

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, October 2, 1952.

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

QUESTIONS.**SALE OF HOUSING TRUST HOMES.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In speaking on the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act Amendment Bill on Tuesday the honourable member for Onkaparinga said he understood the Housing Trust was having difficulty in selling prefabricated houses and that a person could now buy from the Housing Trust any number of them at a cost of about £2,450 each. Can the Premier say whether the trust has surplus houses available for sale, and, if so, in what locality and at what price they are selling?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The most recent advice I had from the Housing Trust in connection with its housing programme was that it was now better off in supplying houses than it had been, although there is a very big back lag with regard to brick houses for purchase or rental, as they are still in great demand, there still being about 10,000 applicants requiring this type of house. The trust is selling its imported prefabricated houses freely as they are erected, and there is no surplus. At present the Housing Trust is maintaining a very good output. During August 386 houses were occupied by various sized families throughout the State, and I fancy that in September the number made available by the trust will be found to exceed 400. I have had no intimation that the trust has had any difficulty in selling its houses. I have been told that a number of persons desiring to buy houses may be having difficulty in finding deposits, for in some instances the money is not so freely available as previously to finance the purchase of houses, but apart from that I know of no lessening in the demand for houses.

ELECTRICITY FOR SPRINGTON AND EDEN VALLEY.

Mr. TEUSNER—A constituent of mine has written to me as follows:—

I want to ask if there is anything you can do to speed up the day when Springton and Eden Valley will be connected to the electricity supply. We were told we would have the extension in about two years. That time has passed and the only work done is about a dozen

poles by the roadside. To me, personally, it would mean a great deal to be sure of the position as we have almost finished a new home on property just out of town and we don't know whether to make do with lamps, candles, etc., or to forget our hopes of electricity and invest in some efficient power unit of our own. Can the Premier indicate when the work is likely to be proceeded with? If not, will he bring down a report next week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

LAND SETTLEMENT AGISTMENT FEES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yesterday the member for Alexandra asked the Minister of Lands a question regarding the agistment of stock at Kangaroo Island. In the course of his reply the Minister said:—

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.

Seeing that so far, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no writing off of the cost of these properties, what would happen to the money in the event of no writing off taking place? Will it be used to reduce the capital cost of the property seeing that the agistment money has in effect been earned by the property?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

TOTALIZATOR FAULT AT BALAKLAVA.

Mr. PATTINSON—At a recent race meeting at Balaklava a mobile automatic totalizator ran amok and overpaid many investors and—what has not been publicized—also underpaid many other investors. The following day I asked the Premier if he would obtain a report from the Commissioner of Police, firstly as to whether or not it would be possible to set or rig such a machine and, secondly, what safeguards against a repetition of such an occurrence, either by accident or design, was proposed by the Commissioner of Police. I understand that the Premier has received a report from him. In fairness to the company, and for the satisfaction of the public, I ask him to make it public.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have a very long report furnished by Detective-Sergeant Packman, but I think the matter can be summarized by quoting the covering minute from the Commissioner of Police. If any member desires to see the detective's report it is

freely available. The report of the Commissioner of Police states:—

The matter of the faulty working of the mobile automatic totalizator at the Balaklava race meeting on 17th September has been fully investigated by a detective-sergeant in the Criminal Investigation Branch in collaboration with the Chief Police Radio Technician and the South Australian manager of Automatic Totalizators Ltd. A copy of the report is appended for information. It appears that the trouble arose through the technician having wrongly connected the various electrical leads between the respective units of the apparatus. This fault could and should have been discovered if proper tests, as laid down by the company, had been carried out prior to commencing operations for the day. The lack of complete testing was occasioned by delay in mounting part of the equipment which became bogged down whilst being transported to the course. In the present instance the company concerned has lost a considerable sum of money and has taken steps to obviate a recurrence. It is not considered likely, nor would it be possible without extensive collusion, for the totalizator to be rigged, or the units assembled in such a manner as to deliberately deprive investors of a proper dividend from the machine. It is certain also that the present instance was the result of misadventure. Instructions have been issued to police officers engaged on totalizator supervision duties to inspect and check the couplings on these machines, and to view tests and certify to same on the reports furnished at the conclusion of each meeting where mobile automatic totalizators are used.

MIGRANT HOSTELS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—In reply to a question on September 17 by Mr. Frank Walsh in connection with the provision of kitchenettes in migrant hostels the Premier made the following statement, *inter alia*:—

If the Commonwealth was interested I would be prepared to take up the matter with the trust, and I was certain the trust would erect the kitchenettes at cost to the Commonwealth. Subsequently, a Commonwealth officer associated with the administration of the hostels discussed the matter with me and I repeated what I had told to the two Parliamentary representatives of the district.

He further went on to say:—

I repeat that if the Commonwealth Government desires it my Government will be pleased to carry out the work expeditiously and at the lowest possible price.

I wish to quote from a letter by the Acting Minister for Labour and National Service, Mr. McBride, to Mr. Clyde Cameron, M.H.R., as follows:—

If the State Government puts a proposition to the Commonwealth to take over a hostel and convert it to homes I will give it the utmost consideration and sympathy . . . I desire to inform you that recently it was

informally suggested to Mr. Playford that if his Government desired to see kitchenettes added to hostels the Commonwealth would be prepared to make a hostel available for this purpose to the South Australian Government on a reasonable basis, but the suggestion met with no response.

Is the statement in the Minister's letter to Mr. Cameron in accordance with facts? If so, why did the Commonwealth suggestion meet with no response?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The letter is so much out of accordance with facts that I should like to see the correspondence. The position is that two members for the district, Mr. Whittle, the local member, and Mr. K. C. Wilson, M.H.R., member for Sturt, asked me privately whether the South Australian Government would be prepared to undertake the erection of kitchenettes, and if so on what terms and the approximate price. That conversation took place in the dining room of this House, and I said, offhand, that I thought the cost would probably be in the nature of £200 and that the member for the district had every right to quote me as saying that the South Australian Government was prepared to undertake that work. Subsequently, two Federal Ministers discussed this with me. One of them was Mr. McBride, who discussed it from two angles. The first was whether the Government would be prepared to install the kitchenettes, and I informed him that we would do it at cost. The second was whether the State Government would be prepared to take over a hostel and control it, installing kitchenettes and letting the accommodation as ordinary residential premises. I told Mr. McBride that, provided the conditions were satisfactory, I saw no difficulty in the latter suggestion, but that the State Government would not be prepared to take over any hostel unless the rental conditions were, in our opinion, satisfactory. Mr. McBride then said that he would submit proposals to us. In the meantime, I had another letter from Mr. K. C. Wilson saying that the Commonwealth, he thought, was interested in the kitchenettes, and on the strength of his letter I asked the Housing Trust to submit a recommendation as to the kitchenettes, their cost, and how long it would take to build them. That information has been secured, with full plans, and I believe it is at present on its way to Canberra. That sets out the present position, and if any honourable member desires to see the plans, the quote, or any other information it will be made available to him. I have heard the propaganda that Mr. C. R. Cameron has put out in the

Commonwealth House on a number of occasions. Categorically, this is the position. If the Commonwealth desires the State to give assistance in providing kitchenettes for hostels, the State Government is prepared to undertake the work expeditiously at cost, the Commonwealth to pay for the work. If the Commonwealth Government desires the State Government to take them over as the fore-runner of a housing proposition, the matter will be examined, and if the terms and conditions are, in the opinion of the State Government, satisfactory, it will undertake the work.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Is it correct that the suggestion has not met with any rebuff?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The discussion with Mr. McBride was that the Commonwealth would put up a proposition regarding the terms upon which the place could be made into a single-unit proposition. I have not had any proposition placed before me. In the correspondence there is evidently a big misunderstanding, probably by the officer who prepared the documents, or Mr. McBride has forgotten one of the conversations he had with me.

KIRTON POINT POWER HOUSE.

Mr. PEARSON—My question relates to the establishment of a power house at Kirton Point. I understand that part of the programme there is to install a turbine plant driven by steam derived from coal. The people of Kirton Point are wondering what provision will be made to get the coal from the jetty to the site of the power house, and whether it will mean a spur line of railway to the power house from the jetty. They do not desire this, because it would spoil the foreshore. Will the Treasurer get a report from the Electricity Trust as to its plans, so that the matter can be further investigated?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

HOUSING TRUST TEMPORARY HOMES.

Mr. STEPHENS—I have been informed that there are over 1,000 applicants for Housing Trust homes in the metropolitan area. I have also been informed that many applications for temporary homes have been made by people who have received eviction orders and others who live in tents and sheds and other unsuitable places unfit for habitation. I have been informed, too, that the Housing Trust does not intend to build any more temporary homes and will only complete those it has on hand. Is this the policy of the Government

and the Housing Trust? If not, who is responsible for not proceeding with the erection of temporary homes and how long will it be before the 1,000 applicants receive homes? The temporary homes are giving relief from the awful conditions under which they are living and if we close down on the erection of temporary homes the position will become worse.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The temporary homes scheme was promoted and financed by the Government, with the Housing Trust as the building and collecting agency. The scheme was based on an emergency and followed a very close inspection which indicated that the serious position should be met. The accommodation was approved at a time when it was impossible to get either tradesmen or materials for erecting permanent homes. That position, however, does not now obtain, as materials are available to provide permanent homes. The Housing Trust's programme is capable of expansion to the full resources of capital available to the Government, but the Government will have the greatest difficulty in financing the present programme with the money provided by Parliament and the Loan Council for the purpose. In those circumstances it would not be feasible, in the Government's opinion, to commence building another batch of temporary houses, because it could only be done at the expense of permanent houses, which the Government believes are the most satisfactory proposition in every way.

