

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 7, 1952.

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

ABSENCE OF CLERK.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that the Clerk of the House is absent through illness, and that under Standing Order No. 30 his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant, and pursuant to Standing Order No. 31 I have appointed Mr. A. F. R. Dodd to carry out the duties of the Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms during the absence of the Clerk.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Advances to Settlers Act Amendment Bill, 1952.

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Stamp Duties Act Amendment, Minister of Agriculture Incorporation, and Land Settlement Act Amendment Acts.

QUESTIONS.**MOORLANDS COALFIELD.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand that for some years investigations have been conducted by the Mines Department into the quantity of coal likely to be available at Moorlands. At one stage it was suggested that a sufficient quantity had been discovered to warrant the establishment of a power house if certain technical difficulties regarding the burning of the coal could be overcome, and I understand certain experiments were being conducted for that purpose. Can the Premier say what the present position is regarding the development of this coalfield, and if there is any possibility of a power house being established in that area in the near future?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As stated, the Minister of Mines requested the Mines Department to undertake a very wide investigation into the quantity of coal likely to be available at Moorlands by open cut methods. The department discovered several new deposits of a considerable quantity of coal previously not known to exist. All that information has been made

available to the Electricity Trust, which has examined the matter closely, but I have not heard of its final decision. As to the possibility of the field being opened in the near future, I point out that when the Leigh Creek field was opened the largest machines then being made in America for handling coal were of 18-yard capacity, and only a few were available. The largest machines of this type now being made in America are, I understand, of 35-yd. capacity, so even in the few years' operations at Leigh Creek the whole economics of shifting materials has changed considerably. Previous figures showed that with the very heavy water content of Moorlands coal it was doubtful whether it could compete with coal from other sources. The tendency is for more and better mechanization, but I do not know whether the present position makes Moorlands an economical proposition or not. The matter is being examined by the trust, and I will see if I can get the honourable member the latest information.

BANK CREDIT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—An announcement in today's press indicates that the Commonwealth Government intends to relax the provisions governing bank credit. Does the Treasurer know whether, because of this relaxation, the State Bank will be in a position to make better advances for the purchase of houses already erected and occupied that are coming on the market for resale and whether it will now be unnecessary for the Housing Trust to go on the market for loans to carry out its work, as suggested by the Treasurer some time ago?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—So far as I know, the relaxations will not have any of the effects the honourable member has mentioned. The State Bank is a State Government bank and has never been subject to any controls by the Commonwealth; in fact, the Constitution does not enable the Commonwealth to control a State Government banking institution. The operations of the State Bank are governed by the amount of money it has available for investment. That, in turn, is governed to a large extent by the amount of money the Government has available to hand over to the bank under the Loan programme each year. Speaking from memory, I think that just over £1,000,000 was made available for that purpose this year. That amount was voted by Parliament and is now being used by the bank for its advance policy under the Homes Act. I doubt whether the banks today are in a position to increase their advances

materially, and for that reason I doubt whether the relaxations will have any marked effect upon the economic position.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES.

Mr. LAWN—I noticed from the press during the week end that the Prime Minister had referred to the alarming increase in the number of unemployed and those receiving relief in Australia. He said that eight persons in 1,000 were receiving relief, which, of course, does not necessarily reflect the number of unemployed. Has the Minister of Industry and Employment the latest available figures for South Australia of males and females unemployed, and the number receiving unemployment benefits?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no figures more recent than the ones published officially about 10 days ago. They showed, speaking from memory, that the total number in South Australia receiving relief was 2,800, but, proportionately, they were better than the figures of any other State. Actually, on a population basis, the number of unemployed here was only about half that of any of the other States. I will see if I can get the honourable member more recent figures. I suggest that he asks the question again tomorrow. The latest figures I had showed not only that South Australia was maintaining its relatively good position, but that the number of unemployed persons was slightly abating.

GAWLER TRAINS.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Can the Minister of Railways say whether investigations have been made into the possibility of running an additional train to Gawler between the 6.16 p.m. and 9.55 p.m. trains?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The suggestion involves an intricate timetable. The investigations made so far do not permit of any intelligent answer being given to a question at present because we should have to compare times with times, and so on, but I hope to give the honourable member the full details in writing. The censuses taken do not disclose that there would be enough patronage to warrant another train, but I will give all the details of the passengers on the respective trains and the timetables that would be affected, and everything relating thereto.

LAND SETTLEMENT AGISTMENT FEES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Lands any further information to give the House in reply to the question I asked last week about the agistment of stock at Kangaroo

Island and what would happen to the amounts placed in a suspense account in the event of no writing off taking place on properties on the island?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Much information is available about agistment. Some years ago it was the wish of the applicants for land that they be permitted to develop, or help develop, their own properties. This has taken place, and after a few years pasture has been planted. In some cases it was found necessary for the pasture area to be agisted, and benefits would accrue because stock had been on it. Grazing fees are charged to employees who choose to graze stock on pastures on properties under development. It is anticipated that owing to increased costs of wages, machinery, superphosphate, etc., there will be losses to be shared by the State and the Commonwealth on a 2/5ths-3/5ths basis, as provided in the War Service Land Settlement Agreement. In the remote event of there being no such losses, the question as to the disposal of the money would have to be put to the Commonwealth Government as the fees were earned by the pasture established with Commonwealth Government money.

TAXATION DEPARTMENT AND ANONYMOUS LETTERS.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Treasurer say whether the Taxation Department has ever taken up inquiries as a result of receiving anonymous letters and, if so, does he think this is a desirable practice, because some person may have a grudge against another and write an anonymous letter to the department, thus causing the taxpayer much unwarranted trouble and, probably expense?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Taxation Department is now under Commonwealth control, so I could not answer any question on administration, but I believe that over many years many anonymous letters have been received by the department. I think the procedure normally is to investigate the information submitted, but frankly I do not know the present position.

POLLING HOURS.

Mr. MOIR—Will the Premier take up with the Federal Government the necessity of closing polling booths at all elections at 6 p.m. instead of 8 p.m., as at present, as most people do not work on Saturdays and only a small portion of electors vote after 6 p.m.?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not agree with the conclusions the honourable member

has reached in regard to the number of persons who vote after 6 p.m., because I know that in a number of electorates a large number vote after that time. Although Saturday may be a holiday in the metropolitan area, it is certainly not in many country areas.

FLAGPOLES FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Is the Minister representing the Minister of Education aware that in the *Education Gazette* of February 15, 1952, under the heading "Saluting the Flag," the following lines appeared?—

It is desirable that this ceremony should be performed in each school once per week, and that it should bring to a focus the patriotic sentiments of the school on such other occasions as may seem fit and proper to the teacher in charge of the school.

Is the Minister aware that flags are supplied to primary schools but no flagpoles are supplied? If a flagpole be needed the parents or the school committee through the parents are asked to provide such flagpoles. In view of it being a request of the department that children should take part in the ceremonies of saluting the flag, will the department in the future provide the very necessary flagpoles?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will address the question to the Minister of Education and bring down his reply at the earliest possible date.

PORTABLE SPRAYS AT LOXTON IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Lands indicate the present position regarding portable sprays in the Loxton soldier settlement area? Has any decision been reached about putting in the sprays, and what is the final decision on the head recommended by the settlers? I understand that a committee of soldier settlers recommended to the department a make of head that would save a considerable amount of money. As the matter has been dragging on for a considerable period and if a decision has not been made, will the department make one soon?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This question has been under consideration by the department and the soldier settlers for a considerable time. It is true, as the honourable member said, that the settlers themselves have recommended a certain make of head, but it is costly, and in this matter economics must be considered. The head suggested by the settlers is considerably more than double the price of a head which the department feels would be suitable for that type of irrigation. However, the matter is

still under consideration. On Friday night I had a deputation at my office until nearly 7 o'clock discussing this matter. As soon as a decision is reached I shall let the honourable member know.

QUALITY OF MEAT PIES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Premier obtained a report following on the question I asked on September 18 about the lack of meat in meat pies?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have obtained a report and I find that the honourable member touched upon a complex question when he raised the matter of the contents of a meat pie. The Assistant Prices Commissioner reports:—

Pies and pasties are not specifically controlled under the Prices Act, 1948-1951. Considerable difficulty was experienced under Commonwealth control regarding prices of these particular items. Most manufacturers evaded price fixation by reducing the quality and the quantity of their products and this would possibly recur if control was reimposed. There appears to be only one logical solution and this would be to have standard contents laid down under the Food and Drugs Act. This already applies to certain foodstuffs and from remarks made by some of the more reputable pie manufacturers could result in bringing the short-weight operator up to a higher standard than that which now exists. Much of the same difficulty could be anticipated under recontrol, whilst the right lay with the manufacturer to vary the size and quality of the product. If, however, definite standards were established as suggested under the Food and Drugs Act, then the setting of fixed prices and the job of seeing that these prices were adhered to would be easier. It is not felt that compulsion to a specific price will achieve anything. Perhaps a press statement to the effect that unless the quality of pies generally was improved the Government would be forced to consider recontrol, and in addition, if such a step was found necessary the control would consist of two forms—under the Food and Drugs Act, and recontrol of prices.

The honourable member has referred to a problem that, even when the Commonwealth was in control, did not lend itself easily to control, because pies are not of standard weight and there is no standard composition.

MIGRANT BUILDING INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier obtained a reply to the question I asked on September 25 regarding men brought out from England to erect houses for Martin Housing Limited being guaranteed housing accommodation on arrival, and told that they might earn up to £25 a week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust reports:—

Martin Housing Limited was some time ago given a contract by the South Australian Housing Trust to erect a number of imported timber houses. In order that this programme should not affect the construction of locally produced houses the company was required to secure tradesmen from the United Kingdom. The trust, in turn, arranged that some of these tradesmen would be accommodated in emergency dwellings. The trust took no part in the engagement of this labour force in the United Kingdom and has no direct knowledge of any arrangements made between the company and the workmen. However, the trust is informed by Martin Housing Limited, that no undertaking was given to the men as to the amount they could earn per week, except that the wages would be at least those provided to be paid by the appropriate award or determination.

WHYALLA SEWERAGE SCHEME.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Minister of Works indicate whether any further progress has been made concerning the preparation of a sewerage scheme for Whyalla, and can he indicate when it will be presented for consideration?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I know that some progress has been made, but the extent of which I am not prepared to state. I shall get a reply and let the honourable member have it one day this week.

WHEAT MARKETING SCHEME.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Agriculture any information to give to the House on the result of the conference at Canberra regarding the continuance of wheat marketing? Did the South Australian Government support the final decision, and will the Minister clarify the conference decision that cost of production will be the subject of a special review? What constitutes "special review," and will the scheme apply to the next crop and be only a one-year programme, or will there be a five-year programme as enunciated by the Commonwealth?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The conference in Canberra last week was not an Agricultural Council meeting. It was a meeting of State Ministers of Agriculture, and was attended by the Commonwealth Minister of Agriculture. The previous meeting of the council, held in Perth, decided that the judicious thing to do was to carry on the existing arrangement for a further 12 months. Nothing has transpired since that meeting to justify any change in the opinion of that meeting. I am not here to give the individual views of Ministers of Agriculture at the conference.

I am here to report on what the conference decided. Obviously, if Ministers coming away from a conference were to disclose what other Ministers said future conferences might not be very happy. With regard to modifications and alterations in the cost of production formula, it was agreed by Ministers from the reports they received that some alterations in the method of computing were necessary because of the altered conditions since the plan was first evolved. It was clear from costs given at the meeting that in the main those alterations would be to the advantage of the wheat-grower, and they will be put into operation in connection with any future plan: I do not think they will operate with regard to this coming year's crop to be harvested under the existing agreement, but they will as regards the year following.

RADIUM HILL POWER LINE ROUTE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week with regard to the possible route of the line to supply electric power to Radium Hill?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I had a report from the chairman of the Electricity Trust which shows the position is very much as I outlined in my previous reply. The report reads:—

The trust plans to supply Radium Hill by a 132,000 volt line from Morgan. It will not be possible to tap this line between Morgan and Radium Hill. The Assistant Chief Engineer for the trust advised me that the approximate cost of a transformer to enable supply to be taken from a 132,000 volt line would be between £15,000 and £20,000 in each case.

HOUSING AT CUMMINS.

Mr. PEARSON—Some time ago a contract for the construction of five Housing Trust homes at Cummins was let to a private contractor, but, for reasons which I have not been able to completely ascertain, progress has been extremely slow. Two of the houses are necessary for members of the Cummins area school staff. Will the Premier obtain a report from the Housing Trust as to the cause of the slow progress made? If it is shortage of materials, will the trust assist the contractor to obtain them; if shortage of manpower, will the trust consider using for the purpose some of its own men who may be in that district building houses on farms under the new rural housing programme?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will obtain a report.

RURAL HOUSING PROGRAMME.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Premier say how many of the imported prefabricated houses, some of which were offered to the New Zealand Government, are still held by the Housing Trust and how many have been sold to primary producers under the rural housing programme offer?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think the total number of houses still to be disposed of by the Housing Trust, including houses that are here, houses being erected, and houses still to come, is just under 2,000. The honourable member pre-supposes that the houses being supplied to rural areas are these imported houses, but that assumption is not correct in every case, for, although the smaller ones may be, I think the larger rural houses are constructed mainly from timber from the South-East and Western Australia. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

SAVINGS BANK ADVANCES.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—

1. Has the Savings Bank of South Australia limited advances (with certain exceptions) on the security of houses to £2,000 because the bank has not sufficient funds to advance larger amounts?

2. If not, what is the reason for such limitation?

3. When did such limitation come into operation?

4. How many exceptions have been made and generally what was the reason for such exceptions?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1 and 2. The board of the Savings Bank advises that the aim of the bank is to make the available funds serve the needs of as many borrowers as possible desiring to build or buy homes.

3. May 9, 1952.

4. Very few exceptions have been made and they for reasons satisfactory to the bank.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR CORONER.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—

1. On how many occasions during the last 12 months has the coroner had the assistance of counsel from the Crown Solicitor's Office?

2. Does the Coroner apply for such assistance?

3. Is such assistance supplied in cases where Government employees are not personally concerned?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. One.

2. The City Coroner requested that a Crown Law officer assist him at that inquest.

3. Yes, if requested and officers of the Crown Law Department are available.

SWAB-TAKING AT HORSE RACES.

Mr. John Clark for Mr. J. F. WALSH (on notice)—Can the Treasurer ascertain whether—(a) any racing club in the metropolitan area discontinued the practice of taking swabs of winners of horse races at their meetings; (b) if not, when was the last occasion that a swab was taken in the metropolitan area; (c) if so, what is the explanation for the discontinuance of the practice?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—(a) No. (b) October 4. (c) *Vide* (a).

