be determined by the Government from time to time, and I hope the Government will not be niggardly, for this new body will have a very great duty to perform to the public in the next few years and its members should be recompensed for devoting a great deal of their time to discharging that duty.

I believe that, unless we pass this Bill, we will be unable to keep our street transport system running, and, if it were to be discontinued, it would be a serious calamity to our metropolitan community. Therefore I support the second reading.

Mr. PATTINSON (Glenelg)—I listened to the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition with attention and interest, as I usually do, and find myself substantially in agreement with most of what he said. Largely for the reasons he gave, I support the Bill. Realizing at the commencement of the session that legislation to abolish the Municipal Tramways Trust Board and to provide Government financial assistance for the undertaking was inevitable, I spoke at length on the subject on July 30 during the debate on the Address in Reply. My remarks were given considerable prominence in the daily press, but I will not weary the House with a repetition of them. However, having reread the report of my speech in *Hansard* I would not, if I had the opportunity, cancel a single word of it. Subsequent events have justified the views I then expressed because the Government has come a long way towards adopting the proposals which some of the metropolitan members, including myself, desired and considered inevitable. When Parliament subsequently adopts the recommendations of a special committee which the Premier yesterday promised he would appoint, I believe that Parliament will have gone the whole way and will have adopted, in its entirety, the third proposal put by the Premier to the councils.

Many members criticised the Premier's second proposal to the councils and said that the third was the only one that could solve the problem. As I interjected to the Leader of the Opposition, this Bill, in effect, is nearly proposal No. 3—certainly $2\frac{3}{4}$ of it—because from the second proposal the Bill has deleted control of the trust by the councils. It has also deleted the limit of five years' financial assistance which the Premier insisted on earlier, and he has announced that the Government will appoint a special and impartial committee to consider the problem of ancillary vehicles, such as taxicabs, and the question of the control of parking. I consider I am sufficient of a prophet to foretell the result of that inquiry, and when it is adopted by Parliament we shall have fully adopted, as we should, the Premier's third proposal.

Mr. Moir—It might take us 12 months to do it.

Mr. Stott—It has been inevitable from the start.

Mr. PATTINSON—I do not think there is any escape from it. The negotiations by the various constituent councils did not reflect any great credit on some of their official spokesmen. I found some speaking with two voices. Many of them engaged in conversations on the topic within the hearing of large groups of people and some said they were definitely in favour of scheme No. 3, yet I read newspaper reports that they voted in favour of No. 2, and then castigated the member for Norwood for being a model of consistency. I find it hard to understand the workings of their mind. Several of the metropolitan councils are completely out of touch with public opinion on this matter which, I am sure, is overwhelmingly in favour of scheme No. 3. The Glenelg Council by a majority vote favoured the second proposal I was a member, and Mayor, of the Glenelg Council for many years, and every member of that council is a great friend of mine. I have a great admiration for them and have found them usually somewhere near right in their decisions, but they were completely out of touch with public opinion in their district on this occasion.

Mr. Stott—The council would have had a different opinion if you were still mayor.

Mr. PATTINSON—I do not know about that, but on July 30, when speaking on the Address in Reply, I said:—

I believe that the Premier's third proposal was by far the best, and the only one capable of finally solving the transport problems of the metropolitan area.

I considered that the undertaking should be controlled by a board consisting of men possessing the highest possible qualifications, men with wide experience who have shown capacity in transport, industry, commerce, administration, and in the organization of employees. Those latter views of mine are not original: they are the opinions expressed by a Royal Commission in Great Britain consisting of men of the highest calibre who spent much time investigating all methods of land transport. That commission used those words when recommending the type of members who should comprise such a board. I sincerely hope, when it comes to the appointment of the board, that the personnel will be considered with great care by the Government, because even though we are to pump financial aid into the trust over a long period of years, money alone will not put the undertaking back on its feet. Much will depend on the type of men appointed to the new board. I do not necessarily agree with the views expressed by the Leader of the Opposition that there should be a union representative, or employees' representative, on the board.