SALT THREAT TO ARTESIAN BASIN.

Mr. FLETCHER—Some time ago I asked whether there was any possibility of private interests drilling bores into the saline basin below the freshwater basin which Adelaide has to rely upon during water restrictions and desired to know whether the freshwater basin would be endangered by this type of unrestricted boring. I understood the Minister to say that a very close watch was being kept on the position. The following item under the heading "New Bore" appeared in the *News* of September 24 last:—

Kooyonga's bore water problem has lessened considerably in recent weeks. The main bore near the fourteenth is working well and is now capable of pumping 10,000 gall. an hour—sufficient to keep 34 of the 75 sprinklers on the course in operation. In addition, a new bore is being sunk between the fourth and eighth holes. Earlier in the season the salty water coming from the bores has provided officials with one of their biggest "headaches" in years.

In view of the seriousness of the statement can the Minister of Works say what information

the department has on this matter? I mentioned this matter to him earlier this week so that he would have a chance to furnish a reply today. This morning's *Advertiser* contains the following report:—

Salt Threat to Artesian Bores.—A serious threat to the underground water reservoir in the Adelaide plains artesian basin from salt contamination by abandoned or improperly sealed bores is feared by the Mines Department. Unless bores are effectively lined and sealed above the freshwater level, salt water can move down between the casing and the walls of the bore and contaminate the freshwater. The department recommends that abandoned bores, whether "salt" or not, be tightly plugged with an impermeable mixture, such as clay and cement, to separate permanently the salt and freshwater levels.

I have great fears with regard to this fresh water basin for I know what has occurred in other districts from my experience as a member of the Public Works Committee. I also have in mind what has happened in Gippsland, Victoria, where the indiscriminate digging of holes and bores and the letting in of salt water has ruined that area as an oilfield. Can the Minister say what is the position with regard to this valuable basin on which the city of Adelaide must depend in the event of a shortage of water?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—At the outset it should be stated that the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department take an intensive interest in this subject, but it should not be thought for a moment that the whole of the underground water supply around Adelaide is contained in one huge underground basin, for it is at different levels and is of different quality in each bore. Some people think that the Adelaide underground water supply is a great underground stream of water and that, if affected in one locality, the whole will be contaminated, but that is not so, although it is not desirable that any portion should be contaminated. Therefore the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department have co-ordinated their researches with the aim of ensuring that no portion of it is avoidably affected. The Engineer for Water Supply reports:—

There is no law under which private persons can be prevented from sinking bores to tap the water in the Adelaide underground basin. However, both our Department and the Mines Department so far as it is possible keep a careful watch to see that none of the highly saline waters enter the basin by means of faulty bores. On a number of occasions old bores have been plugged to prevent this. The highly saline waters are generally above the better quality water in the main basin and

there is always the possibility of the failure of the casing in the bores particularly when they reach an old age. This is believed to be the cause of the increase in the salinity of the water from the bores in the Kooyonga Golf Links. I understand that the Kooyonga Golf Club has already taken appropriate action to overcome the trouble and I also understand that they have done this in collaboration with the Mines Departmental Geologist. The bore mentioned in the report in the *News* on the 24th inst is, I understand, to be plugged to prevent any access of the highly saline water to the basin proper.

Nature is beneficial in providing ample means of filling these underground basins. Furthermore, last year when we had ceased to use the bores to supplement our water supply we used them in a reverse way to put excess water flowing through our pipes into the underground basin. I assure the honourable member that every step humanly possible is being taken by the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department to preserve that basin to its fullest possible capacity with good water.

POOCHERA SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Education, any further information on the question of the urgently needed school residence at Poochera?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have not had an opportunity to consult my colleague, but will do so today or tomorrow and advise the honourable member by letter.

WALLAROO DISTRICT AERIAL SURVEY.

Mr. McALEES—Can the Premier say whether the aerial survey for minerals in the Wallaroo and Moonta Mines district has been completed? I noticed in the *Advertiser* yesterday that the Commonwealth Government proposes to charter a helicopter to survey the Northern Territory. Would it be possible to get the services of this helicopter, furnished with the latest instruments for survey work, to examine the area I have mentioned?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The South Australian Mines Department is well equipped with instruments for surveys. In fact, they have been in use in South Australia for some two years and the department has a full knowledge of the instruments and their use. However, the State is not so well off for planes to use the instruments, and consequently I have suggested to the Prime Minister by letter that the R.A.A.F. should make planes available for certain test areas which we believe warrant a

very much closer examination than has been possible to date. The hiring of private planes by the department and the Government has proved very expensive because of the large amount of non-flying time for which we have to pay. Consequently, the Government believes it would be advisable to make some arrangement with the Commonwealth authorities to do the work with aeroplanes, using these flights for training purposes which would be beneficial both to the Air Force and to the investigation. I understand that the aeroplane that was being used for the survey in the honourable member's district came to an untimely end, and probably the work has not yet been completed.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON—I notice that a Highways Department camp has been established near Eagle on the Hill, which indicates to me that work is to proceed on the improvement of the Mount Barker Road. Can the Minister of Works say how many sites will be widened and the approximate distances vehicles will have to travel to reach one of these sites to overtake slow moving vehicles?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As regards both plant and finance the position is that to do one work sometimes means the suspension or curtailment of another.

Mr. Shannon—You have curtailed the main proposal—the new road from Burnside to Crafers.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—That is a major work and has not yet been started. A survey has already been made for a distance of 2,000ft. near the Eagle on the Hill. A camp has been established and work will go on from there. The Highways Commissioner has reported that owing to the very acute shortage of survey staff, which has continued for a long time in Government departments and also in private practice, the department has been unable to take the matter any further, but as the staff becomes available the work will continue and the worst portions will be done first. The Government is anxious to have all difficulties ironed out and facilities will be provided for more rapid transport. Economic conditions have considerably reduced the number of road hauliers. Interstate shipping is now in a better position to handle freight and, particularly in New South Wales, and to a lesser degree in Victoria, the railways are in better shape to handle it, and the control authorities there are throttling down strongly on interstate road haulage. Therefore, what we

are doing here, plus the economic conditions now applying to hauliers, will make a marked difference on the road in the immediate future.

HOUSING TRUST ADVANCES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Is the Treasurer in a position to indicate whether the Housing Trust is arranging for persons to purchase prefabricated timber imported homes by advancing to them on mortgage more than the 90 per cent of the value prescribed by the Advances for Homes Act?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The trust is providing a certain amount of finance by way of second mortgage to assist persons who cannot pay the full deposit required on timber-frame houses. I am not in a position to say whether in any cases the advance goes beyond 90 per cent of the value, but I should think not.

WIDENING OF ADELAIDE RAILWAY YARD.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Railways received a report from the Railways Commissioner relative to the widening of the Adelaide railway yard prior to the electrification of suburban services?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner has been out of the State for a time on urgent business. I have not yet received the report, but I should say this is not a matter of immediate necessity compared with other urgent works awaiting attention. I will bring down the report as soon as possible.

FUEL USED ON LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. STEPHENS—Is it a fact that on the Port Adelaide line the locomotives on some passenger trains are driven by oil fuel, but that the locomotives drawing goods trains are driven by coal power? If so, why?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I should say that is entirely a matter of administration and that the department would use whichever fuel was at the particular moment the most opportune to use. They have both to be used as occasion requires, and I think that is all the answer I can give the honourable member.

COMPOSITION HOUSES.

Mr. RICHES—I have received a letter from Mr. F. Hensbergen, Whyalla, as follows:—

I have received a letter from Mr. Russell, M.H.R., advising me to get in touch with you in respect to a Dutch architect who wishes to build homes in Australia in mass production. The houses are built of some composition which is waterproof, insulating, fire-resisting and

only approximately half the weight of concrete. The mixture can be mixed on the job and the mixture is poured into aluminium forms. The walls and floors are all poured in one pouring. The roof can be constructed out of timber or tubular steel. The doors and windows are of aluminium. The bathroom, shower, baby bath and laundry are a patented combination, and the lighting system is also patented and installed by Philips. The boxes can be so constructed that there is a great variety of designs, and I don't think there is any plastering to be done and, if there is, it will be very little. I believe the cost of one five-roomed house will be approximately £1,300. A couple of years ago I wrote to the Secretary to the Premier, and he advised me to interview Mr. Cartledge of the Housing Trust. From there I was sent to private builders, and that was as far as I got.