RECREATION RESERVES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—

1. Which corporations or councils have purchased land from the Housing Trust for recreation purposes?

2. What areas, if any, have been so purchased and where are they located?

3. What areas of land have been made available by the trust for children's playgrounds, and in what localities?

4. What areas have been reserved by the trust for the erection of community and public halls?

5. Is it the intention of the Government to request the trust, when purchasing land, to ascertain from the local governing bodies whether they desire to purchase and reserve land for recreation purposes prior to the trust commencing building operations?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

4. The Housing Trust has not reserved any areas of land specifically for halls, etc., but it is the practice of the trust when building on a large area to leave a number of blocks unbuilt upon so that these can be used for purposes such as community halls, etc., if the need arises in the future.

5. When subdividing land, the trust is in very close touch with the councils concerned and the councils are in a position to make early arrangements with the trust where it is mutually agreed that land should be made available for such as parks, etc.

1, 2, and 3. The particulars desired are given in the attached table, which I ask leave to incorporate in *Hansard*.

Locality.	Recreation Reserve.	Playground.	Corporation.	Form of Disposal.	Plan No.	Hall/Kindergarten.	Mothers and Babies Health Association.	Clinic.	Church.	School.
	Acres.	Acres.								Acres.
Albert Park	2½	—	Woodville	Vested ...	HHC46	—	—	—	—	—
Blair Athol	8	—	Enfield	Sold	WD1050	—	—	—	—	—
					WD950	—	—	—	—	19
					WD1820	—	—	—	—	—
Brighton	—	½	Brighton	Vested ...	WD1484	—	—	—	—	—
Camden Park	—	—	—	—	LP4	—	—	—	—	6
Daw Park	¼	1½	Mitcham	Vested ...	LP111	—	—	—	—	—
Draper	—	—	—	—	WD1248	—	—	—	—	—
					WD1401	—	—	—	—	—
					LP119	—	—	—	—	—
					LP118	—	—	—	—	—
	2	—	Port Adelaide ..	Undecided	LP50	—	2	—	—	—
Edwardstown	14½	—	Mitcham	Sold	—	—	—	—	—	—
Enfield	6	—	Enfield	Vested ...	WD1101	—	1	—	—	20
Enfield (Clearview)	—	—	—	—	LP82	—	—	—	1	—
Findon	2	—	Woodville	Vested ...	WD332	—	—	—	—	—
		¼	—	—	HHC4	—	—	—	—	—
Flinders Park	1¼	—	Woodville	Vested ...	WD1109	—	—	—	1	—
Gilles Plains	7	—	Enfield	Undecided	LP73	—	—	—	1	9½
					LP74	—	—	—	—	—
Gleneagles	½	—	—	Vested ...	LP54	—	—	—	—	—
Glenelg North	2¾	—	West Torrens ..	Vested ...	WD192	—	—	—	—	—
Hectorville	11½	—	Campbelltown ..	Sold	RSP3	—	—	—	—	2½
Kilburn	—	½	Enfield	Vested ...	WD41	—	1	—	—	—
	1¼	—	Enfield	Vested ...	WD130	—	—	—	—	—
	¼	—	Enfield	Vested ...	WD18	—	—	—	—	—
Largs North (Swansea)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2½
Lockleys	½	—	West Torrens ..	Vested ...	WD971	—	—	—	—	—
Marion	—	—	Marion	Vested ...	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1½	2½	—	Undecided	LP136	—	—	—	1	10
					LP108	—	—	—	1	—
	3	—	Marion	Vested ...	LP87	1	1	—	—	—

Locality.	Recreation Reserve.	Playground.	Corporation.	Form of Disposal.	Plan No.	Hall/Kindergarten.	Mothers and Babies Health Association.	Clinic.	Church.	School.
	Acres.	Acres.								Acres.
Marion (Darlington)	1½	—	Marion	Vested ...	LP70	—	—	—	—	—
Marion (Gardener's Estate) .	—	—	—	—	LP76	—	—	—	—	—
					WD1485	—	—	—	—	—
Marion (Warradale Park) ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9¼
Morphettville	—	1¼	Marion	Vested ...	WD490	—	—	—	1	—
					LP86	—	—	—	1	10
Netley	—	½	West Torrens .	Vested ...	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Brighton	—	—	Brighton	Sold	—	1	—	—	—	—
Northfield	2	¼	Enfield	Vested ...	LP128	—	—	—	2	—
	1¼	—	Enfield	Vested ...	LP123	—	—	—	—	—
					LP67	—	—	—	—	10
Oaklands	46	—	S.A. Govt.	Sold	—	—	—	—	—	—
Osborne	2	—	Port Adelaide .	Vested ...	WD673	—	—	—	—	—
Pennington	1½	—	Port Adelaide .	Vested ...	HHC3	—	—	—	—	—
					HHC27	—	—	—	—	—
					WD368	—	1	—	—	—
Seaton	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Seaton (Alberton South)	6¼	—	Woodville	Sold	LP143	1	—	—	—	—
Seaton (Albert Park)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Somerton (Paringa Park)	—	¼	Brighton	Sold	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Plympton	—	1	Marion	Leased	—	—	—	—	—	—
Taperoo	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Taperoo (Riverview)	—	—	—	—	LP42	—	—	—	—	10½
Woodville Gardens	—	1	Enfield	Vested ...	WD323	—	1	—	—	—
	¼	—	Enfield	Vested ...	WD1446	—	—	—	—	—
					WD1243	—	—	—	—	—
	1½	—	—	—	WD1431	—	—	—	—	—
					WD1444	—	—	—	—	—
	6¼	—	Enfield	Undecided	WD1641	—	—	—	—	10
	2½	—	—	—	WD1445	—	—	—	—	—
					LP133	—	—	1	—	—
	2½	—	Woodville	Vested ...	EP106	—	—	—	—	—
					LP43	—	—	—	—	—

Locality.	Recreation Reserve.	Playground.	Corporation.	Form of Disposal.	Plan No.	Hall/Kindergarten.	Mothers and Babies Health Association.	Clinic.	Church.	School.
	Acres.	Acres.								Acres.
Woodville North	$\frac{1}{2}$	—	—	—	WD1330	—	—	—	—	—
Woodville West	$5\frac{1}{2}$	—	Woodville	Sold	WD1662	—	—	—	—	—
	2	—	Woodville	Vested ...	WD1663	—	—	—	—	1
York	—	$\frac{1}{4}$	—	—	HHC7	—	—	—	—	—
Crystal Brook	—	$\frac{1}{2}$	Crystal Brook .	Vested ...	LP105	—	—	—	—	—
Gawler	$7\frac{1}{2}$	—	Gawler	Vested ...	WD1149	—	—	—	—	—
Kadina	1	—	Kadina	Vested ...	WD681	—	—	—	—	—
Mount Barker	$\frac{3}{4}$	—	Mount Barker .	Vested ...	WD1135	—	—	—	—	—
					LP27	—	—	—	—	—
Mount Gambier	7	1	—	Vested ...	WD1068	—	—	—	—	—
				Sold	LP101	—	—	—	2	—
Murray Bridge	2	—	Murray Bridge	Vested ...	WD933	—	—	—	—	—
					WD1537	—	—	—	—	—
Nuriootpa	$\frac{1}{2}$	—	Nuriootpa	Vested ...	WD1338	—	—	—	—	—
Port Augusta	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	Port Augusta .	Vested ...	WD918	—	—	—	—	—
					LP205	—	—	—	—	—
					Vacant land	—	—	—	—	—
Port Lincoln	$1\frac{1}{4}$	—	—	Vested ...	LP99	—	—	—	—	—
	$3\frac{1}{4}$	—	Port Lincoln ..	Sold	Vacant land	—	—	—	—	—
Port Pirie	$4\frac{1}{2}$	—	Port Pirie	Vested ...	WD1212	—	—	—	—	—
Salisbury	3	—	Salisbury	Sold	—	—	—	—	2	—
				Vested ...	LP58	—	—	—	—	—
				Retained .	—	—	—	—	—	—
				Sold	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tailem Bend	$1\frac{1}{2}$	—	—	Vested ...	LP24	—	—	—	—	11
Tanunda	$1\frac{1}{2}$	—	Tanunda	Vested ...	SL505	—	—	—	—	—

3rd October, 1952.

CARGO DISCHARGE.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—What were the respective incoming cargo tonnages discharged over Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour wharves (excluding gantries) for the months of July, August, and September, 1951 and 1952, from

	July.	August.	September.	Total.
1951.				
Oversea	76,577	144,658	144,802	366,037
Interstate	30,914	39,384	31,955	102,253
Coastal	25,005	29,909	25,262	80,176
	132,496	213,951	202,019	548,466
1952.				
Oversea	116,716	68,077	100,009	284,802
Interstate	42,942	49,623	43,084	135,649
Coastal	24,925	20,594	17,606	63,125
	184,583	138,294	160,699	483,576

PORT ADELAIDE TUGS.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Is the claim of Captain H. S. Allen, master of the P. & O. liner *Strathaird* that Port Adelaide tugs, excepting the *Tancred*, are ineffective, in accordance with fact?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Captain Allen claimed that with the exception of the *Tancred* there was no other individual tug effective for the berthing of big ships at Outer Harbour. The facts are that whereas the size of overseas vessels visiting the port has shown a progressive increase, there had been no corresponding increase in the power of the tugs operating at Port Adelaide. The Harbors Board endeavoured to impress upon the towage interests the necessity to acquire at least one high-powered tug capable of rendering the additional assistance required by large vessels berthing under inclement weather conditions. Being unsuccessful in impressing the towage interests, the *Tancred* was acquired under hire from the Commonwealth Government. Although regularly employed for Harbors Board purposes, the tug has been kept available at short call for berthing and unberthing mail steamers at the Outer Harbour whenever required. Power and manoeuvrability are the important features of a tug and what these vessels lack in these respects cannot necessarily be made up by weight of numbers. The largest privately owned tugs based on Port Adelaide are the *Woonda* and *Foremost*, which are steam vessels of 1,120 and 850 I.H.P., respectively. Both have been equipped with Kort nozzles to increase their static pulls, but even with the addition of this device they are still a good deal less effective as regards both power and manoeuvrability than the *Tancred*, which is a modern highly manoeuvr-

(a) overseas, (b) interstate and intrastate vessels?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The figures are as follows:—

(a) and (b) The figures for September, 1952, are approximate only.

able diesel electric tug of 1,900 B.H.P. It is considered by the Harbors Board that there should be at least two tugs of the *Tancred* class available at all times for attendance on shipping, thus avoiding multiplicity of tugs. The manager of the Adelaide Steam Tug Co. Ltd. has announced that quotes are being sought in Australia and overseas for the building of a new tug of about 2,000 h.p.

STATE BANK ADVANCES.

Mr. STEPHENS (on notice)—

1. How many applications under the Advances for Homes Act received by the State Bank of South Australia during the nine months ended September 30, 1952, had not been approved as at that date?
2. How many of these applications have been approved since September 30, 1952?
3. If any, are they subject to the new interest rate of 5½ per cent?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Applications received from 1/1/52 to 30/9/52 607
Applications approved during the above period 404
203
Applications withdrawn, etc., during above period 150
Applications pending 53
2. Nil.
3. *Vide* No. 2.

FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

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

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 2. Page 763.)

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—Those who have listened to the debate must have been struck by the wonderful unanimity of the various speakers. If they are looking for a theme song I suggest that popular tune "There's a Hand-out on Panhandle Hill." The only amendment necessary would be to change "Panhandle" to "Parliament." Evidently a good hand-out is taking place, and all those who have spoken are taking part in it.

Mr. Pattinson—Good Liberal legislation.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—"Liberal legislation" has become such a loose term that one cannot tell whether it is Liberal or Socialistic legislation. I have listened with interest to two week-end broadcasts by my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, who has been dealing with the difference between what I might term Playfordian Socialism and that sponsored by the Labor Party. I think the difference is only one of title. The Playford system of Socialism, even if it gave 10yds. in a 100, could still beat the Labor Party system. There is no doubt that the present Government is the best socialistic Government in Australia.

Mr. Heaslip—Do you know the difference between Capitalism and Socialism?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—One system of Socialism was sponsored by Hitler and he has been cleaned up, and another system is being sponsored by Stalin. Discuss it as you will, it all comes back to Socialism. I hope to prove that the Bill is a socialistic measure, and I therefore intend to oppose it. If it should be read a second time, as no doubt it will for obvious reasons, I will try to amend it along the lines the original sponsors of tramways legislation hoped the tramways would function. I will endeavour to prove, by quoting chapter and verse, that the present system is contrary to everything envisaged when the Tramways Trust was established. I intend to oppose the

Bill because of the unwarranted waste of public money which will follow if it is passed. Recently the Land Settlement Committee visited Kangaroo Island and discussed with members of the local district council the problems arising from the rapid development over there. One of the points they made and one with which I think every member of the committee thoroughly agreed, was that there should be one central arterial road established throughout the length of the Island so that settlers on either side could bring their produce to the port of export. The reason put forward for not going on with the road was that the Government was short of money because of the limitations placed on State Government expenditure by the action of the Commonwealth Government. Urgent works are waiting to be carried out in every country district. A headmaster's house in my area was destroyed by fire and on behalf of the committee I approached the Minister of Education to see whether it could be replaced, but the Minister told me he did not know where to turn because there were so many demands on the moneys available to him, and he had the invidious task, not of deciding what district was entitled to buildings, but where he could best spend the money available. Again, the settlers at Winkie hoped to establish a township to attract and retain workers there, but the Minister of Irrigation could not approve of a water tank being provided to supply the township, even though it would cost only a miserable £7,020, which should be a flea-bite for a State like South Australia. The member for Stanley has just handed me a letter stating that owing to the shortage of Loan money the painting of schools and residences has had to be deferred. I have given these illustrations to show why I object to the Bill. Its passing will involve the State in an expenditure of £500,000 in the first year. That sum would go a long way towards solving some of the problems of country districts.

Mr. Christian—And that amount represents only the thin edge of the wedge.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I will follow up that point later. It would also enable two bridges to be built across the Murray.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Only one at present-day costs.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The Minister is a pessimist. I believe it would build two, but at least it would provide one at Blanchetown, which would be a start. The requirements of country areas have been stressed for years,

but all we have got are sentimental statements by Ministers about more people going into the country, more industries being established there, and greater production. They say we have to feed the people of the Commonwealth, but we also have to export enough to pay for commodities imported into the country for use in the cities. However, with more than 60 per cent of South Australia's population in the city, what hope have we from the country if the Government continually ignores its needs? The Bill will give handouts to city people, unlimited in amount or time.