Mr. Fred Walsh—He would not have the knowledge, would he?

Mr. PATTINSON—I do not want to see any section or interest imported into this legislation.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You would confine the new board to business men?

Mr. PATTINSON—No, the honourable member is being too impetuous. I would have no objection to an employees' representative being appointed to the board if he had the requisite capacity. I do not wish to see any provision that, willy-nilly, a representative of employees should be on the board. I hope that men experienced in industry and commerce, and certainly experienced in transport matters will be appointed, because transport is the matter the board will have to administer.

Mr. Stott—The people who pay for the upkeep of the tramways should be represented.

Mr. PATTINSON—I would not object to that, but I hope the Government will not hastily appoint the board and, if necessary, it should seek suitable men from outside the State. This applies particularly to the appointment of the chairman. I do not suggest that the Government cannot get the right men in the State, but it would be a good investment to go outside, if necessary.

Mr. Macgillivray—You might have to go outside this world to get the right men.

Mr. Stephens—You want men of practical experience.

Mr. PATTINSON—That is vitally necessary. In order to cope with what is essentially a transport problem we need to appoint someone who knows something about transport.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Sir William Goodman seems to have known something, but he made a mess of it.

Mr. PATTINSON—In recent months I have had a fairly close association with the present general manager, Mr. Keynes. I am not a transport or traffic expert, but I have formed a high opinion of his ability. He has a modern outlook and has studied the transport organizations of many countries. I believe he will be a great success in his job. We are not concerned with the general manager, the chief traffic manager or the chief engineer, but with the construction of the trust. Its members should be appointed with the greatest care and foresight. Every committee of inquiry in Great Britain and in the States of Australia has recommended the same thing. There have been numerous inquiries in the last ten years, and we have the monumental work of the Royal Commission on Transport in Great Britain.

Mr. Stott—Quite apart from the qualifications of the members, should not those who pay the most have a voice on the trust?

Mr. PATTINSON—Yes. We should not fetter the hands of the Government by laying down any particular categories in the Bill. The report of the committee of inquiry seems to have come as a surprise to a large number of people, and the final report of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services, which was laid on the table on June 27, 1951, has also largely escaped attention. That Royal Commission, of which Judge Paine was chairman, and the Auditor-General, Mr. Bishop, a member, dealt with the problem of the Tramways Trust in great detail. They made some very pertinent comments which have always appealed to me, and they dealt with the aspects of economic running and the obsolescence of the rolling stock. They referred also to the need to get down to a proper efficient basis of running and to the increases in fares being the main reason for the lack of custom. On page 32 of that report the following appears:—

To meet competition, it is obviously essential to provide an efficient and attractive service in up to date vehicles. A study of the trust's annual statements of accounts shows that since 1939 there has been, up to July 1, 1950 no

appreciable new tram rolling stock added, although 40 large (class H) tram cars are in course of construction. The only appreciable additions to rolling stock have been to motor buses and trolley buses.

Further on the report said:—

Evidence as to the rapidly increasing obsolescence of rolling stock may be seen, even if due allowance is made for increases in cost of labour and materials, from the cost of rolling stock maintenance over the same period. The points which have been emphasized above indicate that the Municipal Tramways Trust for some time past has failed to keep its trams up to a reasonably modern and efficient standard, but has retained obsolete and unattractive rolling stock.

There was also a comparison with the position of the railways:—

There seems no substantial reason why, notwithstanding the difficulties in respect of supply of materials and labour and of increasing costs, this policy of inaction with regard to the tramway rolling stock should have been followed. Faced with similar obstacles the Railways Department, as a reference to its annual reports will show, throughout the war managed to increase its rolling stock each year and during the past four years has been particularly active in this respect. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board during and after the war has added appreciably to its rolling stock. From 1940 to 1950, exclusive of additions for 1941 and 1942 for which figures are not obtainable, 94 new electric tramcars were put into service.