This man has evidently been going from one authority to another and running around in a circle. This seems to be a genuine inquiry, and I ask the Premier whether he would be prepared to have the Housing Trust investigate the possibility of engaging the architect or seeing whether he has anything to offer South Australia in the way of a cheaper and better type of house?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Since the war the acute shortage of houses has been so manifest that the trust has investigated, to my certain knowledge, many similar propositions. However, when the examinations had been completed, we got back to the fact that there is not much the matter with a brick house constructed on conventional lines. From the points of view of cost, durability, and everything else, that is probably the best type yet designed. I remember this particular case. I had it submitted to the trust to see whether it was interested in taking it up, but it was not. I do not know the weaknesses in the proposal, but if the honourable member will let me have the letter, I will probably be able to get the report prepared on it at the time. Although in times of urgency it may be necessary to go in for unconventional forms of houses, when materials and labour are available the conventional type meets the bill to a remarkably good extent. The unconventional houses have weaknesses in some respects and usually they are found to be much more costly by the time they are erected and occupied.

COUNTRY PRE-SCHOOL KINDERGARTENS.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier received a report from the Kindergarten Union on the possibility of granting subsidies to committees desiring to establish pre-school kindergartens

in country centres, but who are unable to obtain the services of fully qualified teachers, as required by the union?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and it is available to the honourable member.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 694.)

Mr. MOIR (Norwood)—From the outset I would like to make it very clear that throughout discussions in connection with the tramways I have been in favour of the Premier's proposal No. 3. This Bill represents about three-fourths of what we required and the Premier has put the soft pedal on the other portion by proposing to appoint a committee to investigate ancillary transport and taxi services. I incline a little towards the Lord Mayor's opinion in favouring an independent committee so as not to experience the upheaval we have been going through in the last two or three months through the various councils submitting their ideas, then withdrawing them and finally leaving it to Parliament. From the outset we have wanted the Government to take over the tramways lock, stock, and barrel, and at the first meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall, when the A and B groups and the Adelaide City Council met, we split into three parties. I was appointed chairman of the A group, and this group decided unanimously on proposal No. 3. The B group did not agree with us altogether and we were asked to reconsider our decision and put a tag on it. I opened up the question with my committee again and to suit the B group we put a tag on. A deputation met the Premier and he said he would not accept it. At that first deputation we had 17 votes to two in the A and B groups, but the Adelaide City Council laid down what should be done and what should not. The other two groups stuck out for proposal No. 3, but the Premier would not accept a majority vote. Following that he met the mayors of the municipalities. That precluded me, one of the naughty boys from Norwood, from having any part in the discussions because the mayors had all the say. They agreed—I alleged under pressure, because they were told that there would be no money and no trams—to go back to their councils and recommend proposal No. 2. When it came before my council the mayor asked

me to open the discussion; he knew that I favoured No. 3 proposal. I got my council to agree to it again, for I think that there is only one proposal that we can honestly consider as representatives of the electors and ratepayers, namely, that the Government should take over the tramways completely.

When we came back again the City Council wavered very slightly by deciding to give the Government the privilege of selecting five persons to form a new board. That decision gave practically nothing away, but it lifted a big worry off the shoulders of the two City of Adelaide members on the board. I believe that if they were candid they would say that they would be mighty pleased to get off it. Although one of them had not been on the board very long and had had little chance of making any alterations, he had taken his seat since the appointment of the new chairman, when things had worked a little more smoothly and others had been allowed to have a little more say than during the regime of the previous manager, Sir William Goodman. In those days whenever our council asked our representatives on the trust for any information it usually took them about three months to come out to meet the council and when they did so they could not disclose anything because they were "in committee." That was no good to our council, for we wanted to know what was going on. We felt that the tramways had been slipping, not for the last two or three years as we have been told here, but for the last 10 years. The truth may as well be told as to try to pretend that it has slipped only in the last few years. Why did they have to come to the Government periodically for finance? I will never believe this talk of profits for 44 years. That is simply trying to make the public believe that they did a wonderful job. We have heard from a former member of the board that it has shown wonderful profits.

Mr. Whittle—You will hear it again.

Mr. MOIR—I will say, before the honourable member can say it again, that the trust did not show wonderful profits.

Mr. Whittle—I did not say "wonderful."

Mr. MOIR—As I said, a majority vote of 17 to two was not acceptable to the Premier. We discussed it again and some of the councils went back to No. 3 proposal and some deserted it under pressure, for they have told me that the position was so serious that the Premier had said that the trams would stop running the next day.

Mr. Frank Walsh—What type of pressure?

Mr. MOIR—It was enough to make these men change their minds. One man has since told me he was sorry he had voted for No. 2 proposal. I said to him, "Well, you will have your opportunity again." I have had frequent telephone rings from people telling me how they appreciate the efforts put up by my council and expressing the hope that they will not waver. To win it meant that we had to convert four or five to our view. We got three, making the vote 10 to 9 and I objected to the city council having a vote because that was the council which first refused to accept a majority vote. The Lord Mayor came in and read a long screed with a "take it or leave it attitude"—"unless we get what we want we will not agree to a majority vote." If that is not backing the horse both ways I have yet to learn what two-way betting is.

At the meeting in the Town Hall the mayor of Mitcham, who was chairman, sat next to me. I said to him, "You had better have a roll call," and he said, "I will do it alphabetically." He started off with Brighton. I nudged him and said, "I did not know the alphabet started with B, what about Adelaide?" He went on to the third and I nudged him again, but when people are deaf they are deaf and those who act deaf are the worst. He went right through the list and then asked Adelaide, who said "No." I said, "That is the end of the meeting. I do not see that we can go any further." He turned a deaf ear and took no notice. The chairman said, "There are nine city and nine metropolitan votes." I said that could not be taken as a definite vote. I also remarked that it was the funniest meeting I had ever attended. I know now that there are strong and weak chairmen. We had to put up with the position. The Mayor of Norwood said, "If the Adelaide City Council won't agree to a majority vote I won't either," and I supported him. We took the matter back to council, which is still against the motion. Ours is the only council that has stood out, and we are being called naughty boys, and sometimes flying saucers. I commend our council for having sufficient backbone to stick to its opinion. At our last council meeting I thought it would make no difference because the Bill was already printed. I compliment the Premier on introducing the Bill, which goes three parts of the way towards what we desire. It is only a machinery Bill and I cannot see any objection to it. I have

asked the Premier at question time whether the report of the committee of inquiry would be available this session, but I knew what his answer would be because I have enough commonsense to know that it cannot be presented this year. When the Bill is passed and the recommendation of the committee is available I feel that the State will be better able to handle our taxis and all other forms of transport.

I have repeatedly suggested to the Premier that South Australia should have a Minister in charge of transport, and such an appointment must come. The transport of the State is increasing rapidly and we must grow with the times. After the special meeting of the Norwood Council there was a report in the press of what I was supposed to have said at the Norwood Council meeting, but I have corrected that report by means of a personal explanation in this House. I said that the Lord Mayor and Mr. Sutton had a discussion in the Lord Mayor's parlour before the meeting at the Town Hall, and I wrote to the editor of the *Advertiser* requesting him to correct the paper's report but he did it in a small place in the paper right away from the report of the discussion on the Tramways Trust matter. Even in the latter report they repeated what had been published previously, which I had corrected. I did not say that the Lord Mayor and Mr. Sutton left the meeting to have a discussion. It is marvellous the way some people get a good write-up in the paper, but when I asked for the truth to be printed it was put away in a small corner. To repeat the wrong report after it had been corrected is playing "ducks and drakes." It shows what the press is like. Opposition members have said that the *Advertiser* is a Liberal paper. It may be for some people, but not for everybody, as I know by its treatment of me. When members opposite talk about the *Advertiser* being a Liberal paper let them say that it is Liberal for only some people.

During the negotiations about the Tramways Trust the Premier and the Lord Mayor had several discussions. Whether that built up the Lord Mayor and enabled him to throw out his chest because he knew the Premier did not oppose his views, and that he would be on the winning side, I do not know, but some council members at the Town Hall considered it was the wrong attitude for him to adopt and wrong to say, "Take it or leave it because that is all I will agree to." I have heard previously of dictators, but that was the act of a real

dictator. I have been a member of the Workers' Club at Norwood for years and I was told there recently that a member of the City Council said that the Liberal Party had finished with me because I had dared to oppose the City Council. It would not worry me if I opposed even the Premier of Victoria if I thought I was right. If those at the Town Hall meeting had known that the City Council would not agree to a majority vote there would not have been nine in favour of the motion. At the last discussion with the Premier there were four representatives from each council, and the Premier said he would not accept anything but a unanimous vote. At that meeting Alderman Grundy, the representative of the City Council, was a little our way and he said he would go back and discuss the matter with his council. Evidently he ran second in the matter, as I did. The Lord Mayor and Alderman Young came to the last meeting in the Town Hall and they said they would not accept a majority vote unless they got what they wanted. It was not said in those words, but it was a long sentence and it sounded good. The actual meaning was something like this "If you do not agree with me, boys, I'm not with you." It all finished with 10 votes for No. 3 proposal, nine for No. 2, and nine votes for the City Council for No. 2 were added. We have heard about the good dividends from the totalizator at Balaklava, but at the Town Hall meeting we got what we did, with a bit more thrown in. Right through, my argument has been that the Government should handle all transport in South Australia. It assists the railways and our water supply schemes, so why should it not support the tramways? The cost could be borne by the taxpayers: it would mean only a few shillings a head.