Mr. Pattinson—Isn't that a grave reflection on the country representation in this place? Country people have a two to one majority in the House.

Mr. Moir—All the Ministers are from country electorates, too.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—One only has to listen to the speeches already made on this Bill to realize there is a handy ganging up on both sides of the House for the protection of vested interests in the city. We cannot expect people with families to stay in the country unless reasonable amenities are provided.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why can't we pass this Bill and also provide amenities in the country?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Time after time during the present session the Treasurer has informed the House of the limited funds provided by the Commonwealth. Every department has had to curtail its programme. Under that system we cannot have it both ways: the money to be spent on the tramways will not be available for schemes in the country.

Mr. O'Halloran—But the Commonwealth is busy changing its mind on finance at the moment.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I haven't much faith in the Commonwealth as far as finance is concerned, although it may grant a few concessions. I have said that this was not only a matter of finance, but of principle. I pointed out that the sponsors of the legislation did not think for a moment that they would have to accept the hand-outs from the Government. It was intended that the system should be controlled by the people in the metropolitan area and that no Government should interfere. In those early days the people were jealous of their municipal responsibilities. To prove my points I shall make several quotations from the debates which took place in Parliament in 1906. The Hon.

Thomas Price, in introducing the Bill, is reported to have said:—

They, the Government, invited the fullest examination and freest criticism. They should be no party to squandering public money for the benefit of the city. They did not propose to make a profit out of the city or suburban municipalities, but were satisfied that not one penny of either principal or interest would be lost to the State. They had secured this result by making the city and suburbs responsible for all the money advanced by the Government except the amount required to complete the purchase of the present tramways. There could be no question that the ratepayers were able to meet the liability imposed upon them. All the mayors, after consideration, were satisfied not only with the scheme, but were willing that their towns should bear the risk and financial responsibility.

Mr. Moir—You don't think they are able to pay for the system now?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—All the mayors said they had no doubt about being able to make a success of the undertaking. In those days the mayor of Kensington and Norwood Council agreed to the proposal.

Mr. Moir—Now he has enough commonsense to keep out.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I do not know whether it is common sense or shirking the responsibility.

Mr. MOIR—Not on your life.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—In 1906 Adelaide was largely a city of open spaces and the trams ran through sparsely populated areas—quite different from today. Mr. Moir, in his anxiety to support the argument of his council, says the tramways cannot pay. Why can't they pay? They operate under conditions that were not envisaged in 1906.

Mr. Moir—There were no motor cars in those days. The people came into the city in bullock waggons.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—If we take that interjection at its face value, and it is absurd, it is an argument why we should not have trams. Earlier in the session Mr. Dunnage said that tramway finances are in their present position because the people of Adelaide are too prosperous, and that even the drivers and connies of trams drive to work in motor cars.

A member—Good luck to them!

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes. I am highly delighted at their position, but is it proper that country people, who have no tramway system, should be expected to help to meet the tramway deficit in the city because the prosperous people there do not use the trams?

Mr. Dunnage—About £5,000,000 is lost on the railways in bringing country people to the city and taking them home again.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I do not want to become involved in an argument about the railways. Every member knows my views on that matter, and I shall deal with the railways in a later debate. At present we are dealing with the tramways. Mr. Moir said that the trams now have to compete with motor cars, and Mr. Dunnage said that city people are so prosperous that they have their own motor cars. I agree with both statements.

Mr. Shannon—If the city people are so wealthy that they can use their own motor cars and not the trams, should they not be able to pay for the losses incurred by the trams which they do not use?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I shall come to that matter later. I have pointed out that the mayors accepted responsibilities in 1906, and I will now quote a report of a statement by the then mayor of Adelaide to show that he was cognizant of what was taking place and that he was prepared to put his shoulder to the wheel and carry some of the responsibility, which is something different from what we hear today. Mr. Ware is reported to have said:—

“The matter of urban and suburban transit was recognized in Great Britain as as much a municipal duty as the making of roads and foot-paths and as street lighting and sanitation and local government in Adelaide and the surrounding districts, which formed a portion of Greater Adelaide, in its endeavours to get out of the narrow confines of parochialism, should not have its arduous damped by the suggested State control of an affair of its own domestic economy.” Finally, he pointed out that the profits and the advantages of the control of the tramways belonged absolutely to the people who created them and for whom the tramways existed, and they undoubtedly were the residents and ratepayers of the city and suburbs. They felt that the Government, as representing the whole colony, should confine itself to its legitimate spheres of action, and not seek to interfere with the rights and privileges of the local authorities of any particular area.

Mr. Shannon—He did not envisage a loss.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The financial losses are of recent occurrence, and in my opinion the result of gross mismanagement. I shall deal with this matter later.

Mr. Shannon—Don't you think that men prepared to share in profits should also share in losses?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes. My point is that the responsibility was not foisted on the mayors in those early days. At the time every mayor was prepared to shoulder his share of the responsibility knowing full well what it

meant. Today the mayors are walking away from their responsibilities. In those days the central Government was not allowed to interfere in the matter. Now the Government is breaking its neck to control the undertaking. Later I shall prove that this is a socialistic Bill. It is simply beating the air for Labor members to talk about socialism. We have it in this Bill. During the 1906 debate the Labor Party was anxious to socialize the tramways and the following is a reported statement by Mr. Dankel, a Labor member:—

Mr. Dankel said he would rather see the trams nationalized than municipalized. It was as much a national work as any other public work that had been undertaken. He could not understand the opposition of the country members to the nationalization scheme. There was an absolute certainty that it would be a financial success and pay a handsome dividend. I think the word “nationalization” was used wrongly. A State Government cannot nationalize but it can socialize. Obviously “nationalization” was used in the sense of socialization.

Mr. John Clark—That shows again that the mayors were in only for profit.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I would not say that. On both sides of the House it was said in 1906 that the tramways would be a successful undertaking. They should be but they will not until we get business ability on the trust. Whilst its members represent vested interests we shall not get the business ability needed on the board. This is not my first experience of debating a Bill where the Labor Party has tacitly supported a Liberal Government and where, if the Independents had not provided the opposition, there would have been none. A clause dealing with foreclosure in the case of default was rejected because the Liberals of those days who were not in favour of Socialism were afraid that the Government would take over this undertaking. Believing that it should be left to local government bodies to administer they pointed out that there was no question of foreclosure because of the equity in the City of Adelaide and surrounding areas which could be called on in the case of this body defaulting. Mr. Solomon, who lived in Glenelg, quoted the example of the Patawalonga scheme, and Mr. Smeaton said:—

Mr. Solomon's illustration of Glenelg's Patawalonga liability was a very fair one. He (Mr. Smeaton), as a resident of Glenelg for 10 years, had been paying a special rate of fourpence all that time to meet those bonds. And if it came to the local governing bodies who were parties to the Tramways Trust

having to pay a special rate there would be no great hardship. There was a ratable value of over a million to levy on, and the special rate that would be necessary would be a mere flea-bite.

That statement shows that the question of the councils being called on to make good any deficit was a very real one which was faced up to. In effect, Mr. Smeaton said that there was nothing new about such a proposal. This is a concrete case of where the Government advanced money to run a certain undertaking, the people being prepared to live up to their responsibilities. Indeed, one man said that he paid a rate of 4d. in the pound. The rateable value of a million pounds quoted by Mr. Smeaton could be multiplied by 20 to give the corresponding money value today.

Mr. Pattinson—I would be satisfied with half a million pounds for a Patawalonga scheme today.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—If the honourable member goes on like other honourable members, asking for hand-outs without being willing to take any responsibility for the repayment of moneys advanced, he is not likely to get it, for the way to get money is to live up to the responsibilities involved in its borrowing. If money can be put to good use, as I am sure it can be in Glenelg, it should be repaid, for why should Glenelg, or any other district, get something for nothing at the expense of the rest of the community? Over half a century ago citizens took their financial responsibilities seriously, for the old pioneering spirit was still alive.

Mr. Christian—We are killing it today.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes. A very big proportion of the land values in the city of Adelaide and suburbs was created by the passing of the Municipal Tramways Trust Act.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Doesn't the city of Adelaide assist in paying pumping costs on the River Murray? What would the Murray settlers do if those costs were not subsidized by city people?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—It is a tragedy when a Minister of the Crown who has lived on the River Murray and knows its value to the State can only make such an inane interjection.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—That's not an answer. The general taxpayer subsidizes every water supply scheme in the State, and, because the reverse applies in this case, you are complaining.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Those water supplies are a necessity that have done as much as if not more than, any other service to open

up low rainfall areas in the State, but the city tramways at best can only be said to be conveniences or amenities, which should be made to pay. Originally the responsibility to make them pay was realized by legislators in this House.

Mr. Stott—The Tramways Trust does not produce anything, but the Murray water does. Yet we cannot get a bridge across the river.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—That would not pay a dividend.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The remarks I have quoted from the 1906 debates provide a concrete example of a council living up to its responsibility and being prepared, without complaining, to repay money it had borrowed. What was true in that case could be multiplied many times with regard to the city of Adelaide and suburbs, because it was the tramways that very largely made and are still making suburban land values. What would happen to metropolitan land values if the trams stopped running to the suburbs? They would tumble overnight because people would not be able to get transport into the city. As those lines built up land values, is there anything wrong with the suggestion that city people should pay something towards the cost of the tramways?

Mr. Pattinson—What would happen if the pumping plants on the river stopped pumping?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The country people pay for that service and settlers on the river are paying more for that water supplied by Government Departments than private enterprise charges for the water it supplies. The Renmark trust, which is run by private enterprise and has a substantial equity, has charged less for its water than Government departments do. The Minister of Works mentioned the subsidizing of country water supplies, but any loss incurred in that regard is due to Ministerial and departmental inefficiency.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The honourable member would not like to take them over and run them at his own cost, for today water could not be pumped for the price being charged settlers.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—My argument was not supported only by the Patawalonga scheme, for the Premier (The Hon. T. Price) said, with regard to the Tramways Trust financing itself:—

The trust could not be insolvent as long as there was rating power in the corporation and district councils to raise the deficiency. Personally, he believed the undertaking would prove a profitable one.

Honourable members representing vested interests in the city do not like to be told that, but it is good for their souls to be told what the men of that day and generation thought. In those days when a man incurred a debt he felt a responsibility to repay it, but today people having received the benefit, are anxious to find a way of evading the debt. Private individuals and companies must pay income tax, but the Tramways Trust has been exempted by section 66, which states:—

Neither the trust nor its property shall be subject to general, special, or local taxation. Now it is anxious to get money from the State Treasury. In introducing the Bill the Premier gave an historical review, and, although that review was quite correct, I feel that it missed the whole spirit behind this legislation when it was first before Parliament. Though we had the bare bones of the argument from the Premier, we did not hear of what actuated those members of this Parliament who did so much to develop the State, and I suggest that, if we were imbued with the same sense of responsibility that those members had, it would be better for South Australia.

A special committee was set up by Parliament last year to deal with this problem, and I will comment on some of its recommendations for the control of the tramways, for I feel that the whole responsibility for this fiasco rests with the councils. They asked for power to control the tramways, and Parliament has given it to them. The Lord Mayor of Adelaide said, in effect, "The State Parliament has one sphere of activity and the Tramways Trust another, and we as municipalists do not desire the State to come in." Now, they are in such a mess that the State must do something to rectify the position. In dealing with the control of the tramways, the committee of enquiry recommended:—

That in view of the manner in which certain capital moneys have been expended in the past, and what is visualized for the future, there should be some restriction on the trust in the expenditure of capital moneys.

In effect it says that the trust is unable to control its own finances. The committee also recommended:—

That while weakness in the financial provisions of the Act could be remedied by minor amendments, the weakness in the present machinery for selection of the trust is such that the trust in its present form should be abolished.

Surely there was never a more damning statement? A further recommendation was:—

Making provision, by amendment of the Act, for temporary financial accommodation by way

of bank overdraft. The provision of a bank overdraft would only be advisable if at the same time adequate corrective action were taken to obtain financial equilibrium to ensure that the temporary accommodation did not resolve itself into a permanent loan, and leave the financial problem still unsolved.

The Bill does not suggest a loan, but something of permanency, because there is to be no limit in time or to the money proposed to be given to the tramways. It is simply a subsidy on inefficiency. Everyone knows that if a person has the right to spend money while others have to carry the loss, he is in a very happy position. From the remarks of some members I should imagine that they consider that those who benefit by this method of finance are very lucky, but as one with a sense of responsibility I would consider myself unlucky if placed in that position. The committee further recommended:—

Implement the provision of the Act whereby the metropolitan councils, upon default by the trust, are liable to the Government in respect of debenture payments. The Government to provide financial assistance by way of a loan or a grant.

I would agree to the trust being given a loan at a nominal rate, and under pressure would even approve of the loan being free of interest, even although it is admitted that it is entirely responsible for its financial mess. Although I am prepared to help the trust, I do not agree that the money should be made available as a grant. There is no precedent for that, and it opens up a big question. If finance is to be made available for transport in the City of Adelaide, will it also be made available to help country transport systems? There are several transport systems in my district, and if they make a loss will they receive a free grant from the Government? City dwellers have benefited immeasurably from the tramways, and it would not be expecting too much if they had to pay a moiety to meet the losses of this great undertaking and place it on a better financial basis. I understand that it is proposed to appoint a trust comprising the best men available in the Commonwealth, irrespective of where they come from. They could not be any worse than the present members. The City of Adelaide should be prepared to acknowledge the benefit it has received from the tramways, instead of coming for help to the poor country people who have no roads, amenities, or transport facilities, and asking them to pay a moiety to protect the system. That would not be upholding the city's dignity.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I know the honourable member would not intentionally mislead the House, but I remind him that of 80 per cent of the revenue spent in the country at least 50 per cent comes from the City of Adelaide.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The member for Burnside attempted to establish a principle for such payments as are proposed in the Bill, but he showed how little city members know about what country people have to contend with. He mentioned the Colombo Plan, but what that has to do with a subsidy for the Adelaide city council I do not know. He also mentioned that the State contributed grants to those who suffered from floods, frosts, and fires, or any other national calamity. I have not gone so far as to say that the tramways are a national calamity, but in their present condition they are certainly a State calamity. On one occasion I was placed in the unfortunate position of having to accept frost assistance to enable me to continue as a primary producer, but I have had to pay back every penny, plus interest, and other settlers had to do the same.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—That is not correct. As the honourable member knows, hundreds received the benefit of debt adjustment.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I said that my only experience of receiving Government assistance was in relation to frost relief, and that I had to pay every penny back, plus interest. Many other settlers had to do the same. However, some could not pay, but the last penny was extracted from those who could. I am not objecting to that. The member for Burnside assumes that the proposed grant to the city of Adelaide is similar in principle to the frost relief granted to country settlers. Some settlers received assistance through the Farmers' Assistance Board, but that was not because the Government was particularly interested in them as individuals, but because it knew it had to keep them producing or otherwise the whole State economic system would have gone by the board. I remember the member for Kadley asking the Government whether the Farmers' Assistance Board would allow a farmer to pay his son 10s. a week as wages instead of 5s. and the request was refused. That is the difference between the assistance a primary producer receives and the free hand-out the Government proposes to give to the wealthy city of Adelaide. In fact, the city is so wealthy that, according to its own representatives, many of its people will not condescend to use the tramways provided for them.