Due economy of operation is a factor which must receive attention in carrying out a policy of efficiency, because the cost of service is closely related to the fares charged—a feature which has much influence with tram patrons. The trust increased its fares in July, 1947, and again in February, 1948, and in April, 1950. The effect of these increases cannot be assessed but no doubt they caused some recession in public support.

I have no doubt that the successive increases in fares have been a potent factor in the waning of the custom afforded the trust. In recent years, more particularly since we have had the fare increases, motor traffic on Anzac Highway between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m., and 5 p.m. and 6 p.m., has increased enormously. There are two or three lanes of motor cars, almost bumper bar to bumper bar, coming into the city in the morning and going westward at night. One man brings in two or three people in his motor car, and others use their vehicles turn about. Many of these motorists are not employers but salary earners, and normally they travel on the trams or buses, but now they find it cheaper to travel by their motor cars and to bring in three or four passengers at a time. The policy of continually increasing fares is a policy of despair.

I was pleased to read in the Sydney press a few weeks ago that the New South Wales Minister of Transport strongly urged his Cabinet to accept his recommendation to drastically reduce fares in the metropolitan area of Sydney in order to attract custom back to the various forms of public transport. I act as solicitor for a large number of men who are licensed by various Government authorities to operate vehicles for the carriage of passengers in the metropolitan area, in the country, and to other States. I am a director of a company which is engaged solely in the transport of passengers on a thousand miles journey from Alice Springs to Darwin. The policy of every licensed operator with whom I am associated is to keep fares down as low as possible. He knows his greatest competitor is the private motor car owner and that unless he can provide an efficient and attractive service at a reasonable fare he cannot wean people away from using their own private motor cars. The private operator keeps costs of operation as low as possible by using the best business methods. He cuts out waste and inefficiency in order to keep fares down. I have attended conferences in Melbourne of passenger service operators, and, with the exception of a few short-sighted people, that is the policy adopted all over Australia. In some cases fares might be a little higher than is desired, but it is because minimum fares have been imposed by a licensing authority in order to avoid competition with some form of public transport.

One of the greatest mistakes made by the Tramways Trust, and a mistake which the private operator does not make, has been the lack of standardization of vehicles. The trust has a motley collection of trams and motor buses. With the motor bus there is not the interchangeability of engines or parts. Costs of maintenance are increased and there is not the same flexibility of staff. As the years go by I hope the new trust will endeavour to bring its rolling stock up to standard. There is a need for the various State tramway undertakings to confer with a view to a greater standardization of tram vehicles. It costs an enormous amount of money to construct a tram and if every tramway system in Australia uses a different type of vehicle the manufacturers cannot get down to a fine price, as they could if they turned out a large number of vehicles of the same type.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is a useful suggestion.

Mr. PATTINSON—There is scope for saving money by doing that. I do not think it is beyond the realms of possibility. It just has not been done previously. I am sure it would be an advantage if that suggestion were followed up. The Leader of the Opposition referred to private bus operators. If members look at the map in the committee's final report they will be amazed at the growth in the metropolitan area during the last 10 or 15 years, and I think they will also be amazed to see the extent to which transport services in the metropolitan area are supplied by private operators. A big majority of the people in my electorate could not be transported to and from the city and throughout the district but for private bus operators. I agree with the committee that there is still further scope for private bus services in the outer areas. Present tramway services which are lightly patronized could, with great success, be handed over to private enterprise. It is remarkable that many private operators are given a licence by the trust to operate a service which it does not want itself because it says it would run them into heavy losses.

Mr. Quirke—Do you know of any who have gone bankrupt?

Mr. PATTINSON—No, but I know of a number who from very small beginnings have built up large fleets of vehicles and are now men of substance. I am pleased to see that.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The trust subsidizes some of them.