Mr. Lawn—What has happened in the past?

Mr. MOIR—The councils have never had to impose a rate. Nobody has had enough backbone to try to do so. The threat was there, but a dog with lock-jaw would not bite at the first proposal, which was to leave things as they were. It was impossible to accept No. 1 proposal; it was a question of "Do as I want you to do or stay as you are, boys." It all boiled down to our having to do what the Adelaide City Council wanted, not what we wanted. If we had stuck to proposal No. 3 right through this Bill would have been introduced a month ago and gone flying through without opposition. Since then we have had two months to argue

the point and introduce other matters. That makes the Bill harder to push through.

Mr. Lawn—Tell us what happened in the parlour and why you voted for No. 3 proposal.

Mr. MOIR—I will mention one or two of the complaints I had to make. The first section on the Kensington line ends at the old brewery, now the Kent Town malthouse. It is the shortest tram section in the State.

Members interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! I just heard members ask the member for Norwood to speak up. If they keep on interjecting it will compel the member for Norwood to raise his voice higher than he desires during the debate. I ask members not to interject.

Mr. MOIR—Half the first section on the Kensington route from Adelaide is through the east park lands, with about three stops from King William Street to the brewery. Kent Town is within the Kensington and Norwood council area and I desire that the first section should end at the Salvage Company's premises. If that were done mothers with babies or parcels could alight in the centre of Kent Town and would not have to walk a quarter of a mile from the malthouse. I arranged for a deputation to meet Sir William Goodman, Alderman MacKay, and the late Mr. Gurner, all three saying that they completely favoured the idea. However, when they referred it to the "House of Lords" the pressure was put on and they were informed that this was one of the first sections fixed by the Tramways Trust and that Sir William Goodman did not want it altered. Later the council received a reply that the trust did not intend to alter the first section. Then a fortnight or three weeks ago the council received a letter from the trust asking whether it objected to the first section being moved one chain further down Rundle Street, Kent Town. Apparently sections are only altered to suit the convenience of the trust and not the convenience of the public. The letter added insult to injury. Things like that show that the Tramways Board has not the interests of the general public at heart and that the members of the board are unsuitable.

I will mention another complaint. The Kensington and Norwood council later requested Mr. MacKay and Mr. Gurner to attend a council meeting to discuss tramway matters. After about two months of writing and telephoning, together with special requests, they attended, but they might just as well have stayed away as they would not answer questions, saying they were not allowed to disclose

anything. If information cannot be obtained from the present board I hope that it will be from the new board and that when it is selected it will comprise men of business ability, possessing accountancy and traffic knowledge. We have had enough of "yes" men who do just what they are told and nod instead of speaking up. Council members were informed by one candidate that he nominated for election to the Tramways Board merely in order to put some person in his proper place. That person is not a member of the board now, but received a superannuation benefit sufficient to last him for the rest of his life.

I am pleased that the Premier has introduced the Bill, and that it will not be limited to five years, otherwise at the end of that time it would have to be extended or the Government would have to take over tramway affairs entirely. There are some fairly long runs by the trams and the line from Kensington Gardens to Henley Beach should be a good paying one. The same applies to the Mitcham to Walkerville run. These lines should still remain tramway routes, but if a profit is to be shown on some other routes it will be necessary to run buses. The alternative is to get private owners to enter into contracts for the non-paying routes. An undertaking like the Tramways Trust has a lot of overhead expenses which private owners do not have. When fares were increased I said that the board had sounded the trust's deathknell. People who travel from Kensington to the City by tram have to pay 9d. each way and the more sections they travel the higher the cost. They could travel by motor car for less than 1s. 6d. Again, the trust has motor cars, costing between £1,000 and £1,200, in which inspectors travel about trying to catch up with conductors who do not collect fares or do not collect the right amount. Each car contains two officials, one of whom is nothing more nor less than a chauffeur. There is no need for two men to travel in a motor car to do this work. What is wrong with an inspector boarding one car, getting out at a section and catching another travelling in the opposite direction? Unnecessary overhead expenses are incurred by the present practice, and I am told that not only motor cars belonging to the Tramways Trust have been cared for in the trust workshops. Such factors as these have helped to put the Tramways Trust in the position in which it finds itself today, and the new board must attend to such matters.

Complaints are often made by people, who have been riding on the trams for years and who live near a racecourse, that, because they walked to town in the morning or were fortunate enough to secure a lift in a motor car, they had to pay the special fare required of racegoers on Saturday. In the case of Victoria Park they must pay a minimum of 1s. or wait for another tram.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Such passengers are issued with a voucher on their way to town in the morning.

Mr. MOIR—I heard of one man who refused to pay the special minimum, and who gave the conductor his name, but he was not prosecuted by the trust. The secret of his success may have been that he was a big man who had been a wrestler and that he overawed the conductor. Recently the service on the Kensington line has been unsatisfactory, and passengers must wait 15 or even 20 minutes for a tram. Now that these trams run through the city to Henley Beach, a 12 minute service should be possible. People travelling to town want to travel when it suits them and not when it suits the Tramways Trust. Now that buses have replaced trams on certain routes, local councils whose areas are served by those buses are expected to maintain the roads along which they run and the lighting thereof. These buses cause greater damage to the road than the trams, and the councils have applied to the Government and to the Tramways Trust for assistance, but neither seem inclined to assist in any way, and I expect some strife between the new board and the local government bodies over applications for financial assistance made while these buses continue to rip up the roads. Councils cannot afford to spend all their revenue on one or two roads along which buses may run. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that a board of three should be appointed, but I support the provision in the Bill for the appointment of a board of five and believe that Mr. Keynes, the present General Manager of the Trust, who has proved capable, should be a member.

Mr. O'Halloran—My suggestion for a board of three related to a different set of circumstances.

Mr. MOIR—I am sorry I was not here to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak, as I had to attend a meeting. The other members of the board should be men with traffic, accounting or general business experience. I agree that, when necessary, a union secretary could be called in to meetings of the board,

but I fail to see the necessity of the appointment suggested by Mr. O'Halloran.

Mr. O'Halloran—I suggested a representative of the men engaged in the industry.

Mr. MOIR—Such a man should be entitled to attend meetings at which industrial matters relating to the workers are to be discussed, and he should be paid for such attendance, but he need not be on the board, for there are many other matters beside working conditions to be considered. It is no use our condemning the men who have been members of the board, but, apart from the General Manager, I do not want to see any members of the old board appointed to the new one, for they have not had the practical experience nor would a union representative be better off in that regard. The Government should appoint men with unbiassed judgments as members of the committee to investigate transport and traffic problems in the metropolitan area. Such men would take up the matter at its face value and not give certain privileges to certain sections. Parliament should abide by the recommendations of such a committee, but I do not want to see council representatives on it for they might pick the eyeballs out of their own pet ideas. The Lord Mayor is trying to be unbiassed in this matter, and, if he is prepared to accept the recommendations of such a committee, so should we be.

The councils have not been too happy about previous appointments to the board. Some councils have waited for over three months before receiving replies to questions addressed to the trust, and at times no reply has been received. Recently the Payneham Council asked the board for a trial bus service between Firlie and Evandale running along Bakewell Road, but, although that is a fairly thickly populated area, such a trial was refused. Surely the trust should have given the service a trial, for, if it proved unnecessary, the trust could have advised the council that it would discontinue the service, because after all, the council received that request from the rate-payers and merely passed it on to the trust, but the trust ignored it. Although the running of trams is essentially a matter for the trust, there is ample room for private enterprise to operate bus services in the rapidly developing areas, where they would be entitled to any profits which may accrue. So long as the trust runs its business whilst incurring such big overhead it will never catch up with its finances. I support the Bill, and hope that any recommendations made by the proposed committee of inquiry will be implemented.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Burnside)—The two reports of the special committee appointed to examine the affairs of the Tramways Trust are most comprehensive, and the members of that committee must be commended on the thoroughness and competence shown in their inquiries. It is proper to pay a tribute to those members, as it will be recalled that their appointments were sharply criticized when first announced. Although much fault may be found with Tramways administration, it is only fair to say that members of the trust and the management alike have accepted the report in the proper spirit and have not indulged in apologetics for the trust's past activities. I believe, too, that the trust is already giving effect to some of the committee's recommendations, and that it had even anticipated some of them; therefore no purpose can be served by a post mortem examination of all the matters covered in the reports, but the graph at page 31 of the interim report is highly significant. I cannot think that the trust itself had such a graph continually before it. If it did, then it was neither understood nor appreciated. It seems from that graph, which shows tram miles run, passengers carried, city population, debentures outstanding, revenue and working expenses, that the growing difficulties of the trust should have been recognized and acted upon in 1945-46. From 1942, undoubtedly due to petrol rationing and other causes arising from the war, passenger traffic increased from 70,000,000 to 95,000,000 in 1945, yet between 1943 and 1946 the trust's income was almost unchanged, while the operating expenses were showing a steady but markedly upward trend. Then came a falling off in traffic, although mileage was going up.