Mr. John Clark—That was only one man's opinion.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—If a depression struck us tomorrow half the motor cars now on the roads would be back in their garages and then the tramways would get the support they are entitled to.

Mr. Moir—We do not want another depression so that the tramways can be put back on their feet.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—There has been a peculiar silence from certain members on the Government benches who should be in a position to help the House to come to a decision—provided it is to come to a logical decision instead of one that is already decided. For the House to come to a decision in open debate it should have received help from those members who have a knowledge of accountancy. I imagine we could have been informed where the trust had gone wrong. In its report the committee of inquiry stated:—

A decided weakness in the financial administration of the trust is the absence of detailed cash budgets as an aid to control its working and capital expenditure.

If that is so, the trust is less intelligent than the average housewife, who must budget her expenditure every time her husband brings home his wages; and yet we have this huge undertaking which evidently does not budget its income and expenditure. Surely that is extraordinary. Never before have we had a business undertaking run on such lines. And yet taxpayers throughout the State are to be asked to subsidize this inefficiency and ignorance. Members of the House who have the specialized knowledge have been silent on the cause of the trust's financial position. I have had to make a similar complaint before. If a Bill dealing with irrigation or fruit growing were before the House I would feel it my duty to tell the truth as I knew it, even if it were not accepted. However, now we find a discreet silence from those in a position to inform the House of what has taken place. Under "Administration," the committee states:—

In view of all the circumstances, and the alternative methods of control, it is desirable that the Government take over the control of the public street transport system and appoint a trust.

The criticisms by the committee amount to a damning indictment of men appointed to control public affairs. It seems that they have

merely been looking for plums, drawing salaries, but doing nothing. We have learnt from the press of members going abroad and others refusing to give information to councils on what has taken place. The Government now proposes to call on the general taxpayer to subsidize tramway finances, which have come to a sorry state through gross mismanagement. I doubt whether anything I can say will alter the vote on the Bill, but I place my remarks on record to show my views. The short title is "Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment Bill," but it simply means the socialization of the tramways, the very thing the Labor Party has been working for since 1906. Clause 5 provides for the re-constitution of the trust, but allows a council to petition for the trust not be re-constituted. I suggested to the Treasurer, by interjection, that this was an empty gesture because the vital provision of the Bill is the one enabling Parliament to make grants to the trust. The Treasurer realizes the truth of Rothschild's statement that it matters not who governs the country; what matters is who controls its credit. When the Commonwealth Government controls the finances of the States it controls the States' legislation. When the Treasurer controls the finances of the trust he also controls the trust itself. Therefore, we shall have a socialized trust. Some members have stated that they will support an amendment to prevent any council from petitioning against the re-constitution of the trust. This provision has been put in the Bill merely to meet the wishes of those who want to take something out of it. The Treasurer knows that the provision does not mean a thing, but that it gives the Opposition a chance to amend the Bill for the sake of amending it.

Clause 12, the vital one, states:—

The Treasurer may from time to time, out of money voted by Parliament for the purpose, make grants to the trust to enable it to meet the expenses incurred by it in the exercise of its functions under this Act.

Mr. Pattinson—That is a simple little clause.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am in favour of simplicity, but I shall move for the substitution of "grants" by "loans." I would grant loans to the trust in spite of the inefficiency and mismanagement which has been entirely responsible for the losses incurred. My amendment will give Liberal members a chance to show their Liberalism. It would also protect the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Whittle—The trust gets loans from the Government now.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—My amendment may be redundant, but that is the worst that can be said about it. I also propose to move for a time limit on the granting of loans. The Treasurer has stated that the trust should not need assistance after five years, but there is nothing in the Bill to limit it to five years. I hope that the new board will make use of private enterprise as much as possible, for private enterprise can do many things far better than an unwieldy Government department can. The member for Adelaide said a man started in the transport business in Melbourne in a small way, but had made such a success of it that it had got beyond him and that he would like to sell out to the central body. A municipal body carrying on that business would probably have made tremendous losses. The officers of the Railways Department, municipal trusts, and other socialistic undertakings know that they will get their salaries whether they make profits or losses. Unfortunately, all losses have to be met by John Citizen. This Bill is a travesty of everything Parliament stood for when the trust was formed. Although the trust, in justice, is not entitled to loans, I would be merciful enough to allow it loans, but not grants. Many country people have never been to the city, but they will be called upon to help meet tramway losses. The Treasurer said he would be prepared to appoint a committee to inquire into ancillary transport and that the Commissioner of Police would be a suitable person to have on the committee, but I could not think of any person more unsuited. He may have much ability, but he has been conditioned by a lifetime of police work, which does not place him in a position to come to wise decisions on transport matters. I believe that the Attorney-General is not in favour of appointing policemen as justices of the peace because they are often prosecutors and their approach to the law is different from that of an ordinary citizen. A policeman might come to a decision before hearing a case. I am not casting any aspersions on the ability of the Commissioner of Police. He could give valuable evidence, but would not be suitable for making decisions. The Treasurer once said that he received better reports from committees comprising members of Parliament than from outside bodies. The Premier has given only lip service to that opinion, because in recent years he has not acted on

it. Give me the freedom to pick my committee, and I guarantee to get any decision I want. If I want a decision for private enterprise I shall be able to get it by picking my committee, and in the same way I could get a decision for socialism. I hope we shall get a trust comprised of impartial men, to whom the Commissioner of Police and other experts can give valuable information. As I said earlier, I oppose the second reading, but if it is carried I shall, in Committee, endeavour to amend the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—Unless I get some definite assurances from the Premier, it will be necessary, in Committee to amend the Bill. The *Advertiser* of June 28 contained three proposals put forward by the Premier for the future control of the Municipal Tramways Trust, but not one of them is related to the contents of the Bill. In the main, the measure deals with section 5 of the principal Act, but what is to happen to the portion of the section that is not mentioned in the Bill? The section sets out the councils of group "A" and says:—

Councils of group "A" mean the councils of the corporations of the City of Port Adelaide, the town of Kensington and Norwood, the city of Unley, the town of St. Peters, the town of Hindmarsh, the town of Thebarton, the town of Henley and Grange, the town of Glenelg, and the town of Brighton.

Then there is a reference to the councils in the other group. The Bill does not say whether these groups are to be retained. Under the measure a new board of management is to be set up and the Premier's idea it to place the finances of the trust on a solvent footing. Section 42 of the principal Act provides for what the Bill seeks to abolish. The section deals with the cessation of Government control on repayment of advances, and says:—

When all money advanced by the Treasurer to the trust, pursuant to this Act or any repealed Act, together with interest as aforesaid, has been repaid (a) the Treasurer shall, in writing, certify the fact to the trust and thereupon (b) the assets of the trust shall be held for the benefit of all the metropolitan councils as they may agree.

Unless the Premier can explain the need to retain this, the position should be further investigated. Part VI. of the Act refers to the liability of metropolitan councils. Does the Bill envisage a Trust of five members operating the tramways, whilst certain provisions are left in the Act? If the trust is to be appointed by the Government to accept the responsibility of operating the trams with the assistance of

Government money, and the Auditor-General is to audit the accounts of the undertaking, why not repeal the provisions in the principal Act which have led to the present unsatisfactory state of the trust's financial affairs? The whole thing seems to be out of proportion. During this debate Mr. Whittle said that Mr. Tapping deplored the need for increased fares because it placed a great burden on the wage earner, but Mr. Whittle indicated that it was the only way in which the trust could increase its revenue. I have an extract from the *Government Gazette* which shows that tram fares were increased in 1947, 1948, April 1950, April 1951 and January 1952, and that in May 1952 there was a reduction in the length of sections equivalent to a fare increase. In 1949 when Parliament debated the Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment Bill, which dealt with borrowing powers for the trust, Mr. Whittle said:—

I trust that the Bill will be more beneficial than indicated by the last speaker and go some way towards preventing an increase in fares which would be disastrous to people dependent upon the trams for transport. I support the Bill.

I was the "last speaker" mentioned by Mr. Whittle. In its final report the committee of inquiry recommended:—

That in view of the fact that a very considerable part of borrowed capital of the trust is now represented by worn-out or obsolete assets, the greatest caution be exercised in the matter of additional borrowing.

In the 1949 debate I said that the assets of the trust must be worn out or obsolete long before they were paid for. I said also that the trust would repay over the first 20 years more of its borrowings than it would over the last 30 years or so of the 53 year period. My forecasts have come true, and the committee has reported that the rolling stock is becoming obsolete. During the last 30 years of the loan the rolling stock and equipment would deteriorate and the depreciation and maintenance costs would be enormous. The trust depends on its rolling stock to earn money and if it is obsolete it is costly to maintain. Unlike other transport services tramways are dependent on passengers only. If fares are increased and sections shortened the public will not be catered for. Notwithstanding that the member for Prospect contends that fares cannot be decreased, I maintain that we must encourage people to use trams and offer them some inducement.

In speaking to this Bill the member for Prospect said:—

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.

The original Act provides that the trust shall licence and control private bus services, but the private services have an obligation to the travelling public. In many cases the owners have built up efficient services, although the member for Adelaide said that as a user of private bus services he is dissatisfied with some of them. If the Government advances money to the trust the trust must have an obligation to the Government and must have control over private bus operators. It would not be wise to permit private buses to compete on profitable lines. I suggest that the member for Prospect reconsider his words because the Tramways Trust should control private bus routes.

Mr. Whittle—It does now, and I did not suggest its control should be taken away.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Your words were “I have never been, and never will be, an opponent of private bus services . . . and it is unfair that they should be taken over by the trust.” If we are to advance money to the trust it must control private bus operators.

Mr. Whittle—The committee suggested that more routes should be given over to private buses.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Money should not be advanced to the trust unless there is some safeguard to the community. There was a suggestion that the trust would take over the private bus service to Edwardstown and Darlington but that proposal is dependent on the Hilton Bridge being widened. I have been informed by the Government that the bridge will not be widened until the unification of railways takes place and your guess as to when that will be is as good as mine. In the interests of the people living in those growing areas we should know when the trust will take over that service. If it will not happen for a long time, licences should be granted to private operators in order that an efficient service will be built up. Those operators should be assured, under agreement, that they will retain the services for a definite period in order that they make a reasonable profit and provide an adequate service to meet the demands of the people concerned.

I often wonder how much time is lost during peak periods. What time would be occu-

pied and lost by a tram coming from North Terrace-Pulteney Street corner, along North Terrace, down King William Street and into Wakefield Street? It is obvious that with the congestion of traffic in King William Street a great number of man-hours is lost daily. In view of such losses it would be desirable to consider altering certain tramway routes. During this debate Brisbane has been held up as a city where the tramway system is not losing money to the extent that the tramways system in this city is. Is that because the Greater Brisbane corporation exerts its authority over trams, taxi services, and other transport facilities throughout a wide area? The Premier has indicated that a committee will be appointed to investigate the licensing of taxi services and other matters associated with ancillary transport facilities and that committee would do well to visit Brisbane to see how such control is exercised there and what benefits have resulted from its being exercised by the Greater Brisbane corporation, for there is much to commend a Greater Adelaide scheme to control trams and other transport services.

Section 48 of the principal Act defines the general powers and obligations of the trust, and describes what it may do on roads along which its trams run. The Bill provides that these powers will be vested in the new board, but, although the committee of inquiry has recommended that no new tram tracks shall be laid and that bus services shall be gradually introduced to replace existing tram services, no provision is being made to meet the additional cost of the increased use of our roads by heavy buses. The trust is obliged to keep in repair that section of the roadway between the rails and so much of the road as extends 18in. beyond the rail on each side of any such tramway, but provision should be made to recompense councils whose roads must be used by buses operated by the trust or by private owners. My electorate includes parts of West Torrens, Mitcham, Marion and Unley corporation areas, and I am particularly concerned about the rates being charged in Mitcham and Marion. Are those rates being collected only to repair the roads in those districts? Newly developed areas demand transport services, and such areas are frequently served by private enterprise. This Bill should provide that where a bus service operates the roads shall be kept in good condition, for can we expect a council to provide the wherewithal to establish the necessary routes at the expense of the rate-payers? As these buses are licensed by the Tramway Trust, should not a portion of those

licensing fees be returned to corporations for the upkeep of the roads along which those buses run?

Mr. Tapping—Some of those roads are maintained by the Highways and Local Government Department.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Winston Avenue, along which a bus runs from Dawes Road to the Glenelg tramline, could not be defined as a highway in that respect. Certain roads along which buses now run were originally constructed to take light vehicular traffic, but with the advent of bus services corporations are at their wits' ends to know how to maintain them so as to give a satisfactory service to road users. They should be entitled to some compensation from the Tramways Trust, either by grant or directly by the payment of a certain part of the fee paid by the bus operator. I realize that buses are costly to run, but it is necessary that a decent standard of road should be provided. Harcourt Gardens and Daw Park are two areas in my electorate which are served by privately-owned bus services, and in other parts new avenues of transport are being opened up to residents. The Government should consider assisting councils to keep such roads in a fair state of repair.

I trust that the new board will make a success of its job, but, unless the Premier in his reply in this debate can indicate the necessity for retaining section 42, which deals with the cessation of Government control on repayment of advances, it will be necessary in Committee to move an amendment to section 42, for I see no reason why, certain improvements having been achieved by the Bill, the tramways should be handed back to the people who are responsible for the present position of the trust. The Premier should also indicate why it is desired to retain sections 46 and 47, which provide for the levying and collection of special rates to meet liabilities. Provided the Premier is in a position to satisfy those queries, I will support the second reading.