Mr. PATTINSON—Some of these men would be prepared to subsidize the trust by paying for the right to operate in an area and also pay a percentage of their annual takings to the trust.

Mr. O'Halloran—That was suggested by the committee of inquiry.

Mr. PATTINSON—Yes. The new trust could seriously consider, among other things, not opening new services unnecessarily, but farming out some of its very lightly patronized services on which it is now making losses. Private enterprise would soon convert those losses into profits. I recall an article appearing in the American magazine *Bus Transportation* of July, 1952, under the heading "New York sells Five Lines; May not Retain any Buses." It includes the following:—

N.Y.C. Omnibus Corporation successful bidder on Manhattan bus routes; city official would like to see all bus operations returned to private enterprise. Is New York City going to go the whole hog and get out of the bus business entirely? It is a good question, for

this reason; it is the expressed hope of Lazarus Joseph, comptroller of the city and a man who carries a lot of weight at the city hall. Last month the board voted to accept the bid of New York City Omnibus Corp. headed by John E. McCarthy, for five city-owned bus routes in Manhattan. It offered to buy the lines for 1,750,000 dollars. In addition, the company will pay about 200,000 dollars a year (5 per cent of gross revenue), 85,000 dollars annual rental on two garages and, the city figures, about 50,000 dollars a year in interest on the purchase price. . . . While under city control the five lines lost about 300,000 dollars a year. Under private ownership they will, the company naturally thinks, make a profit.

I have not the slightest doubt that it will succeed in doing what it proposes. I believe there is a field to be explored in that direction by the new trust, in view of the tremendous growth in the metropolitan area. Yesterday the Premier said he would refer the question of ancillary transport to a special committee for inquiry. I recall an article appearing in the *News* of March 10 last, written by the special feature writer, Mr. Blake Brownrigg, under the heading "Public Inquiry into Taxi Services Needed." It contained the following:—

Persistent demands for a public inquiry into the Adelaide taxi industry should be granted without delay. There is immediate need to answer at least four questions:—(1) Is the present rather loose-knit supervision of metropolitan services by the Adelaide City Council and suburban councils satisfactory? (2) If not, is it capable of development into a closely co-ordinated set-up, guaranteeing efficient operation of enough taxis to meet all public demands at the same time offering taxi operators prospects of a reasonable living without working excessive hours? (3) Should taxi services be administered by a one-control authority appointed by the Transport Control Board? (4) How much truth is there in allegations of trafficking in licences, dummy operators, pirating by unlicensed taxis, refusal to accept fares on race days, and other undesirable practices?

Finally, during the course of a lengthy and most searching article, the contents of which I have some knowledge, he concludes by saying that he is not prepared to believe all the allegations, but there is no doubt that there is much which is undesirable in the control of taxi cabs in the city of Adelaide and much which could be cleared up. Finally, he says:—

Dissatisfaction with City Council control of taxis in Melbourne culminated in the State Government handing over complete responsibility to the Transport Regulation Board on February 1.

Melbourne followed the example previously set out in Sydney, where taxis were at one time

municipally controlled, but so dissatisfied was every section of the community, including proprietors of taxis, that they were removed from municipal control and handed over to the Transport Commission. Anybody who visits Sydney today must be convinced, as I have been convinced, of the tremendous improvement in the taxi cab business there compared with what it was before.

I associate myself with the Leader of the Opposition's remarks about the deletion of the clause giving councils the power to petition against the Bill. It was significant that the Premier asked the Leader of the Opposition whether his remark was a threat or a promise. If the Premier is half as delighted when that clause is deleted as I am he will be a very pleased man. It would be wholly undemocratic for one council to be allowed to torpedo this most urgent and necessary legislation and would make a farce of Parliament. I have a high regard for local government, having been a member and a mayor of councils in both the country and the metropolitan area. I have said during the months that these rather futile negotiations have been proceeding that it is a problem for Parliament itself. We are responsible for spending the taxpayers' money and it is our responsibility to clear up this mess. I will not be a party to allowing any council or group of councils to veto this legislation merely by the presentation of a petition to the Minister.