Mr. Whittle—It made a profit in 1943.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Yes, but although the number of passengers increased greatly, its revenue remained almost constant, and the margin between working expenses and revenue gradually decreased. Of course, during the war service men and women were carried at reduced rates, and the trust must be given credit for that. It seems to me that the danger spot was reached about 1946, and that the remedies, such as they were, that were then prescribed, did not attract passengers to the tramways. In fact the very opposite occurred. As a result of the serious financial and other problems of the trust the taxpayers will have to support the trust to the extent of £500,000 or more this financial year. This has come as something of a shock to the average person, yet the people

have accepted almost with equanimity the subsidy of £5,000,000 now being paid to the railways literally to keep them on the rails. The trend of tramway finances concurrently with similar trends in railway finances and identical problems with regard to the obsolescence of rolling stock shows that a very serious problem exists in public transport undertakings. This problem is not singular to South Australia, and indeed is being experienced all over the world. It may be that we are to some extent insulated from world trends in these domestic matters, and that may excuse us for not taking more courageous steps earlier.

I am not sufficiently sanguine to believe that the tramways will pay in five year's time. If they could no one would be more pleased than I, but the public is coming to look upon such things as public transport as public services in the same sense as they now look upon water supply, electricity, schools, and such services. The strengthening of that view, which to me is very evident even since the war, leads me to state that the steps now to be taken are in the nature of interim steps, a sort of stepping away from the traditional outlook on public utilities into a not yet clearly defined path. I feel confident that the next few years will harden the now growing view that all transport should be integrated into a smoothly working plan in which, as the Leader of the Opposition so truly said, private enterprise can play a useful part. With four types of authority controlling transport—the railways, tramways, local government authorities, and Transport Control Board—there has developed a hotchpotch of overlapping and uncertainty.

I approve of the appointment of the special committee to examine problems relating to ancillary transport and hope that the functions of the various types of transport can be defined. I believe there always will be difficulties with taxi licences, with the issue of road permits and so on until the role of each medium of transport is properly defined. If nothing else comes from the appointment of the special committee than a definition of the desirable functions of private transport in relation to public transport, its appointment will have been amply justified. I am confident that this clarification of the functions of each section of transport is fundamental to the whole problem of public and private transport. For that reason, though I hold the view that a Ministry of Transport should be set up, perhaps it is wisest to take the interim step we are now taking so that we may be quite

sure that the foundations for the next edifice are sound. For that reason I support the Bill in principle, but would like to see the power of veto removed, which seems very likely from what previous speakers have said.

Before concluding, I wish to mention a matter of some importance as it touches on a fundamental principle of public finance. I can understand without accepting the view held that taxpayers generally should not contribute to the support of an undertaking which, in the opinion of some, contributes a service only to the city. To use a phrase of the Premier, be that as it may, I think the matter goes far deeper than that. I have said before that the interests of the country and the city are indivisible and attempts to sectionalize or tie up into watertight compartments the revenue and expenditure of the State topographically is completely unsound.

Mr. Pattinson—It would be disastrous to country residents.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Yes.

Mr. Riches—Would you favour an extension of the trust's powers to inaugurate and run bus services in country towns?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I have not considered that. I am advocating a principle and not suggesting how the trust should go about its work. The basis of public finance should be, and I think all sections would at least in their hearts agree, that taxation is fairly imposed according to ability to pay and that it is spent according to need. Unfortunately, sometimes it has occurred in our smallest, but none the less valuable unit of government, namely, local government, that some measure of parochialism in expenditure has been shown. The view has often been expressed that one's rates should be spent on the street immediately in front of one's own house. This view is understandable. In fact, sometimes I have to bring my own view into line with proper principles. The division of corporations into wards for all purposes does tend to encourage that view. If now we take a similar view of the State it is understandable, but nevertheless untenable, that a member should expect all the revenue raised in his electorate to be spent in that electorate, or at any rate spent on projects which are for the good of that electorate either directly or indirectly. It would be a sad outlook if that attitude were to be applied to the international situation. Where would be Britain's aid to the rehabilitation and defence of Europe, and where would have been lend-lease, whereby fabulous amounts were provided by taxpayers in one country

to aid economic recovery elsewhere. Even our own Colombo Plan recognizes the principle of spending according to need. I still contend that revenue must be collected on the basis of the ability to pay and spent on the basis of need. If we do not accept that principle, the whole of our fiscal structure will fall to the ground.

I think it is necessary to explode the doctrine that country people should not contribute to the support of the tramways as they are most generally used by city dwellers. I want to some lengths to establish the principle, which should be universally recognized, as indeed it is becoming, that taxation must be raised according to ability to pay and spent according to need. That principle is understood and applied when grants are made in the event of floods, frost, fire, or other national calamity. So in making the grant to the Tramways Trust the Government will be rightly conforming to the principle I have tried to establish. We cannot properly apply the principle in one instance if it is to be discarded in another. Therefore, the objections which may be raised to the general revenue being applied in this case of need cannot be sustained in principle, whatever one may think of the amount involved.

Mr. Macgillivray—Do you know how much it is?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I am not discussing amounts, only principles. I support the Bill, reiterating my view that this is an interim step only, but perhaps a sound step in as much as there is more ground to be explored by the special committee before the next step of appointing a Minister of Transport is taken. I think that is inevitable. Not the doctrines of any particular Party, but the needs of the State, demand an integrated, smooth-working transport system in which the activities of each type of transport is clearly defined.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the measure with certain reservations. I feel that the Government has failed in not facing up to this matter before. No doubt it has been aware of the trust's financial position for a number of years. Its delay in taking action has proved serious to taxpayers. I trust that with a few amendments the Bill will be passed and a trust established to work for the benefit of the people of South Australia, including the trust employees. I have mentioned before that I never had any faith in the personnel of the trust. For a number of years they have

proved incompetent. I will attempt to establish that charge. The manager, Mr. Keynes, who has assumed control at a most precarious stage, is a man of outstanding ability, with all the acumen necessary to bring about the successful operations of the trust, but he is faced with a hard task. Most of the members of the trust are elected by popular vote but that does not signify that they have the necessary ability. We find that representatives selected by the councils have fallen down on their job. In Sir William Goodman the trust had an outstanding manager. While I was a member of the Port Adelaide City Council I conferred with him on more than one occasion and was convinced beyond doubt that he always was the trust. That state of affairs is entirely wrong, despite the fact that Sir William had all the ability necessary for the job. Men like Sir William have such an influence and are so convincing that trust members are liable to be subservient to their opinion.

Mr. Whittle—Sir William Goodman never had a vote.

Mr. TAPPING—That did not matter: it was his influence on members of the trust. When I was a member of the Port Adelaide council some years ago I vividly remember the council seeking an extension of the bus service to Semaphore South. Members of the trust made an inspection and after about one hour's consultation Sir William Goodman commented, "It is not practicable. There are not sufficient people living in the area and I will turn the proposition down." Members of the trust had no opportunity to express their views. When one man tries to rule the situation in that way it is wrong, and that is why I feel that for a number of years the Municipal Tramways Trust has fallen down on its job. It is proposed that the new trust shall be composed of five men and it is to be hoped that expert engineers will be included. The Australian Labor Party considers that a representative of the Tramways Union should be selected. If the secretary of the union were chosen, the trust would have the services of a man experienced in traffic matters over a number of years. With men of that calibre appointed, there would be better understanding and co-operation between the employees and the trust. It would not be the first time a union representative had been appointed in such a position. Such a representative is a member of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board and he is doing excellent work, and the Australian Labor Party is also represented on the Housing Trust.

The moment that its finances begin to go wrong the trust increases its fares and as a result patronage is discouraged, resulting in a further severe loss. In May last the trust decided, with the acquiescence of the Prices Commissioner, to increase fares once again and to reduce the length of sections. This was a dual blow to tram passengers. Since that increase, there has been a still further severe falling off in patronage. The answer is not an increase in fares. If they were not increased more people would travel by tramways and there would not be such a big deficit. Many people are using other means of transport. Quite a number are travelling with their friends in motor cars to their places of employment. Some use bicycles and others, who used to ride one section, are now walking to and from their employment. An increase in fares only drives patronage from the trams. The report of the trust for the year ended January 31, 1952, shows that in the previous year 78,141,000 passengers were carried, but the number for the year under review was 75,435,000, a decrease of 2,706,000. I predict a greater decrease for the next year.

Mr. Whittle—The trust gets more revenue by increasing fares, even if patronage falls off.