Mr. HAWKER (Burra)—Members must be very perturbed by the necessity for this Bill, especially after reading the two excellent reports furnished by the committee of inquiry. Not only is the trust in financial difficulties with regard to its ordinary working expenses and revenue but though it has in no way spent money lavishly on its plant. Its exchequer is empty and its assets are in a very bad way. The Hackney workshops and depot require reorganization and moderniza-

tion, the power plant has passed the end of its economic life and the condition of its rolling stock is a matter of deep concern. The trust has not followed the policy of replacing rolling stock as it has become obsolete, and of the 279 trams 165—over half—are due to be scrapped. Further the report contains some rather caustic remarks about the H1 tram at present being built. It is heavier, of greater horse power and more expensive than many other types. It will carry 52 passengers as against lighter, smaller horse powered and cheaper trams used on other tramway systems carrying 60. The permanent way, too, is in a most unsatisfactory condition.

Parliament is being asked to give financial support to this public utility. We have reached a state of affairs where a utility like the Tramways Trust, which paid in its initial stages and which councils desired to have control over, is now losing heavily. The Tramways Inquiry Committee praised the Queensland tramways system which formerly added a considerable amount to the revenue of the Brisbane City Council, but today is making a loss. Another big utility which formerly contributed considerably to the revenue of the country but is now making a loss is the Post and Telegraph Department. Nobody can view with any feeling of equanimity this trend in Australian finance. Australians should inquire closely into the reason why these things are happening and how long they will be permitted to continue. We have gone a long way along the path of Socialism in the past few years and more leisure appears to be one of the chief objects of life. As long as we continue along those lines we can hardly expect to obtain the same excellent results from the utilities mentioned as we did in the early days. Australians as a whole must take stock of themselves in this regard and before going too far towards socialism.

Some members have compared the tramways with the railways and said that we need up to £5,000,000 a year to run the railways. They contend that the tramways should be placed in the same category, but I disagree. Their argument is built on wrong premises. Members will appreciate that many of our lines were constructed to open up the country and it was known that they would not directly pay. By this means the city has expanded in a manner that would not have been otherwise possible. Moreover, the railways also serve thousands of city folk and the tramways, which serve only a local area, cannot be compared with our far flung railway

system. I do not believe that our railway rolling stock is as obsolete as our trams. It has been kept up-to-date and compares favourably with other Australian railways. Again, our railways give a much better service than those of other States. Several country towns have privately run transport systems and the people who use them pay.

The Tramways Inquiry Committee gives a definite pointer as to how our tramway losses could be minimized. It went to great lengths to point out how an excellent system of private buses was run. Mr. Pattinson referred to the various modes of transport in the metropolitan area. If members look at a map showing the various routes they will be surprised at the number of privately run bus routes. In giving evidence before the committee the chairman of the trust made some pointed remarks about private bus routes paying. He said:—

None of the services operated by the trust pay. On the other hand, private buses operating in sparsely settled areas are, with one or two exceptions, operating at a profit. Thirty-one of these services operated during the past year carrying 10,700,000 people. The type of vehicles used, their time tables and the quality of the service rendered are under the strict supervision of the trust. If private owners can make these services pay why is the trust losing money? The chairman said that the trust would lose heavily if it operated them and it was estimated that in one instance it would lose £20,000 a year. There is nothing in the Bill to prevent the proposed new board from continuing to license private bus services or from farming the business out to private enterprise, if it felt so disposed, even to the extent of providing some kind of subsidy where it was impossible to make a system pay.

It would be dangerous to entirely confine transport to fuel driven vehicles as we have witnessed times—and they will come again—when our ability to get fuel from overseas was limited. With the use of New South Wales and Leigh Creek coal we can generate sufficient power to run all our trams and trolley buses. The board it is proposed to appoint should seriously consider the farming out, as far as possible, of our metropolitan transport services. We are really asking private enterprise to provide the money to run them. People who favour Government ownership should realize that private companies and individuals have supplied, by taxation from their revenue and profits, sufficient to enable the undertakings to be run at a loss. Mr. Pattinson proved that

private companies were capable of running our transport system efficiently. Why not allow them to run as much as possible of our transport system in the metropolitan area?

As regards the operation of one-man buses, doubts were expressed recently whether they could be effectively run. I understand that something in the nature of a Gallup poll was held amongst tramway employees on the question. I have seen one-man buses operating in New York city where traffic is extremely dense. A man will drive a bus, collect fares and give change at the same time. Most taxi cabs have a grid, both in front and at the rear, something like a grid that is seen on a 5-ton army truck. New York drivers find not difficulty in driving and giving change at the same time. The committee mentioned that trams disappeared from London streets, but I do not think that that is relevant to the position. A huge number of passengers are carried into London in the mornings and out in the evenings by underground railways. Doubtless that is the backbone of the traffic, but I think the underground carries the bulk of London's traffic. The committee pointed out that when Adelaide's population grew to the extent expected, about 700,000, trolley and fuel buses would be able to handle them.

In his second reading speech the Premier said it was expected that the tramways system would be self-supporting in five years. The committee said it should not be a charge on the taxpayers generally or ratepayers in the metropolitan area, but should be paid for by the people who used the trams. I am not happy that the Bill gives Parliament the right to vote money yearly to make up losses on the trams, although I know that such advances will be subjected to scrutiny by Parliament. I realize it would be a vote of no-confidence in the Government if on the Estimates a member moved that an individual line should be reduced by £1. In my short experience in Parliament I have arrived at the conclusion that matters are dealt with more fully when they come before the House in a Bill than if they are dealt with as a line of expenditure in the Estimates. I should like to see some alteration to the Bill limiting the time of making grants. I do not believe that we shall ever reach the stage where public transport can pay. We have gone too far along the road of Socialism for that ever to occur. Even if the Bill were limited.

to a period of five years, I believe the legislation would have to be extended further. Parliament should be given the opportunity at the end of the five-year term to review the position. I support the second reading with the reservations mentioned.

Mr. CHRISTIAN (Eyre)—I do not like the Bill, and particularly its financial proposals, which are definitely not those the Treasurer discussed with the councils. Proposal No. 2 as I read and understood it provided that financial assistance would be given to the trust for a limited period of five years, it being expected that within that period the tramways would be put in order and would be able to stand on their own foundations. The fact that the Government has departed from that provision suggests that hopelessness to which the member for Burra has just given expression; namely, that he does not expect a socialized transport system will ever be able to pay its way; or else it displays a lack of confidence in the Government's ability to appoint a board which could put the trust back on its own feet. Surely, the Government can find men who have the ability and the right attitude of mind—men imbued with the ambition to put the trust back on its own feet so that it will not lean in perpetuity on the Government or the general taxpayers. There have been some excellent speeches on the measure, and I was particularly interested in the valuable contributions of the members for Prospect and Hindmarsh who had been associated with the trust. I shall make my position clear. I do not intend to support the financial provisions unless they can be modified. I am prepared to accept the second reading because I realize, with those very few members who feel as I do, that there is very little hope of preventing the Bill from being carried. But I feel strongly that unless we give voice to our opinions we shall be assisting in fostering the invidious growth of the attitude of mind which we see prevailing in public life in relation to the running of public utilities—as soon as anything gets into difficulties, run to the Government and let it carry the burden.

Mr. Lawn—Private enterprise does it.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Private enterprise generally is only too happy to stand on its own feet, although on occasions private enterprise has had to approach the Government for help in difficult times. I remind the honourable member that these difficulties have frequently been the result of Government policy, either

State or Federal. No doubt he has in mind primary industries. He dealt at considerable length with railway freight concessions to these industries.

Mr. Lawn—Secondary industries seek concessions, too.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—That is so. Let me remind the honourable member that if private industries, particularly primary industries, had not been hampered so often by governmental policies—and I refer particularly to Federal tariff policies—they would have been able to accumulate reserves and stand on their own feet. However, because they were circumscribed and had to carry on under those adverse conditions, as soon as they ran into adversity they had no reserves on which to depend and were driven to the Government for assistance. Mr. Lawn mentioned railway concessions. Let me remind him that the book to which he referred was not a book of freight concessions but of the general rates applicable to the railways. The few concessions which did apply a few years ago could have been numbered on the fingers of one hand. They have long since been abandoned. To my knowledge no freight concessions operate today.

Mr. Lawn—You want freedom for private enterprise.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—The honourable member is confusing the issue. I am not opposed to the Government's running certain public utilities, as in fact it is doing. The State had to depend on public utilities for developmental purposes, because no railways, waterworks, harbors or roads were provided by private enterprise, therefore, these services had to be undertaken by the Government. Surely, the State has enough operations to manage already, losses on which must be shouldered by the general taxpayer. Why should the State undertake further obligations when experience shows that the moment a State enterprise undertakes a service on which a great many people depend, then the general cry is for this service to be run at a loss and charged to the public? Although costs overtake those charges before long, the Government is not allowed to increase the charges. As I have said previously, it then becomes politically impossible to make such an undertaking pay, and yet the Government proposes embarking upon a proposition with a very limited objective. Here we have the Municipal Tramways Trust serving only the municipal areas and it is proposed that it should be taken

over by the Government. That is the demand by the public, and of course it is easy to support such a thing when it has popular demand behind it. The public favours this because they hope thereby that the charges to them will be kept below cost and the good old general taxpayer will stand up to it. The tramways are not on all fours with certain other governmental utilities, such as the railways and water supplies, which are for the benefit of the State's development. Had it not been for the railways, our primary industries would be almost non-existent. The same applies to water supplies and electricity, which are State-wide in their operation and assist in the development of our industries. For that reason there is some justification for supporting them while they are in their developmental state. The tramways are a non-developmental undertaking. They are purely a service organization to carry people to and from their places of employment and elsewhere, and those who benefit should be prepared and able to stand up to the cost of running this utility and should not expect the country people to be taxed, because they derive no benefit from this service, and labor under many disabilities.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you say that those people who are carried on the trams make no contribution to the development of the State?

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I said that the tramways are not a developmental enterprise, but purely a service facility for the benefit of those who use them to go to and from work and elsewhere.

Mr. O'Halloran—You could not establish industries without some transport facilities.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I recognize the necessity for such facilities, but there is a distinct difference between the railways and a purely service organization such as the tramways. I object to the contention that the whole of the taxpayers should assist in shouldering the deficit on a purely parochial undertaking. No doubt the fact that 60 per cent of the State's population resides in the city weighs very heavily in some members' minds; it is a tremendous factor in their political judgment, and it becomes difficult to resist the demands of such a vast population. But we are treading a very dangerous path if we continue to foster that idea. I do not want to lay the blame particularly on this Government or this Parliament, for I know that the greatest share of blame in fostering this attitude of mind lies in the Federal realm, where both sides of politics, I think, are equally to blame. We are today reaping the legacy of that kind of thing which has been so insistently fostered

over a long period. Instead of the people having still that outlook described by Mr. Macgillivray where they expected to stand on their own feet in regard to metropolitan utilities it has disappeared; not only councils, but the residents in the metropolitan area are only too ready to be rid of the responsibility of running their own show; as soon as they get into difficulties they think it is for the Government to step in and undertake the task.

The proposal contained in this measure so nearly approximates proposal No. 3 submitted to the councils that I fail to see much difference. Immediately a Government board is appointed it becomes in the minds of the people a Government undertaking, and the people look to the Government to maintain it. It does not matter how we camouflage it with all the rest of the legislation, they will look to it as a Government show and come with both hands out to take any gifts that are forthcoming. We could have curbed this propensity by limiting the financial assistance, as was originally intended, to a period of five years. Surely we could say, "We will give you five years to put your house in order." That would put the new board on its mettle and if, having done its best, it still found itself in difficulties, then, as the member for Burra said, Parliament could have another look at the legislation. For goodness sake do not make this free money available in perpetuity. I most strongly object to that principle. It is entirely unsound and is an open invitation to inefficiency. The board can say, "We have done our best and cannot make this thing pay, but it does not matter. The Government has said in its own legislation that grants will be available for all time to help us out of our difficulties." That is perpetuating a very bad principle, and if I had the opportunity in Committee I would most strenuously oppose it and, of course, vote for some amendment which limited this financial assistance to five years.

Mr. Macgillivray—An amendment to that effect is already on the files.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I shall be very glad of an opportunity to support it.

The Hon. T. Playford—You will have the opportunity to record a casting vote if the voting is equal.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I would be one of the happiest members here if I had that opportunity. Although I do not like to enlarge on the question of country disabilities versus

the city, the matter has been raised by certain members in such a form that some further information is justified. It has been said that the country benefits very largely from the profits on metropolitan water schemes which have offset the losses on country water districts. Let me remind the House that it is by the fortuitous circumstances of being grouped together in very large numbers that the city dwellers have not to pay anything like the amount of water rates which the country dweller has to bear. I suppose the average city householder has to pay about £5 or £6 in water rates, whereas I imagine there is not one country consumer of reticulated water who does not pay anything from £10 to £20. I know many who pay, not 1s. 8d. a thousand gallons for rebate water and 1s. a thousand for excess, but 4s. a thousand for both categories.

Mr. Whittle—Do you say that the average water rate charge in the city is only £5 or £6?

Mr. CHRISTIAN—It would not be much more. Perhaps it has gone up a little since last year.

Mr. Whittle—Did you say per head of the population?

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I said the average householder. What is more, the metropolitan householder is not required to provide himself with water, whereas in the country many hundreds have to make their own full provision which costs, in many instances, hundreds of pounds. That is one of the differences between the country and the city. Again, consider hospital services. In the metropolitan area people get free hospital treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, whereas in country districts people have to build their own hospitals. Admittedly, the Government gives a subsidy on a pound for pound basis, but the people nevertheless have to build their own hospitals and maintain them mainly by their own contributions. I remind members that we are having the utmost difficulty in maintaining our country population, particularly the young people. They will not stay in the country because the amenities offered in the metropolitan area are so much superior—all provided by a kind, beneficent Government. The cry goes up, "Cut tram fares below the minimum and let the general taxpayer—which is mainly the country taxpayer—find the balance of the cost." That is the kind of thing that is going on, and denuding our country districts of their youthful population. We have to maintain our own school transport systems in some instances. As an example

of what it is costing some people to send their children to country schools, in one instance in my district four or five parents between them have to contribute £6 15s. a week by way of subsidy to the school transport system, as the Government balks at finding the few extra pounds which would free those parents of that liability. But it does not balk at free hospital treatment in the city, or at the spending of half a million pounds on the fruit fly campaign and paying compensation to suburban gardeners for the little bit of fruit that is stripped. All that sort of benevolence has been going on here and, as there is 60 per cent of the population to be treated like that, the amount involved in handouts of this description can be imagined. That is not all. There is free milk for school children which operates only in respect of metropolitan schools, although supposed to be State-wide in operation. I realize, of course, that the funds for this come from the Commonwealth Government, but nevertheless the State Governments is involved in considerable expense. Then there are free kindergartens, to which the Government contributes £20,000 or £30,000 by way of free subsidy. None of these amenities ever reach country districts. Can you wonder that people are leaving the country when they get this sort of hand-out in the city?