Mr. Macgillivray—What would be the result if any council wished to contract out of this clause? It is only an empty gesture.

Mr. PATTINSON—It is not only an empty gesture, but a very tempting one. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I support the second reading and trust that the Bill will be dealt with expeditiously because of the serious financial position in which the Tramways Trust finds itself. As far as I am concerned, the House can pass the measure tomorrow and allow the Legislative Council to deal with it next week. For some time the financial position of the trust has been causing the public, and doubtless the trust itself, much concern. I represent a section of the public in Adelaide who use trams and buses a lot. First of all the trust endeavoured to overcome its difficulties by increasing fares, but found that as they were increased its deficits grew.

Mr. Whittle—The trust got more gross revenue.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, but its deficits grew. In 1951 it had a £500,000 deficit. The shortening of sections did not solve the problem and the trust will have to shut up shop unless the Government can save it from its present situation. The Premier's proposals were reasonable. I prefer No. 3. He was most fair to the councils in giving them a choice. However, they could not agree amongst themselves. The Adelaide City Council seems to be the stumbling block. Greater unanimity would have been reached if it were not for the City Council desiring to retain certain traffic rights, the fixing of parking areas and the licensing of taxis. Let us examine what has happened regarding the increase of fares. The minimum fare from Adelaide to the Wayville Showgrounds is 9d. and therefore it would cost a man with a wife and three children about 3s. 9d. to go from Adelaide, through the parklands to, say, the Exhibition. In addition, he has to pay his fares from, say, Norwood to the city, whereas he could take a taxi from Norwood to Wayville for practically the same price as he would pay from Adelaide to the showgrounds and travel much more comfortably.

Mr. O'Halloran—And leave his own gate and return to it.

Mr. LAWN—Exactly. Many old age pensioners find it necessary to go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for medical treatment, in most cases at least once a week, and in many cases more. At one time they could travel by tram from anywhere within the city to the hospital for a minimum fare of 3d. Today they have to pay for two sections, for which the fare is 6d., for there are not many people resident in the northern part of the city, the main residential area being in the southern part. It may be said that the Bill proposes that any deficit in future shall be found by the taxpayers of the State and not the ratepayers of the metropolitan area, and there is no limit to the period they will have to do so. The Premier, in submitting his original proposals to the councils, said he would make grants for the next five years; £450,000 for the first, £350,000 for the second, £250,000 for the third, £100,000 for the fourth and £30,000 for the fifth year, or a total of £1,180,000 as a contribution from the taxpayers, leaving the present control to remain, if that was desired. This Bill, however, does not limit the making good of deficits to five years, but commits the taxpayer until the Act is amended or Parliament refuses further monetary grants. I have no complaints against that proposition. It

should be controlled by the Government and any profits should revert to the Government—

Mr. Macgillivray—Did you say profits?

Mr. LAWN—Yes.

Mr. Macgillivray—If they break even they will be lucky.

Mr. LAWN—I am not so pessimistic as the honourable member. The interim report of the inquiry committee reveals that in some States the tramways have been doing very well—

Mr. Macgillivray—Which States?

Mr. LAWN—Queensland and Victoria, and I think the Treasurer said in his second reading speech that for the first 44 years the trust here more than paid its way. Many people today are finding it hard to pay their way. Although I do not altogether believe them, some members opposite have stated that some employers are finding it difficult. I read in the press this morning that a person appearing before the Arbitration Court on behalf of the Metal Trades Employers' Association admitted, upon questioning by Judge Foster, that his concern was doing quite well under the 40-hour week, and the only fault he had to find was with the increased Commonwealth taxation. I mention that to emphasize my point that there are many business concerns who claim that it is hard to keep on making the record profits they have made in the last few years, so this phase through which the Tramways Trust is passing may not be serious. If, in the first 44 years, it more than paid its way I am optimistic enough to believe that it will once more pay its way in the future.