Mr. TAPPING—I agree, but if the fares were not increased the trust would get even greater revenue from an increase in the number of passengers carried. It costs a family living in the outer suburbs about 10s. to get to and from the city. A man on or just above the basic wage cannot afford such an expense, so the trust loses revenue. Fares were increased in 1948, 1950, 1951, and 1952. When they were increased in 1950 there was an increase of 142,000 in the number of passengers carried, but the increase in fares was not as great as in later years. The more the trust puts up fares the more it drives patronage away. The Railways Department takes a saner attitude; it increases fares periodically, but the increases are small compared with those of the Tramways Trust. The higher fares of the trust have resulted in greater patronage on the railways. I can hardly say that the tramways or the railways will ever pay their way, but it is hard to understand how the trust could lose £555,000 for the year ended January, 1952. We cannot assess the true value of the railways to the State because they open much country that would not otherwise be developed. The railways transport primary produce from all over

the State to the city and towns, and much of it is exported. Although the railways do not pay their way financially they are certainly a great asset to South Australia. The railways go into the sparsely populated areas where private enterprise will not go because it would be uneconomic. It is often said that the tramways cannot pay because of the huge wages bill. The trust's last report analyses its costs. The major cost is salaries and wages, which is 64.87 per cent of the total. Other costs come under the headings of statutory charges, general expenses, stores and outside services. I am sure that an efficient administration could reduce the salaries and wages bills.

Mr. Macgillivray—Do you think the responsibility for meeting the losses rests with ratepayers of the councils concerned?

Mr. TAPPING—I have always said that the tramways should be placed under Government control. I stand for co-ordination of transport services.

Mr. Macgillivray—Wasn't the control of the tramways the responsibility of ratepayers? They elected the councillors that elected the members of the trust.

Mr. TAPPING—It could not be suggested that the ratepayers selected the members of the trust. I can give a few instances of how money has been wasted by the tramways. About two years ago it was decided to extend the Cheltenham-Largs North bus route and to do so it was necessary to erect hundreds of poles, involving considerable labour and the use of much cement. However, eventually the trust decided that it was not wise to extend this route and, after spending many thousands of pounds, the poles were uprooted and they are now lying in the streets. That shows lack of foresight. A few days ago I boarded a bus at Semaphore and when we arrived at Pt. Adelaide an inspector got on to check the conductor's book. When he alighted half a mile up the road the conductor told me that that was the fourth inspection made in four and a quarter hours on his bus that morning. Some members may suggest that many inspections were carried out because the conductor was under suspicion, but I know him well. His character is beyond reproach. The conductors are giving fine service and it is pleasing to hear the kindly comments made by patrons about the courtesy displayed by them over many years. I would dispense entirely with inspectors because their employment means a waste of money. Although they may save a few pounds a year in discovering

fares not collected, their employment costs thousands of pounds. The railways do not use these methods. They do not have men jumping on trains to see whether passengers have bought tickets. The railways prefer to trust their employees.

Mr. Whittle—They have men at the exit gates to collect tickets.

Mr. Macgillivray—An inspector might protect the conductor against dishonest people.

Mr. TAPPING—I realize that the railways have men at the gates to collect tickets, but they do not have inspectors jumping on the trains.

Mr. Macgillivray—An honest conductor has nothing to fear from an inspector.

Mr. TAPPING—It is only natural that he feels it keenly when four inspectors get on his bus in a period of 4½ hours. Without inspectors the men would be happier because they would feel they could be trusted to do their job properly without being pinpricked. Sometimes when conductors have been found guilty of missing a fare the fault has been with the passenger. The onus should be placed on the patron to pay his fare. The trust has not always provided essential services to the people. For instance, in the Largs North area huge industrial and housing expansion has taken place, but the trust took too long in providing a service. It has now decided to extend the route as far as the I.C.I. works, but the existing service to Largs North is most unsatisfactory. It is only a 14-minute service and the buses are always packed. One employee has to take the fares and drive the bus, which results in the vehicle always arriving at the terminus behind schedule. I listened attentively to the Premier's second reading speech and felt that he was endeavouring to absolve the Adelaide City Council from blame, without any excuse, for I claim that it adopted a dictatorial attitude. There are 19 councils in the present set-up. Eighteen of them have one vote each, whereas the Adelaide City Council has nine, and I could never agree with that. The Premier in trying to defend the Adelaide City Council said it must be remembered that it was responsible for one-third of any deficiencies, but he also told us that never had any council been called upon to meet deficiencies, so if this council did not have to meet its responsibilities more than any other council why should it have nine votes compared with their one. I hope that never again will any council have such power on any

matter. It is rather peculiar, too, that while the Adelaide City Council desired to forego its responsibilities in regard to the Tramways Trust it wanted to retain its rights in respect of taxis. Of course, one can see the reason why. Taxis are a paying proposition to the council as the revenue from fees must be enormous. I welcome the proposed inquiry into the taxi services, for there has been untold dissatisfaction on the part of taxi drivers for a long time and an inquiry would straighten out matters. In passing, it is of interest to note that one of the large taxi companies is subletting its licences to drivers at £8 a week, and the rake-off it is getting, when it is known that they have a dozen or 14 licences, can be imagined. As things stand, the taxi driver has no alternative and must bow to the dictates of this company. What I cannot understand is that this Bill retains the power now in the Act to levy on councils. I understood that if there were any deficiencies on the tramways they would become the responsibility of the taxpayers of the State, but the Bill still retains the power to levy on councils.

Mr. Macgillivray—So it should.

Mr. TAPPING—I cannot agree. You cannot have it both ways. We are discussing taking the tramways over as a State instrumentality and the new board will have to report annually to Parliament.

Mr. Whittle—Parliament will have to authorize any grants.

Mr. TAPPING—I concede that, but if this Bill becomes law the undertaking will become the responsibility of the people of South Australia, through this Parliament, and the councils will be cut out entirely from the administration, so I fail to see why that provision should be retained.

Mr. Macgillivray—The honourable member has already said that the councils have made a complete mess of their powers.

Mr. TAPPING—Admittedly, but the members of the trust are men of integrity, men who have made great sacrifices to give their services to the various councils, but I say that because of the magnitude and importance of this job they are not competent to sit on the board. I trust that the measure will pass the second reading and that in the Committee stage members will have opportunities to make amendments to render it more effective.

Mr. WHITTLE (Prospect)—I do not wish to delay the passage of this Bill and therefore will not make a long speech, but I have been interested for many years in the operations of the trust. On behalf of an important

suburban council and its ratepayers, I commend the Premier for so promptly taking action to alleviate the desperate plight of the Tramways Trust finances. As I will show from previous reports the situation has been developing for some time. I recall the consternation created in some of the suburban municipalities 18 months or two years ago by the prospect of what would happen in connection with the trust's affairs, and it will be appreciated that members of councils are very greatly relieved that this measure has been brought forward.

Mr. Quirke—I'll bet they are.

Mr. WHITTLE—There is no question about it. Most of them are men who have a very keen interest in the affairs of their districts, and it was a matter of very deep concern to them, and particularly members of finance committees who have to plan ahead for the requirements of their councils. It must be remembered that the reasons why the Municipal Tramways Trust's affairs have got into a mess are exactly the same as those which have caused councils to increase their rates, and even then they have not been able to do anything like the amount of work required. The enormous increase in wages and cost of materials—

Mr. Stephens—Including fees.

Mr. WHITTLE—Fees represent so small a proportion of council revenue as to be insignificant.

Mr. Stephens—The percentage increase in fees has been greater than that in wages.

Mr. WHITTLE—I do not complain about workers getting better wages. I am simply pointing out the main reasons why the finances of the trust have become difficult. It is easy to talk about inefficient management and I dare say that every complaint expressed here has some foundation. The inquiry committee stated that in some minor details mistakes had been made and that some economies could be effected. I have not been a member of the trust since 1938, when I resigned upon my election to this place, but I recognize that there have been some very good members on the trust since I left. I was very pleased therefore to hear the tribute paid by the member for Semaphore to the integrity, competency and business ability of some of the members of the trust whom he knows and for whom he has probably voted as a councillor of the municipality of Port Adelaide. However, he went on to say that "Everything was decided by the general manager" and those statements do not tally. Every time the name

of Sir William Goodman is mentioned an air of disparagement of his competency seems to arise.

Mr. Tapping—I paid him a tribute.

Mr. WHITTLE—That is true, but the honourable member then complained that when members of the trust who represented the Port Adelaide council visited the council with Sir William he was the only one who spoke. I was on the trust for 13 years and I am thankful to say that when I visited the ten constituencies which I represented—and I did so at least once every year—I never asked Sir William Goodman to come with me. I would not think of doing so. I was representing those councils; it was my job to express their views and I did not want Sir William to accompany me. I will read from the admirable interim report of the inquiry committee, which everyone has complimented. Under the heading "Administration" it says:—

In reviewing the quality of the administration by the trust the committee is not unmindful of the fact that—

- (i.) the trust had, from the inception, a capable manager and skilled engineer in Sir William Goodman, in whose judgement it had the greatest confidence. For many years the Adelaide tramways system was probably the most efficiently managed in Australia.

Mr. Macgillivray—What happened in the end?