We should look at this thing, not purely from the point of view of putting the tramways back on their feet, or to what extent we are willing to continue that policy. We must examine the whole picture to see where we are going with this policy of consistently meeting the insistent demands of the popular voice in order to cut down their commitments to below the cost of running any particular facility. Although we have had an excellent report from the special committee on the administration of the tramways, there are some facets of it with which some of us are acquainted, where improvements could be made. The committee drew attention to the fact that the new tram line through Franklin Street should never have been laid, or if laid, it should have cost no more than £6,000, instead of the actual cost of £25,000. I do not know whether members are aware—I assume they must be—that that tram line need not have been laid if the Government had exercised its powers under section 28, which provides that the Governor's consent must be obtained before any new tram lines are laid. Why was not that power exercised in this case? What is more, section 63 provides that the contract system of carrying out any such work shall be employed unless the Governor consents to some other method.

Was that provisions insisted on in this case, or in connection with any of the new works which the trust has undertaken during the past few years?

Mr. Macgillivray—No.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I am suggesting that the Government could have exercised much firmer control over the operations of the trust through those two particular powers. Whether it used them or not I do not know; I assume it could not have done so, for I feel certain that the new tramline in Franklin Street and others would not have been consented to had those powers been exercised. Some members have compared the financial results of the trust with the prosperity of private bus operators. I join with other members in paying a tribute to private bus operators. In most instances they have had to live on the skim milk of the transport business, operating in outer suburbs.

Mr. Shannon—They have got fat on it.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—There is no question about that. Why have they made handsome profits, and why, by contrast, has the trust, living on the fat of the land, made such huge losses? Some members, including the member for Norwood, have stated that the motor car and prosperity generally have militated against the trust's paying its way. Does not that apply with equal force to the private bus services operating in the outside areas? By and large, they give good, reliable service. Their fares are on the same level as the fares of the trust.

Mr. Moir—They are controlled by the trust.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Yes, and their time tables are controlled. Notwithstanding their registration and insurance fees they have paid their way handsomely. Their suggestion that they should be represented on the new board should be seriously considered because they have had long practical experience of transport operations and they could assist in putting the trust back on its feet if anyone could. If the trust had done more in considering the interests of the public it would not have alienated its support as it has. For many years there was constant agitation to show more consideration to the travelling public, particularly to mothers with young children. A proposal was put forward for the carriage of pushers on buses and trams, but the trust has never unbent or relented from its attitude not to carry more than two pushers on one vehicle.

Mr. Riches—Do the private buses carry pushers?

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Other tramway authorities have been far more considerate to the public. In Perth at least half a dozen pushers can be hung on hooks at the rear of buses or trams. Only the other day I saw a picture of a New Zealand bus—I believe a tramway bus—with hooks for hanging pushers, but our trust has spurned the idea. That shows a completely unrealistic attitude, and an unsympathetic attitude to the needs of the public. People waiting for a bus opposite the Adelaide railway station often have to stand in a queue for 10 minutes, though it seems longer when one is tired. Sometimes the incoming bus stands on the other side for five minutes. I have never been able to discover why it should not immediately come to the starting point and allow the people waiting to sit down in comfort. These are only little things, but they would do much towards dissipating the present attitude of many people towards the trust.

Mr. Pattinson—They are big things to the travelling public.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Of course. I hope that the new board will have regard to these things. I know, like King Canute, that the popular tide cannot be held back. It will wend its inevitable way shoreward and in due course engulf any who may stand in its path, but I reiterate my protest against the financial provisions of this measure. They should never have been incorporated in the Bill in their present form. I do not object to providing the necessary financial help to get the undertaking back on its feet, but we should not grant financial aid for more than five years. Surely we have enough faith in ourselves and the board that the Government will appoint to hope for the financial stability of the trust within that time. If necessary, Parliament could again review the position, otherwise we may be granting money to the undertaking in perpetuity to bolster up its finances. We should retain a close control over public utilities, or they may forever lean on the support of the general taxpayer.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—From the speeches of members so far it seems that the majority favour implementing the third proposal that the Treasurer put to the metropolitan councils. Moreover, most members favour the establishment of a Ministry of Transport. I advocate such a ministry to co-ordinate transport services not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the State. Members have accepted the measure before us because they believe it

to be a step in that direction. It is strange that whereas the majority of members favour the third proposal we are forced to vote for the second, although it does not completely satisfy most of us. It is not possible, under the Constitution, for a private member to move for the establishment of a Ministry of Transport. The Government must be aware of the views of members, but does not seem prepared to give heed to them.

Mr. Macgillivray—We could all vote against the Bill.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, but I feel that it represents a step in the right direction and that to vote against it would be to disregard the facts as we know them.

Mr. Macgillivray—To vote against Socialism.

Mr. RICHES—Many measures of advantage to the State are described by the member for Chaffey as socialistic. I agree that this Bill is socialistic, and I support it. South Australia has benefited tremendously from socialistic enterprises in recent years. I believe it to be in the interests of the State for the metropolitan tramway system to be maintained. I represent a country electorate, but it would be a reflection on the State if we lost our tramways. Country people would stand to lose if Adelaide lost its trams because Adelaide is our capital city and often a State is judged by the facilities provided in the capital. Parliament dare not allow our tramways to close, neither would it, as some members seem to desire, hand them over to private enterprise. Some members can see all the virtues in private enterprise, but none in public utilities. Not even the member for Chaffey would dare hand the tramways over to private enterprise. I suggest to the Premier that if it is good for the Government to subsidize a transport service in the city by £500,000 in the first year, and indefinitely with unstated sums, it is good to give the same consideration to the establishment and maintenance of country transport services. The Premier should consider the expressed opinion of the majority of members and have another look at the Bill with a view to setting up a Ministry of Transport, which could provide services not only in the city but in country districts. In the country we have motor cars and road transport services, but the difference between Government policy on country road transport services and on services for the city is that the Government will interest itself in the country services only after private individuals have established them.

Then the Government comes in with control by imposing a tax of 5 per cent on every fare collected. I support the Government in accepting the responsibility of controlling transport services essential to the city, but the Government should also accept responsibility for establishing and maintaining necessary services in the country. I cannot see that the powers of the new trust will cover country services. The only way to deal with the matter is to have an authority handling all forms of transport. Mr. Macgillivray may help to extend the operations of the new trust to any area in the State where transport services are needed.

Mr. Macgillivray—No.

Mr. RICHES—Let the trust establish services where there are none now.

Mr. Macgillivray—Don't you think country people can handle their affairs better than it can be done from the city?

Mr. RICHES—I have the greatest admiration for our country people and I do not think anything is impossible to people who put their mind to the job, but country people have to shoulder too many responsibilities now without Government assistance. My plea is that they should receive the same consideration as is meted out by the Government to city people. I ask the Government to remove the 5 per cent tax on all fares collected on country road transport services.

The Hon. T. Playford—To which clause is the honourable member referring?

Mr. RICHES—The clause which establishes the new trust to deal with tram services in the metropolitan area. I am saying that the Government should accept the responsibility of establishing and maintaining road transport services in the country. The only function the Government is now prepared to exercise in regard to country road transport services is to impose a tax of 5 per cent on every fare. In the city the Government is prepared not only to accept responsibility for maintaining transport services, but to subsidize them with substantial sums of public money. The Government's action in taking over the tramways is long overdue. Experience in other States has shown that public transport facilities cannot be successfully controlled except by the Government. There is the instance of the Sydney ferries. All over Australia it has been shown that private enterprise cannot successfully operate public transport services and Governments reluctantly have had to step in and take them over. The representatives of metropolitan councils say that they can no

longer operate our tramways system, and the Premier has said that this Bill must be considered urgently if the trams are to run.

Mr. Macgillivray—Do you know the loss this year on the Sydney tramways?

Mr. RICHES—No, but I understand there was a substantial loss. My point is that every tramway system in Australia is in financial difficulties. I do not expect that in five years our tramway system will be able to carry on without Government assistance. I have heard Mr. Macgillivray say that there should not be so much concern about finding money for the development of a country, because credit can be used.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is a different matter.

Mr. RICHES—I was amazed to hear the honourable member advocate a loan instead of a grant to the trust. That seems to be a direct contradiction to what he has said over the years. I am not an authority on the operations of the existing trust, but I have not heard, from those who claim to be an authority, any strong criticism of the trust's operations, and certainly nothing to lead me to believe that the new trust will find the going much easier. No indication has been given, by those who have studied the operations of the trust, that there has been serious maladministration, or a serious waste of money, or that the new trust will find conditions any different from how the old trust found them. The Premier should make the new trust more directly responsible to Parliament, and there is no better way of doing that than to place all our transport services under a Minister of Transport, who would report to Parliament. It has been the policy since the inception of the Playford Government to hand over to boards the responsibility of some of our undertakings. Some of them have operated fairly well, largely because of the degree of oversight given by the Premier, but all transport undertakings should be under one Minister. If the Premier has any regard for democracy, and expressed opinions in Parliament, he will give serious consideration to the establishment of a Ministry of Transport. If the opportunity presents itself in Committee my vote will go in that direction.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—Legislation of this kind is the inevitable result of the build-up of the majority of the State's population in one congested area. Every city in the world has had the same experience, or will have it, because of the adoption of a stupid policy. It

has led in South Australia to a centralization of population. What has happened with our tramways has happened in other cities the world over. The progress of a city reflects the progress of a State. People concentrate in the heart of the city, which inevitably becomes the business centre. When that becomes congested another circle is formed—the suburbs—and there are in Adelaide suburbs such streets as O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, Unley Road and the Parade, Norwood, which tend to obviate the necessity for people going to Adelaide on shopping expeditions. There are peak transport periods in the morning and afternoon when people are going to and from business in the city. In between the peak periods tramcars to and from the city often run empty, but they run to a fixed schedule and definitely do not pay. Outside the second circle there is an extension of living areas and the wider the circle the less populated the areas, but long lines of tramways are required which provide little return. Reference is made in the report of the committee of inquiry to the lighter traffic tramlines and it is suggested that it would be economic to abolish such lines and replace them with trolley or one-man operated fuel buses. An attempt has been made to supply those far-flung suburbs with transport, but the overhead costs of maintenance are so great that it is killing the lighter-patronized tramlines, which cannot possibly pay. The report suggests that they be handed over to private enterprise, and it obviously agrees that where the trust cannot make those lines pay private operators could, and we all know that private operators are making their routes pay. Some criticism has been levelled in this debate at private bus services—that they are not all they should be. Those services are licensed and if they do not conform to requirements there would be people eager to take over and improve them. It is no use condemning privately-owned transport systems because one or two fall down on their job. Throughout the Commonwealth there are private transport systems which could not continue to operate unless they paid, and they do pay in spite of shocking road conditions which shake the transport vehicles to pieces. Yet their charges are no heavier than sea transport charges. It is possible to send bulk goods interstate by rail more cheaply than by sea. In one instance 80 tons of freight sent by rail to Melbourne were transported for £105 less than it would have cost by sea. That is

contrary to what we have been told but I use it as an illustration that under adverse circumstances any system of transport can go wrong.

I have some sympathy for the Tramways Trust board which has got into the difficulties mentioned. About four years ago I visited the yards maintained by the trust at Allenby Gardens. The principal work involved an electric welding plant, which was being used to make cross-over sections which were not being made elsewhere in Australia and not being imported. The amount of work involved was tremendous and the cost too must have been enormous. In order to keep trams running it was necessary for the trust to engage in such work. The report states that maintenance and overhauling equipment is obsolete and needs bringing up-to-date, but the cost of re-equipping would be tremendous. Is the Government going to undertake that task and at what cost? It is necessary to hand as much as possible of the existing fixed rail tramway system over to private enterprise, and according to the report the peak routes should be operated by trolley buses. It is only necessary to drive along Prospect or Enfield Roads to realize what an obstacle to good transport control fixed tram tracks are. They are a menace to traffic safety and I am satisfied from my own observations that many accidents are due to the presence of tram tracks in the middle of a road along which cumbersome vehicles move. Motorists have to stop repeatedly because they cannot pass a tram and there is a build-up of vehicles. If there is a dodderer at the head of a traffic line who is afraid to pass a tram and dutifully pulls up at every stop cars and trucks are banked up for perhaps half a mile. If trolley buses were operated on such roads they could swing into the kerb and the traffic could pass on the off side, which they cannot do with trams. From that standpoint alone it would be good business to ease traffic congestion by taking trams off such roads and narrow highways. London—the biggest city in the world—has declared trams obsolete and diesel buses handle the traffic. If the bus system can handle London's traffic it can easily handle ours. Buses are more mobile, easier to handle and are not on fixed rails. If they are of one design, maintenance costs are lower and in some cases faulty power units can be completely removed and new service units installed. There is no messing around for hours to find the trouble. The time

will come, notwithstanding the passing of this Bill, when most of our obsolete fixed rail system will be removed.

Much has been said about country and city interests and I agree that the country man will pay for this assistance to the Tramways Trust and reap little benefit. Adelaide gets into trouble with transport and at once it becomes an urgent matter. A Bill is presented which places the tramways system under new management. We are not told how the new management is to function, whom it will comprise and what it will cost—it is being given an open cheque. The tramways will continue to operate and everybody from Clare to Hindley Street will pay but Hindley Street will benefit and Clare won't. That is what it amounts to. The tramways system will become a sink for an unknown amount of money which will be readily available, but when I ask for something to be done on the railway line between Riverton and Clare the answer is "No," for apparently that is a different story. I have asked the Minister of Railways and the Railways Commissioner to take a trip by railcar from Riverton to Clare and people in my district are prepared to care for their ills and dislocations on arrival at Clare, for they must suffer the same disabilities as regular travellers on that train whose bones are a jangling mass for a week after their trip.

Mr. Dunnage—You never look like that.

Mr. QUIRKE—Only because I have given it away.

Mr. Macgillivray—Life is too precious.

Mr. QUIRKE—And death is so permanent. Unless something is done on that line, sooner or later a major accident must occur.

Mr. Dunnage—You told us that 12 months ago.

Mr. QUIRKE—And I am telling you again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—The honourable member should link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am doing that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by saying that taxpayers in Clare will be forced to contribute towards the maintenance of the tramways system in Adelaide, but the same people who must use the railway from Clare to Riverton because they have no other transport do not benefit from similar assistance.