Mr. Moir—Does the honourable member still believe it paid for 44 years after hearing the figures given by the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. LAWN—I am not so pessimistic as to say that it will go on making deficits and never any profits in the future. I do not oppose the provision that Parliament shall make good any deficits. Our railway system serves the people in the country as well as those in the city, and country people who figuratively speaking, "have been riding on the sheep's back" and who cannot complain of being in necessitous circumstances enjoy concessions which are paid for by the general taxpayer. On November 13 last year I asked the Minister of Railways:—

Are concessions granted to consignees of certain goods on the railways, and, if so, can the Minister of Railways indicate the classes of freight on which such concessions operate and give an estimate of the amount involved?

The Minister replied:—

The question is very wide, as the schedule covering railway rates is contained in a volume almost as large as a bound sessional volume of

Hansard. The general principle is that the freight system is so assessed that the goods best able to pay in the main pay the higher freight, having regard always to the primary importance of having the lower rates for such essentials as superphosphate, firewood and agricultural machinery. Every rate is fixed on the basis of a fair charge for a fair service. If the honourable member has in mind any particular item I will try to get the information he requires.

The Minister said that the schedule covering railway rates is contained in a volume almost as large as a volume of *Hansard*.

Mr. Christian—He was referring to the whole book of rates and not to concessional rates only.

Mr. LAWN—Both my question and his reply were quite clear, and the taxpayer must pay for all those concessions.

Mr. Quirke—They are one-way concessions to Adelaide, and double and treble the freight rate must be paid on some commodities going to the country.

Mr. LAWN—If the taxpayer is asked to make good the deficit on metropolitan tramways there should be no complaint, for he is called upon to subsidize country freight rates on the railways. In view of the fact that the Government is to take away from the councils their obligation to make good any deficit, it is wrong for the City Council to hold a gun at the Premier's head and say, "We want the right to control taxis." In the past few years there has been much talk about a racket in taxi licences, and for some reason the City Council does not want to lose its authority over their issue. The Premier should have told the City Council that, as his Government was going to subsidize the metropolitan transport system with taxpayers' money, he insisted on the right to control all transport. Recently, there have been too many squabbles in the City Council over the issue of taxi licences and complaints that returned soldiers could not obtain licences unless they paid about £1,000. Why do the city fathers wish to retain control of taxi licences? Is it because a racket is involved?

Mr. Moir—They have their pimps who report on the activities of suburban taxi operators.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, that is another squabble between the City Council and suburban taxi operators. The City Council says that suburban taxis may not pick up a fare in Adelaide unless they are engaged specifically. They may not ply for hire.

Mr. Whittle—There is no squabble about that, for the suburban councils realize it.

Mr. LAWN—The squabble is between the Adelaide City Council and suburban taxi operators. Although the Government is to appoint the board to control the tramways and it is to make good any deficit, the City Council still wants authority to control parking. Tram passengers need a safety zone in which to wait and buses need a reserved space at the kerb where they may pick up passengers, and the Government which subsidizes the transport system should have the right to control those areas, but the city council wants to retain the right to fix parking areas.

Mr. Maegillivray—What happens in regard to stands for taxi cabs operating in the metropolitan area?

Mr. LAWN—I am opposed to the Adelaide city council maintaining its right to control the licences of taxi cabs and to fix the parking areas. The Premier said that if the councils wanted the Government to finance the undertaking it should have the control over parking. Those who run the tramways and bus services must have some say in where they will pick up and drop passengers. If the city council says it will not allow the transport services to pick up passengers at a certain spot they will be in a dilemma. I think the question of the control of parking was the most serious obstacle in the reaching of agreement between the councils. Several press reports said that various councils were prepared to accept the third proposal and that they asked if something could not be agreed upon between the Adelaide city council and the Premier on the parking question.