Mr. WHITTLE—The trust was still effectively managed. This avalanche of increased expenditure occurred mostly after Sir William Goodman left. In 1938 the basic wage was £3 15s. a week, and £5 14s. in 1948. That was the year mentioned by Mr. Geoffrey Clarke when the trust started to make an appreciable loss. This year the basic wage is £10 11s. Fares charged by the trust have not been correspondingly increased. Mr. Tapping deplored the need to increase fares because it placed a great burden on the wage earner, but it is the only way in which the trust can increase its revenue. How else can working expenses be met? I was a member of the trust in 1925 and for several years thereafter there was much competition from unrestricted bus services. The buses were allowed to operate and pirated business from the trust. At the time Parliament was aware of the unfair competition. I have never been, and never will be, an opponent of private bus services, because they assist the community. Some of the private bus owners have built up a wonderful service, and it is unfair that they should be taken over by the trust.

Mr. O'Halloran—Private bus services have extended in recent years.

Mr. WHITTLE—Yes. People living along the Churchill Road and in Gepps Cross are satisfied with their private bus services, and it would be unfair if the trust took them over. During the days of the unrestricted bus competition Parliament should have protected the trust, because it had a most detrimental effect on trust revenue. Some of the bus operators told me at the time that it would be better if our transport services were regulated. The trust lost about £480,000 directly from this unrestricted bus competition. As a member of the trust I got £78 a year, which represented £1 a meeting. For two or three years in succession I earned my £78 because I attended every meeting up to the end of October. Altogether in one year I attended 108 meetings, but I got no more remuneration for the meetings after October. We used to meet several nights a week to try to get support for the trust, but Parliament would not assist. Bills were introduced; some were passed and others were turned down. The trust had to wait some years before it got any real support from Parliament. The Labor Government in office at the time did what it could to help.

Mr. O'Halloran—It was the Tory representatives in the other place that held things up.

Mr. WHITTLE—There was a fear on the part of the Adelaide City Council that if they lost control of the traffic they would lose control of their streets. That is something like the argument put forward by Mr. Moir.

Mr. Moir—Were you on the trust when it established the superannuation scheme?

Mr. WHITTLE—Yes.

Mr. Moir—Tell us something about it.

Mr. WHITTLE—I will. In 1930, after getting the benefit of the protection under its Act, the trust had a deficiency of £120,000. In 1932 there was a profit of nearly £10,000. Then there were several depression years. In 1933 the loss was £742 and in 1934 it was £2,885. In 1935 there was a somewhat larger loss of £10,000. I was a member of the trust during those years and we were concerned about the position, because wages were not high and operation costs had fallen slightly. The trouble was that the people could not afford to pay even the low fares then charged. In 1936 the trust had a profit of £2,589, after paying all its charges under the Act. In 1937 the profit was £3,000 and in 1938 it was £2,000. Then there were the war years. In 1939, 1940 and 1941 there were losses, not on working expenses but after all statutory

charges had been met. Respectively, those losses were £30,509, £31,617 and £9,860.

Mr. Macgillivray—During the war years more people travelled on the trams.

Mr. WHITTLE—In the early years of the war everybody in uniform was carried free. In 1943 the profit was £4,800, in 1944 it was £10,250, and in 1945, £9,045.

Mr. Pattinson—They were years of unprecedented loadings.

Mr. WHITTLE—Yes. Last night the Leader of the Opposition made a very good speech on this Bill. I think he approached the matter in an admirable spirit. He referred to some of the amounts the trust had been relieved of. At the time I could not recall the circumstances. Mr. O'Halloran said that in 1936 there was a writing off of £160,724, mentioned in the annual report as "Development expenditure—capitalized." I was a member of the trust at the time and I recall that the £160,724 was paid to the private owners when the horse trams were taken over.

Mr. Quirke—There were several private companies.

Mr. WHITTLE—Yes. Two routes were privately owned and the remainder by the Adelaide & Suburban Co. They were paid that sum of money for the rights they had, and for their rolling stock and tram sheds. The present depot of the Prospect Council is situated in the old tram sheds at the corner of Johns Road and the Main North Road. It was purchased by the council from the trust. At the time the book transfer was made the late Mr. J. W. Wainwright was a member of the trust and we thought that it was wrong to show that amount in the annual report. There was no money to wipe off the debt, but as we had plenty of reserve in the sinking fund it was considered good book-keeping to use it to wipe off the debt. It was really goodwill. There was no hole in the corner element about the matter, because the Government and the Auditor-General knew of it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Prior to 1928 there was no provision for repaying debentures.

Mr. WHITTLE—The trust adopted what was becoming an ordinary practice and set aside so much per cent for a sinking fund.

Mr. O'Halloran—Wasn't that fund supposed to cover the purchase money?

Mr. WHITTLE—Yes. The accumulated deficit in the previous year was £213,000 and by writing off £160,000 it was reduced to £53,000. There was no desire to confuse anybody and both Mr. Wainwright and myself thought it was a good plan. I have elaborated

these things to show that tramway affairs were not haphazardly managed as has been suggested by some members who apparently do not know what they are talking about. I feel that it was ignorance on their part and do not think they wanted to kick members of the trust in the shin. The original Act was introduced by the Hon. Thomas Price. At the time there were three groups—suburban municipalities, suburban district councils which generally speak were on the outer fringe, and the Adelaide City Council. Today we have A and B groups and the Adelaide City Council. The Parliamentary Draftsman included in the Bill on three occasions references to district or municipal councils, but when the Bill is in Committee I will move to delete "district" because there is not a district council in the metropolitan area. Much misconception exists about the manner in which the trust has viewed the continued retrogression of its finances. In 1948 the loss was £93,748; in 1949, £138,403; 1950, £235,807; 1951, £313,230; and last financial year £528,804. Referring to these deficits the trust said in its report of 1950:—

The resulting retrogression for the year under review (1950) is £97,404, due to the following causes:—Increased salary and wage rates and increased penalty rates; increased cost of electric power due to rises in price and inferior quality coal; loss of revenue from curtailment and restriction of services imposed as a result of coalminers' strikes in New South Wales during last June, July, and August.

Those are the factors singled out as a reason for their losses. What chance had the trust of preventing those losses? The only way was by increasing fares. That was done that year and the year after and in each instance, as the general manager had predicted, although additional revenue was received, many passengers were lost. I was interested to hear Mr. Pattinson say that the New South Wales Minister for Transport recommended to the New South Wales Government that, in view of the very great loss sustained by Government-owned trams, fares should be reduced. I do not know what the result of that decision will be, but if they are reduced history will repeat itself and more money will be lost. There has been some outstanding examples of that in the history of street cars and other modes of transport. In no instance has reduced fares meant more revenue. The oft-repeated saying that more revenue will be received if fares are reduced is not borne out by facts. Take the case of one large American city where cars were run by a company, although its

fares were controlled by the civic authorities. It was found that the cars were running at a loss. The authorities approached the court and it decreed that within one month fares should be reduced, as suggested by the council. The press endeavoured to create enthusiasm amongst the people in a greater use of the cars. Although patronage was greater and people left their motor cars at home the novelty soon wore off and within one month considerable revenue was lost. The experiment was unsuccessful and it never has been proved that reduced fares will produce more revenue. It is revenue that is required to balance the affairs of the trust. Today we have eight members on the Tramways Trust Board. I told the Premier that I thought five members, as proposed under the Bill, was too many and that a board of three would be sufficient. Sometimes there is safety in numbers, but with a board of eight there is always room for a few drones. The reconstituted board should be active and right on the job and there should be no leaning on the other fellow.

Mr. Christian—There is no board for the railways.

Mr. WHITTLE—I admit that. I sincerely trust that the new board will be able to run the affairs of this important concern without great detriment to the ratepayers.

Mr. Frank Walsh—For whose benefit are the trams run?

Mr. WHITTLE—The service should be rendered on reasonable lines, and if the private bus owner can make a good profit surely there is no reason why a show as well-run as the Municipal Tramways Trust has been until recently should not be able to conduct its affairs, if not at a profit, at least not at a loss.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—Previous speakers in this debate have spoken of the fortune, achievements and failings of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and we have been told that the present position of the trust is such that Parliament must snatch it from the grave. It is important that this Bill should be treated as urgent, but, as a past employee of the trust and a municipalist, I feel that I should make some contribution to the debate. This Bill is the result of a long inquiry and many months of negotiation. Three proposals were made by the Premier to councils about June 27. The first proposal was that the tramways should continue to run under the present form of control and management, which, if acceptable to the councils, meant that they were prepared to continue without assis-

tance in which case this Bill would not have been introduced this session. Proposals No. 2 and No. 3 gave the councils food for discussion. The original No. 2 proposal was that a more efficient type of control should be established, local government authorities still retaining a voice in the management. The original No. 3 proposal was that metropolitan local government authorities should entirely divorce themselves from transport and traffic consideration and that Parliament should appoint some other authority.