Mr. Stott—That is a missing link.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is my argument, and as a representative of those people I will not support the Bill, which provides for unlimited spending on city transport, whilst nothing is done for those people. The country

areas supply the very life blood of this city by sending to it the food it eats. Remove that supply and the city must cease to exist. The city is the market for the produce of the country districts, but the country people must pay freight rates both on their commodities for sale in the city and on those purchased from the centralized manufacturing system operating in this State. Until I receive some assurance that the transport system serving my district will be a lot better off than it is today I do not feel justified in supporting a Bill which gives an open cheque to a board, the personnel of which we do not know, to carry on and spend to the limit it considers necessary to resuscitate an obsolete tramways system.

Mr. Pattinson—What a dreadfully parochial outlook.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is not parochial.

Mr. Pattinson—I thought the honourable member was broader in his outlook.

Mr. QUIRKE—My outlook is so broad that it embraces the whole of South Australia, but that of the honourable member is bounded by the environments of Glenelg and Adelaide.

Mr. Macgillivray—And the Patawalonga.

Mr. QUIRKE—Probably, but my outlook is State-wide, and I know the real condition of our country railway system. In fact I invite the member for Glenelg to join the Minister and the Commissioner on their trip from Riverton to Clare, and the people of Clare will look after him in the same way as they have promised to look after the other gentlemen.

Mr. O'Halloran—What set have you got against those gentlemen?

Mr. QUIRKE—I have no special desire to injure them, but I warn them it will take them some time to overcome the disabilities resulting from the trip. I do not joke when I say that, for every traveller on that rail car from Clare to Adelaide looks forward to the trip with considerable apprehension.

Mr. Dunnage—Why don't you do something about it besides talk?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am just as impotent to do anything about it as the honourable member is to do anything in his district unless the power that is approves.

Mr. Dunnage—We have everything we want in our district.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, except a tramways system that pays. Although the population per square mile in the honourable member's district

is very dense, it cannot pay for its transport, and he wants it paid for by country people who live miles apart.

Mr. Dunnage—Our system pays and it is the only one that does.

Mr. QUIRKE—The tramways system does not pay, otherwise this Bill would not have been introduced.

Mr. Dunnage—We are going to get something done about our transport system.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, because you have the aggregate population, and that is my complaint.

Mr. Dunnage—That is the most important factor.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is to the honourable member, and I remember that recently he was not so happy about that. It is all very well for city members to talk in that strain, but, although I do not disagree with the statement that the city should have a good transport system, I want something done for the transport system in country areas. However, after years of trying nothing has been achieved in that regard. If I vote for this Bill I vote for an open cheque to be given to a board the composition of which I do not know. I object to the appointment of a board which will be able to spend an unlimited sum, and therefore I oppose the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—At the outset I deplore the mention of either city or country interests in a debate on a measure such as this, for I think it is neither appropriate nor necessary to compare transport facilities offered to people in one part with those offered to people in another part of the State. No Government, however willing it might be, would provide standard transport facilities throughout the length and breadth of a sparsely settled State such as South Australia, for that would be beyond the realms of possibility, therefore I do not propose to have much to say on that angle.

Mr. Macgillivray—Good old whitewash brush.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member can do his own whitewashing in a minute or two, for I propose to comment on his speech. Although he said, in effect, "Don't worry about the metropolitan area. Give me something to help the people on the Upper Murray," I point out that it is very easy to make a speech which will be popular with the people a member represents, but it does not further the matter we are discussing; it rather delays it by tending to drag in irrelevant

matters. I am disappointed with local government in the metropolitan area, for it has fallen down on its job.

Mr. Macgillivray—Hear! Hear!

Mr. SHANNON—I am concerned not with the line of argument that brings “Hear, Hears” to that statement, but with the lack of understanding of the true responsibility of local government. We are shearing from local government, without complaint from it, the various activities which for years it has performed. One such important activity was the abattoirs, and now public transport is being taken away. Soon its sphere of activity will become so parochial that after it has dealt with roads, footpaths, street lighting and sanitation it will have finished its job.

Mr. Pattinson—It will be as parochial as the last speaker.

Mr. SHANNON—As parochial as some other members we heard this afternoon. Local government seems to be reaching a stage of municipal menopause when it will conceive nothing for the good of the business it has in hand. At present it has not one constructive suggestion to make. Indeed it did not go to this committee of inquiry and put before it any real worth-while proposal so that local government could continue to operate as it has now for almost the whole of my lifetime in looking after street transport. In the early 1900's the councils took the tramways over from private enterprise, which had made money with horse trams. There was no thought in the mind of the legislators who passed the original legislation that the trust's operations would prove unprofitable, and consequently they were not concerned with the interests of the ratepayers who were to be called upon to make good any losses, for Parliament did not envisage such losses. Local government as we know it in South Australia is no more new than our Parliamentary system. Practically the whole of our method of governing people, both by local and central government, has been adopted from parliamentary and local government in the United Kingdom. The first observation made by the Tramways Inquiry Committee which has been lauded for its investigations into the trust's affairs, is headed, “Method of Control in England,” and states:—

The method of control by councils in England is through sub-committees appointed by the councils. The transport committees comprise from 10 to 20 members who often have full powers as to policy. This method is stated to be working satisfactorily.

Although London is not the largest city in the world there are cities comparable in size to Adelaide to be found all over England. Many county cities of importance run their own street transport systems. If this can be done in most of the larger county cities in England, with a denser population a square mile than Adelaide, surely it could be done here. I refer to industrial towns like Manchester and Sheffield, and there are others with somewhat similar public transport problems. If these things can be handled satisfactorily there it appears that something is lacking here. I would have thought that some local government member in this House would be keen enough, when he saw the drift in affairs of our tramways, to look into tramway systems in other parts of the world and perhaps return with some constructive suggestion to offer the trust, but I have not yet heard of any such suggestion.

Mr. Whittle—How many English transport systems are operating successfully?

Mr. SHANNON—The committee says that the method of control by councils in England is working satisfactorily. I cannot help it if the honourable member questions the basis of the committee's comments upon English public transport systems. We all appear to be a little blind in considering how a thing affects the other man and are apt to view it as it affects ourselves. Although the matter merits some examination members of councils have been cautious in drawing attention to that statement by the committee. Generally speaking, we are in a position where we cannot permit our public street transport system to languish nor can we allow it to perish merely for the sake of several thousand pounds. We could not permit the railways to cease operations by not financing its annual deficits. The whole thing must be looked at from a State-wide angle. It is obvious to anybody who has travelled around our city that the Tramways Trust could have farmed out many of the developmental lines serving fairly sparsely settled areas to private bus owners. I have not heard of any private bus owners going broke by running services in sparsely settled areas with very light loadings.

Mr. Pattinson—You won't, either.

Mr. SHANNON—I believe the trust keeps a most careful watch on the timetables of private bus operators and the fares charged. I think they are made to keep fares within reason, run to set timetables and give a service which, in the trust's opinion, meets the

needs of the people. If private owners can show a profit on light traffic routes it would appear that the trust has fallen down on its job by failing to make ends meet in more densely settled areas. I believe it had in mind the taking over of fairly well-developed private routes and turning them into tramway trust routes. I understand that the Edwardstown route is one, but on the trust's form it would not be long before that run, instead of showing a profit to the private owner, would show a loss to the trust. By and large, I think that private bus owners run one-man buses, with passengers paying as they enter. Obviously that must mean a considerable saving. I believe the trust desired to adopt a similar system, but its employees objected. I do not think it handled that position very well. There is no doubt what would have happened had our public transport system been privately run. Buses would have been put on a one-man basis.

Mr. Heaslip—The trust has some operating today.

Mr. SHANNON—There should be more of them.

Mr. Whittle—The buses have only recently arrived.

Mr. SHANNON—The trust is beginning to do some of the things which private owners would obviously do. That appears to be a proper approach to this problem. Although the trust has discovered that it has certain non-paying routes the Colonel Light Gardens-Prospect route is, I believe, a paying one.

Mr. Hawker—I think the trust's chairman said that none of the routes was paying.

Mr. SHANNON—I think the trust said that certain routes would always pay.

Mr. Whittle—Under its original agreement the trust was bound to electrify all horse tram routes. Some routes have never paid.

Mr. SHANNON—In order to obviate losses the trust could have asked Parliament to grant it similar facilities to those given to the Transport Control Board for bus routes. Bus owners conveying passengers from Mount Lofty to Adelaide have to pay a commission of 5 per cent on bookings. I think the commission on goods is 10 per cent. There is an overriding commission on the gross takings of country owners who operate road services and there is no logical reason why a similar facility should not have been granted to the Tramways Trust. It could have licensed private owners to operate on routes where it could not make a profit and take a small rakeoff for the licence, thus converting a loss into a slight profit.

Mr. Pattinson—The licensees would be prepared to pay it.

Mr. SHANNON—I think so. I believe that would have necessitated a small amendment to the Act. I would have thought that councils which took some pride in their affairs and desired to carry out their operations in as wide a field as possible would seek it. Street transport is a most appropriate field for councils to enter. I find myself largely in agreement with the Lord Mayor of Adelaide in his fight to retain for the city at least some of the controls it now has over street transport. I commend him for that attitude rather than criticize him for his fight against the Premier's No. 3 proposal. Much has been said about deleting tram transport entirely and using buses. Mr. Quirke said that London handled all its passenger traffic with buses, but nearly all my friends who have returned from a visit there say that the tube railways carry most of the traffic. I have heard it said that for every passenger carried by the buses the tubes carry 20. I am not sufficiently conversant with our transport problems to offer any constructive criticism. Some people talk of the tremendous transport problems handled in America by road buses, but the same people fail to appreciate that in America they have efficient municipal railway services running not only at street level but also overhead and underground. These are extant in such places as New York and Chicago. Our problems are purely of a local character and should be resolved by people conversant with them. Because London dispenses with its trams is no reason why Adelaide should follow suit. We have not the equivalent of the underground services to be found in London and other overseas cities. We have a dead-end service at the Adelaide station and under those conditions it will be impossible to handle all the traffic from the eastern suburbs in years to come, and I have grave doubts whether the traffic from the western suburbs can be handled either.

I wish that the Bill had followed more closely the recommendations of the committee which inquired into tramway ramifications. For instance, I wish a provision had been included for a definite term during which the State would provide financial assistance to tide the trust over its immediate difficulties. I contend that the 5-year term mentioned by the committee would give the trust a fair opportunity to put its house in order. It was the committee's considered opinion that the trust

should be placed under more efficient management and that its policy should be directed by people more concerned with its making a profit. In those circumstances it would be possible in five years for it to dispense with further State assistance. That approach should be closely examined. It has been said by speakers on both sides of the House that ultimately it is obvious that the Government must take over the trams, and they contend that the Government should take the bull by the horns and do it now. I do not agree. That is a policy of despair. If that were done it would be a stalking horse for increased services and decreased fares for every metropolitan member of the House when facing the electors. I would feel very uneasy if this position developed.

Mr. Christian—That will happen even now.

Mr. SHANNON—Perhaps it does not apply at the moment, but I am fearful that such a state of affairs would result in immense pressure being placed on whatever Government was in power. All kinds of fanciful facilities for the travelling public would be demanded at a price not commensurate with the services rendered. We should avoid that at all costs. If a definite time factor were included in the legislation providing that it had to come before the House for review, then we could review what had occurred in the interim. Such a provision might spur the councils to do something about their own business—the tramways. If they knew the tramways would be placed on a business basis, then at the end of the period when Government assistance faded out they could take over the organization and make a profit. I believe they would be encouraged to take this step, and therefore I should like that approach to the problem to be adopted.

I view this proposition from a State angle and do not adopt a parochial view. Many country people—and I include myself among them—have to use street transport in the metropolitan area. It is one of the facilities they expect. If there were no such street transport it would be a poor lookout for some country families visiting the city. If they had to engage taxi cabs it would be very expensive. The problems associated with the tramways must be handled from a State point of view. I can see no harm in the House adopting the Premier's suggestion, and actually I can see no other way out of the difficulty. The trust is not entirely to blame for its present position. Private enterprises have been faced

with somewhat similar problems during the period of spiralling costs, and have been compelled to tighten their belt. However, they have been able to pass on some of their increased costs to customers. If they have not, invariably they have gone out of business.

If any criticism can be levelled at the trust it is regarding its policy of increased fares. I propose to support the second reading, but in Committee will endeavour to have included amendments which will limit the period of Government financial assistance. I do not criticize the proposal to dispense with the existing method of appointing members of the trust. That is a good thing. I consider that the present method of appointment has been one cause for upsetting the policy of the trust, which has been pulled hither and thither by people who want to remain members of the trust at any cost. Members have first-hand knowledge of what takes place when a trust election is due, there being much lobbying and string pulling. That is one of the unhappy factors that has perhaps brought about a lack of a thorough grip of the affairs of the trust to enable its members to keep in line with current moves in the economic sphere. After all, this does not apply only to public transport, but also in other directions. The trust had done very little about its position except raise fares, and it can be justly criticized on that score. It has not pursued sufficiently vigorously avenues of economies in its operations.