Mr. Quirke—Why does the council want to retain this control? Doesn't it make a big loss in paying men to police the areas?

Mr. Moir—The council is playing with the idea of increasing the penalty to 10s. so that it can show a profit.

Mr. LAWN—It is evident that the Adelaide city council has been the main stumbling block in the way of reaching agreement on the Premier's third proposal. Many people wonder why the Tramways Trust cannot make a profit because private bus services run at a profit. There are various reasons. Perhaps a man and his sons start in business with one or two buses. As the business progresses they may engage one or two drivers, but the overhead in a small concern like that is practically nil. However, the overhead of a large transport system covering the whole of the metropolitan area is great. When in Melbourne last Monday I read a statement in the *Herald* that a partnership of two

persons running a suburban bus service had grown so much that 25 or more buses are now running. The persons concerned have stated openly that the business has become too big for them and that they have offered it to the Victorian Government, I think for £25,000.

Mr. Macgillivray—But they did make a success of it, which is more than the tramways have done here?

Mr. LAWN—Yes, but I do not say that the tramways cannot be made to pay here.

Mr. Macgillivray—Then why the need for all this monetary assistance?

Mr. LAWN—The member for Chaffey has criticized the Government on many occasions and, in effect, he is now saying that nothing can be made to succeed, even if we adopt the methods he has advocated in levelling criticism against Ministers. I am sure he told his constituents that he could do a better job for them than any of his opponents could, but when he gets here he says it does not matter what we do, no undertaking can be successful. I would like him to tell us how it is possible to run the tramway system successfully.

The Hon. T. Playford—He will finish up by supporting the Bill.

Mr. LAWN—I have no doubt about it. He has often criticized the railways, but I would like him to live in the metropolitan area and have to patronize a private bus service. When I go home I get in a tramway bus, and later transfer to a private bus. Last night I caught the tramway bus opposite the railway station and arrived at Marion Road at twenty minutes to seven. The private bus should have been there at two minutes to seven, but it did not come until twenty-eight minutes past. As a result, I got home half an hour late. The member for Goodwood knows that there are many complaints about this private bus service. Often people waiting for the bus are told by passing motorists that it has broken down. The service is not run by one concern, but by several. It all depends on who is running the bus whether it will be on time. A bus may be due at five minutes to nine and is usually on time if one group is running the bus, but if another group is responsible for supplying the bus it may not be there until five minutes past nine. That is not the type of service we get from the trust. We get a good service, although it might cost a little more. It runs ten and five

minute services, and sometimes three minute services. There is a bus service down the Port Road every two or three minutes. Private bus operators cannot do that. A private enterprise service cannot be as good as a Government service. It is rumoured in my area that the trust will run a bus service from Glenelg to Morphett Road, up Gray Street behind the racecourse, down Marion Road to Sweetman's Road, and then up South Road to the city. The residents are praying for that day to come because it will mean a better transport system than is now available. I support the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that in the constitution of the new trust every consideration should be given to the appointment of a trust employee. Employees at the abattoirs have a representative on the Abattoirs Board and I have heard of no criticism of that procedure. In the industries where there are few industrial disputes there is the closest consultation between employer and employee. In many industries there are periodical consultations between the management and the workers. The Premier has said many times how he appreciates what is done by South Australian workers and the wise leadership of trade unions. I have been a trades union leader and I know how beneficial are these periodical conferences. It would be advantageous to appoint a trust employee as a member of the trust. He would know the problems facing the other employees and his presence on the trust would bring about happy results.

Mr. Moir—Could there not be frequent consultations between the trust and the employees?

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member wants to get the views of the employees by means of periodical conferences but he does not want to appoint one of them as a trust member. He does not mind the employee pointing out what mistakes have been made, but he believes that trust membership must be reserved for businessmen because they are the only people competent to act in that way. The Government must take a broader view of the matter. I hope the remarks of members on this side will be considered.

Mr. MOIR secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 2, at 2 p.m.