Every thinking person associated with local government affairs desired the acceptance of No. 3 proposal, but for reasons which have been explained it was rejected. I appreciate the fact that progress has been made towards the acceptance of the No. 3 proposal, as little of No. 2 but much of No. 3 proposal is embodied in the Bill. The only matter that concerns me to any extent is the fact that there is still a danger of transport not being brought under one control, but I hope that the proposed amendment to clause 5 will obviate that risk. Many reasons could be advanced for the present financial position of the trust, and I have heard a number suggested during this debate. I agree with some, but as a past employee of the trust I have one or two comments to make. Some of the criticism of inspectors is a little unreasonable because very few employees object to them. Because I found that shift work prevented my carrying on certain public activities, I worked for only 12 months in the traffic section of the trust, but during that time I found the inspectors very helpful to conductors. Often, when an inspector jumped on to the vehicle on which I was working, he was able to assist and advise me. Conductors handle much revenue which, after all, is public money, and, if a periodical check were not made, some might be lost. I believe that no honest employee had reason to fear the inspector, and I feel that was the attitude of most of the traffic men toward the inspectors. The member for Semaphore mentioned a conductor who was checked four times in a very short period, but, although a little annoying, that sort of thing may happen anywhere, without being done with deliberate intention. The use of motor cars by inspectors is a wise provision, for it enables the saving of time and money. Prior to their use an inspector had to alight from one tram and possibly walk across to another line to board a tram, but now inspectors can move around much more speedily.

The chief function of any transport system is to run its service in the most economical manner, and the only way that can be done is by means of a co-ordinated system of transport. Such co-ordination, like the Greater Adelaide plan, is long overdue in the metropolitan area, and this Bill goes a long way towards co-ordinating our transport services. All public services should be co-ordinated. As an illustration I draw the attention of members to a drainage scheme costing £200,000 now being put into operation in the Woodville municipality. In company with the member for Semaphore and the town clerk of Woodville I saw work being done on that drainage system, and I asked a council officer whether provision had been made to link up that system with a future scheme in Hindmarsh and Yatala when they become necessary, but I was told that that aspect had not been considered. The day will come when the pugholes in Hindmarsh will no longer take the water and a drainage scheme will have to be provided at a cost far in excess of £200,000, whereas the total cost might have been shared if a co-ordinated system had been put into effect.

A map supplied with the final report of the Committee of Inquiry shows the transport facilities available to residents in districts between Largs and Adelaide. Along Torrens Road a bus and tram run parallel to the railway line, and the same applies to the trolley bus running along the Port Road. Another bus and tram service is available along Grange Road. I have seen a loaded bus waiting at the Largs North railway crossing for an almost empty train to run through to Adelaide. Later in the journey that bus passes under the Commercial Road station in Port Adelaide, and often at that time an almost empty train is leaving the station. There are no less than 10 stations between Port Adelaide and Adelaide at which that empty train must stop.

Mr. Christian—The Bill contains no power to co-ordinate transport or to prevent the overlapping of railways and tramways services.

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is so, but I hope this Bill will be a step toward the setting up of a co-ordinating authority. Surely some of those trains, although giving a service, must be run at a loss. With the electrification of the Port Adelaide and Henley Beach lines consideration should be given to a suggestion made last night by the member for Glenelg. The member for Prospect complimented the Leader of the Opposition on his speech on the Bill, and I compliment Mr. Pattinson on his. He

supplied members with some enlightening points and submitted valuable suggestions. We must remember that there is the possibility of this country being involved in an invasion or an attack from the air, and we should prepare for it. If only trains and buses using electricity were employed and the centre supplying the power were bombed and destroyed, the whole system would be brought to an immediate standstill. Mr. Pattinson complained that the tramways were operating a motley collection of trams and buses. In a co-ordinated transport system a uniform type of buses should be used as feeders on regular routes. Mr. Whittle, who said that history would repeat itself, considered that when fares were increased losses resulted. I consider his deductions were wrong. Mr. Pattinson submitted that when fares were increased the number of passengers decreased. That is only logical.

Mr. Whittle—That always happens, but there is more revenue.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The honourable member gave no reasons for his deductions. However, a decrease in passengers must result because people with motor cars who can get others to travel with them and contribute small weekly donations towards the cost will use their own vehicles.

Mr. Whittle—They do that in any case.

Mr. HUTCHENS—But why encourage them? These small contributions cut down the motor owners' running costs, but unfortunate people who cannot afford to buy a motor car and have not the opportunity to travel with others are obliged to pay increased tram fares. From the point of view of the interests of the community it is a mistake to increase fares.

Much has been said about tramway employees being represented on the trust. I agree that there are men on the trust with undoubted ability; for instance, the chairman, Mr. R. O. Pitcher. I find that he receives £400 a year as chairman. No-one would question his ability, but he is employed as accountant at the Treasury at a salary of nearly £2,000 a year. I do not say that his salary is too high, but can he be expected to give the necessary time to administer the affairs of such an important institution as the Tramways Trust? Mr. Watson, the General Traffic Manager of the South Australian Railways, is also a member of the trust, but surely his duties in the railways demand all of his time. The new board should be as small as

possible. The members should make their duties a full-time job and be paid a salary commensurate with the demands made on them. I did not agree with all of the remarks the Treasurer made about the trust's obligations under awards. According to a newspaper report, he said:—

In fairness to the Municipal Tramways Trust, I say that a number of the difficulties in which it is involved at present are due to industrial awards. It is only possible for a tram conductor to collect fares for 20 hours each week because of the rosters at present in operation.

I realize that the rosters are responsible to a degree for the unhappy position in which the

trust finds itself. I remember, as an employee, starting duty at 7.20 a.m. and booking off at 8.36 a.m. I would then return to work in the afternoon and go home just after eight o'clock. It was 13 hours from the time I signed on until I signed off for the day, but I only received pay for 6 hours 20 minutes. I have taken out a number of rosters at random; they show that on the average the employees work 44 hours 12 minutes a week. I ask leave to have some of the schedules inserted in *Hansard* without reading them.

Leave granted.

The schedules were as follows:—

WORK FOR ONE WEEK.

Sunday only. Schedule 1586.

Schedule 1586. Sign on 1.25 p.m. Hackney Depot.

Run 178—

Depart Hackney Depot	p.m. 1.35	Arrive Morialta	p.m. 2.05
“ Morialta	2.06	“ Richmond	3.00
“ Richmond	3.05	“ Morialta	4.01
“ Morialta	4.06	“ Richmond	5.00
“ Richmond	5.05	“ Morialta	6.01
“ Morialta	6.07	“ Hackney Road	6.33
		Sign off at 6.49 p.m.	

Hours paid for on duty: 5 hr. 24 min.

Hours on tram collecting fares: 4 hr. 36 min.

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday (Thursday off duty).

Schedule 278. Sign on 11.38 a.m.

Run 287—

Depart Grenfell Street	p.m. 12.18	Arrive Henley Extension	p.m. 12.47
“ Henley Extension	12.50	“ Kensington Gardens	1.39
“ Kensington Gardens	1.43	“ Grenfell Street	2.03

Run 275—

“ Grenfell Street	3.03	“ Henley Extension	3.32
“ Henley Extension	3.35	“ Grenfell Street	4.04

Run 185—

“ Hackney Depot	4.53	“ Magill	5.34
“ Magill	5.36	“ Hilton	6.18
“ Hilton	6.19	“ Hackney Depot	6.43
		Sign off 6.58 p.m.	

Hours paid for on duty: 7 hr. 20 min. each day.

Hours on tram collecting fares each day: 4 hr. 23 min.

Saturday.

Schedule 1215. Sign on 11.48 a.m.

Run 100—

Depart Hackney Depot	a.m. 11.58	Arrive Hyde Park	p.m. 12.22
“ Hyde Park	p.m. 12.24	“ Hackney Depot	12.48

Run 150—

“ Hackney Road	3.15	“ St. Peters	3.27
“ St. Peters	3.31	“ Glen Osmond	4.14
“ Glen Osmond	4.16	“ St. Peters	4.57
“ St. Peters	5.01	“ Glen Osmond	5.44
“ Glen Osmond	5.45	“ Hackney Road	6.15
		Stand by and sign off 7.08 p.m.	

Hours paid for on duty: 7 hr. 20 min.

Hours on tram collecting fares: 2 hr. 37 min.

Total hours on duty for the week: 42 hr. 04 min.

Total hours on tram collecting fares: 24 hr. 45 min.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It can be seen from that schedule that the total time on duty for the week was 42 hours 4 minutes and the total time in collecting fares was 24 hours 45 minutes. However, the work of a tram conductor is different from that in other industries, and to say that the collecting of fares is the only responsibility of a tram conductor would do him an injustice. I do not suggest that the Premier implied this, but that could be inferred from his remarks. The conductor has to book on and off and has to make up his journal. Further, he has to be on the tram when it leaves the depot to go into service. He is allowed 10 minutes to travel from Hackney to Grenfell Street or the city depot. When the car reaches its destination he has to make up his journal before it returns. About five minutes would be taken up there. I know, from personal experience, that the Tramways

Employees' Union is just as concerned about running an efficient service as any body could be. The secretary, Mr. Les. Johns, has the welfare of the nation at heart. He is known and respected not only by members on this side of the House, but by many on the other side. I am sure that the union encourages employees to do their best. I hope that the suggestion from members on this side that a representative of the employees should be appointed to the new board will be accepted, because I know that the union would make every effort to see that the employees were well represented. I support the Bill.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 7, at 2 p.m.