When the special committee examines the position I hope it will realize that the central Government must not be saddled with an undertaking which could grow into a vote-buying business. Pressure could be brought to bear upon anyone seeking a metropolitan seat in this Chamber and it would be so great that the prospective member would have to agree before he could hope to win. He would have to agree to do certain things regarding street transport in his own area and that would be very undesirable. I am not unmindful of instances of railway lines being placed throughout the State in most uneconomical positions because of such influences. Knowing that, I fear that as regards the tramways the weapon would be such in the circumstances that no Government could retain the Treasury benches which did not agree to what public clamour wanted it to do, and frequently such clamour is not right. It is generally the vociferous few who whip up the other fellow into a real steam of indignation and get him

to believe he is the instigator of the plot. Ultimately it snowballs and the stage is reached where nothing can withstand it. That is what I am fearful of. That is the only dangerous thing I can see in the Bill, and with the reservations mentioned I propose to support the second reading.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—The argument developed seems to be whether the tramways shall be taken over by a central Government authority or whether the present arrangement should be allowed to continue for a little longer. I have been very disappointed with the Municipal Tramways Trust for a long time and members have heard me speak on this matter before. It seems obvious that the setting up of a trust, the members of which are elected by councils, to run a very important transport system could not possibly result in the most efficient management, for too often, as Mr. Shannon said, we have seen persons standing for election to the trust who would not know which end passengers entered a tram. What we are discussing on this Bill is, in effect, a subsidy on inefficiency. Parliament is being asked to vote a grant to an inefficient body to get it out of its difficulties, but I think it wise, nevertheless, to face the inevitable facts associated with this small city. These are that the Municipal Tramways Trust and the transportation systems of Adelaide are passing through a transitional period; the inevitable results of having a city with one arterial north-south highway, King William Street; expanding immigration, and the Housing Trust's policy of building houses far out of the city without making provision for either trams, buses or railway to serve these new communities; all haphazard, with no overall planning. They are the first things. Secondly, there has been lack of finance to enable the trams to be taken out of King William Street and replaced with Diesel buses; thirdly, the inflationary period, with its increasing costs and high wages; fourthly, the effect of motor cars and bicycles, the percentage of which per head of population is very high. All these factors have resulted in the bankruptcy of the trust. It has already been said in this debate that prior to the inauguration of the trust the councils thought it would be a wonderful paying proposition, and they never thought about losses. It seems to have been overlooked by most speakers, however, that provision was made in the original Act to permit councils to levy rates to meet any losses on

the trams. However, the local governing authorities and the ratepayers were so incensed and horrified at the thought of a special rate to make up for the trust's terrific losses that the committee of inquiry was appointed, and this Bill introduced as a consequence. Parliament need have done nothing, for the Act empowers the councils to levy rates to meet the losses. That has not been done and this brings me to the important point that we in the Murray River districts have for years been crying out for bridges, but have been told repeatedly, "We haven't got the money," or "We cannot find the steel." What is more important in the economy of the nation than to provide a proper system of transport for getting primary products to market? Yet on the main highway to Sydney there are no proper bridges in the State because we cannot find the money. We have recently learnt of the 30 per cent increase in railway rates on primary produce and on the essential commodities required by the producer. If this Bill passes, as no doubt it will, there can be no longer any argument against bridges across the Murray.

Mr. Macgillivray—In the richest part of the State, incidentally.

Mr. STOTT—Not only one of the richest parts, but one where the greatest development has taken place in respect of soldier settlement, but with no provision for getting their increasing volume of products to market. We must consider what is the right thing to do. I can imagine that if some members opposite were in opposition the old cry of "Bringing out the Socialistic Tiger" would be heard, but is not the taking over of the tramways a socialistic measure? I suppose now it will be called "nationalization" instead. The Bill does not set up exactly what is wanted, but if it becomes law I forecast that within two years we will be considering an amendment in terms of the Premier's number three proposal, namely, to take over the whole thing, lock, stock, and barrel. It is wise therefore to see what is happening in some of the other States and I wish to read an extract from one of the provincial newspapers of New South Wales, which has a large circulation. Under the heading, "Transport savings in New South Wales" it reads:—

In the last three years the New South Wales public transport services have lost something over £17,000,000 and this sum has had to be taken from general revenue that would otherwise be available for expenditure on hospitals, schools and other essential Government services. The railway, tram, and bus

services have been the victims both of inflation and gross blunders of State Government policy, the latter chiefly centering around political meddling in the everyday management of services and the untimely introduction of the 40-hour week. Now that the responsibility of raising its own income tax revenue is being handed back to the State it will no longer be possible to run to the Commonwealth for special grants to make up transport losses. The Cahill Government, no doubt with this development in view, has issued orders that the slide to bankruptcy must be stopped. Recently, the astounding disclosure was made that in the metropolitan transport service it is costing 26s. to earn each £1 of revenue. In an attempt to cut expense retrenchments of staff are now in progress and the Government is being tormented with the anguished cries from the unions concerned. It is regrettable that staff should have to be reduced but what is happening is the inevitable consequence of the mistaken belief that any industry, public or private, can pay more and more in wages for less and less in service and that always the boss or the customers will meet the bill sometime.

Some time ago a Royal Commission on transport inquired into the whole of the transport systems of the State and among its main recommendations was that the time had come when we should electrify parts of the suburban railway system. Where are we going if we accept that principle? Here we are talking about taking over the tramways system, but as I see it making no attempt to plan ahead for the electrification of suburban railways recommended by the Royal Commission. Again, this haphazard method: this taking a plunge in the dark; patching up a hole here and a hole there with no thought of the overall consequences. Instead of bringing down a Bill of this nature the Government should introduce legislation to establish a Ministry of Transport and give the Minister complete power over all transport systems and the planning of the future requirements of our numerous housing projects; whether we should have an electrified suburban railway service, or, having regard to the Tramway Trust's finances, diesel buses, or an extension of the tramway services. But nothing of the kind is visualized in this Bill and the time has come when the Government must seriously tackle this problem in a bold manner, because inevitably we will have to face it within the next year or so. We shall have to do something shortly about King William Street and we shall only run into further trouble if we pass this Bill without considering all these factors. If we had a Minister of Transport to plan overall policy we would get somewhere and Mr. Shannon's argument that the trust should be given five years or seven

years in which to right its position would hold water. A Minister of Transport could say to the trust or board, "It is obvious you are passing through a transitional period and you have to take the trams out of King William Street and get more diesel buses in order to give a faster service," and he could impose a trial period in which they had to make it pay. The committee's report states that most cities that years ago substituted diesel buses for trams are making their transport systems pay. A Minister of Transport could plan the electrification of suburban railways so as to dovetail with the tramways and bus services. Today we have two authorities running services in opposition. The Railways Commissioner administers the Railways Department with somewhat limited power because he must, under the Act, come to Parliament when he wishes to extend a railway, whereas the Tramways Trust can extend a line without doing so. With two transport authorities in opposition in the metropolitan area it is no wonder that one has fallen by the wayside.

Mr. Dunnage—The other has, too.

Mr. STOTT—Yes, and is only carrying on because it is rendering great service to country areas.

Mr. Whittle—Aren't the railways subsidized?

Mr. STOTT—Yes, but I am now stating that an overall policy in regard to transport should be formulated. I have advocated this in Parliament before, but I hope that the constant dripping will wear away the hardest stone.

Mr. Macgillivray—There is no harm in hoping.

Mr. STOTT—I am always an optimist. There would be no need for this Bill if the financial provisions of the Act had been invoked, but the people in the metropolitan area are now asking for a hand-out of £500,000 to subsidize inefficiency in the management of the trust's affairs. A railway runs to Port Adelaide with a trolley bus service running parallel for most of the way. That is not warranted in a small city such as Adelaide. The population is increasing and the Electricity Trust proposes to build a large suite of offices in the city. More people will have to be carried, so the time has come to formulate an overall plan to solve the transport problems of Adelaide. I hope that before the next elections the Government will do this and that another north-south highway over Morphett Street Bridge will be constructed to

allow a modern diesel bus service to bring people to and from the eastern suburbs. A Ministry of Transport could control the whole transport system of the State—railways, tramways, buses and taxicabs.

Mr. Shannon—Sydney is not happy with the set-up you are advocating.

Mr. STOTT—I know, but there is a different set-up there. This Bill does not solve our problem; it is only a plug in the bucket. I do not wish to be accused of being parochial, but if people on the Murray asked for £500,000 on loan to build a bridge across the river they would be turned down. The Government is to blame to some extent for the parlous financial position of the Tramways Trust because it has no policy on transport. Something has to be done to tide the trust over the crisis, so there is no alternative at the moment but to support the Bill.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I support the second reading because nothing else could have been put forward under the circumstances, although I am not entirely in favour of the Bill. From time to time, through force of circumstances, we have to support measures with which we do not entirely agree. I regret that the conflict between city and country interests has been brought into the debate because that will not help solve the problem. I remember many occasions when country interests have been glad to support the metropolitan area and on this occasion, when the city is in difficulties with its transport system, I do not see anything out of place in the Government's being asked to help. So far no-one has brought forward any other method of solving the problem facing the trust. I agree that the concentration of people in the metropolitan area has aggravated matters, but no-one can really fault what this Government has done towards decentralization, for it is providing amenities in country areas to entice people away from the city. The member for Ridley was inconsistent in his arguments. He attacked socialistic measures, but then advocated the establishment of a Ministry of Transport, which means nothing other than the socialization of our transport system. He would not have mentioned bridges over the Murray except as an attack on the Government. I am not opposed to bridges over the Murray, but he did not support me in my efforts to have the road on the north side of the river bituminized. This would not cost as much as bridges and could be done much more quickly. The people on the north of the Murray could then, by travel-

ling a few miles further, get to Adelaide without crossing the river. The ferries could then expeditiously handle the traffic that must of necessity cross the river. The member for Chaffey said both Parties have ganged up on this Bill, but there has been no more ganging up than that between the members for Chaffey and Stanley. They are "Yes" men to each other, far more so than the two Parties. I regret that it is necessary for the Government to make grants to the Tramways Trust, but because of its financial position the grants must be made. From time to time the Government has had to financially assist public utilities, but with the trust there should be a time limit in the making of advances. If there is none, members of the trust will have no incentive. I believe an amendment will be moved in Committee to fix a time limit.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Doesn't the amendment to be moved by Mr. Macgillivray refer to a time limit?

Mr. MICHAEL—I am prepared to support any move to limit the time in which advances can be made to the trust. I support the second reading because no-one has put forward any other worthwhile suggestion to overcome the trust's present financial position.

Mr. DUNNAGE (Unley)—As a member of one of the councils that have been castigated in this debate I feel it essential for me to speak on the Bill. We have been told that trust affairs have been carried on in an unbusiness-like manner, but it is apparent that some members have not thoroughly read the report of the committee of inquiry. It has been said that some of the lines operated by the trust have not been profitable, whilst others have, but on this matter it is interesting to note the following comments by the committee:—

According to information supplied by the chairman of the trust, none of the services operated by the trust is profitable. On the other hand licensed owners of private buses operating in the sparsely settled areas are, with one or two exceptions, operating at a profit.

Regarding administration the committee reported:—

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

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

(2) The trust from its inception, has always been able to meet its operating expenses, and commitments to the Treasury for debenture interest and sinking fund payments. As a result, during the past forty years there has been no recourse to the metropolitan councils under Part VI. of the Act, and the members of those councils and their representatives on the trust had become accustomed, over the years, to regard the demands from their constituent ratepayers for increases in transport services as of more moment than the effect of those services on the finances of the trust.

(3) Exceptional difficulties were associated with operating the undertaking during the post-war years.

In connection with financial policy the committee said:—

The committee is fully appreciative of the difficulties which have confronted the trust as a result of the inflationary pressures since 1946. It has been estimated that every 1s. increase per week in the basic wage costs the trust an additional £8,000 per annum. The increased costs do not stop there; they are followed by increases in costs of stores and services obtained from outside sources. The effect of the 40-hour week is now costing the trust approximately £142,000 per annum, and other improved conditions granted by the courts to employees, have placed additional heavy financial burdens on the undertaking. The increased costs, despite substantial rises in fares, have resulted in a rapid retrogression in the finances of the undertaking since 1946.

The trust has operated for many years and now we propose to put Government-sponsored men on the board.

Mr. O'Halloran—In the final report the committee made some invidious comparisons with Melbourne and Brisbane services.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Yes, but notwithstanding the inefficiency of our tramways system it is as good as any other in the Commonwealth. I do not know of a better one, and although Melbourne trams may be on a par, Sydney and Brisbane are no better.

Mr. O'Halloran—Brisbane fares are cheaper than ours.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Yes, but their trams and the way their conductors are dressed cannot compare with ours. We are condemning a trust which has done much work and only in the last few years have its members received fair remuneration. The member for Prospect mentioned that they once received £78 a year. Only in the last three or four years have they received a wonderful increase to £250 for managing the affairs of this huge organization. We are condemning men who have virtually given voluntary services and criticizing them because they are not transport officers. Where are we going to get the wondermen who will

re-establish the tramways? The member for Glenelg said we would get them from interstate if necessary, but where are the men who have done so much for trams in other States? The member for Ridley referred to the New South Wales trams and railways which have lost £17,000,000.

Mr. Pattinson—That loss was mainly in the railways.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Yes, but trams have lost a considerable amount of money.

Mr. Pattinson—The loss on railways was £15,000,000.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Admittedly, but we lose money on our railways. In spite of the inflationary trend, although losing money our tramways are providing efficient services. Immediately the trust is socialized those who advocated it will be on the Premier's back wanting something done for their districts.

Mr. O'Halloran—I will not be worrying him.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Under the honourable member's decentralization scheme Peterborough will become a big city and trams will automatically be needed. Every metropolitan member has been worried about what will happen to the tramways and I commend the Premier for this Bill. I deplore the criticism which has been levelled at members of the Adelaide city council and especially at the Lord Mayor. If we were in his position I am certain we would all do exactly as he has done. He is only looking after the interests of the district he represents and I eulogize him for his actions. Under the old legislation the Adelaide city council had a greater share of the responsibility than any other council and it was entitled to ask for greater consideration. I do not blame the Lord Mayor, because he has done a good job.

Much has been said about the amount of money the Government will put into the tramways and what will happen to it. At a conference with representatives of the councils held on June 27 the Premier said:—

What is difficult is to decide how you shall reach an agreement. At present the councils are in three zones, each represented on the trust. The interests of the councils will not be identical in this matter, and it would be rather a fluke if any one particular authority met with the approval of everyone. I should like to have your suggestions on how we can reach an agreement. The Government does not desire to force any proposition on you which you do not want. The financial resources of the State are not unlimited, but at the moment are rather constricted, as there has been a severe cut in our loan programme. We have taken out some figures in relation to scheme No. 2—that is, a scheme where there would be

efficient control, satisfactory to Parliament. The Government would be prepared to provide financial assistance by way of annual grants.

It has been suggested that perhaps these grants may not be needed in a year or two. I hope they won't be but the Premier has stated that for five years he is prepared to make grants and he expects that at the end of that time this problem will be solved. Many members do not agree with that and I do not think the Premier does in his heart because I cannot see how this problem will be solved in five years unless trams are removed and one-man buses installed.

The Premier went on to say:—

Our figures show that for the year 1952-53, the expected cash deficiency of the trust would be £590,000. Our experts consider this would be the figure after certain economies have been effected. To cover this deficiency it would be necessary to sell stock to realize £140,000 and the Government would grant £450,000. For 1953-54 the expected cash deficiency would be £550,000. To cover that it would be necessary to sell stock to the value of £200,000 and the Government would grant £350,000. For the year 1954-55 the expected cash deficiency would be £350,000, and to cover that £100,000 worth of stock would have to be sold, and a Government grant of £250,000 would be necessary. After the remaining two years, as far as we can see, the undertaking would begin to get on its feet, and the Government grant in 1955-56 would be £100,000, and in 1956-57 it would be £30,000. By that time it is expected that the undertaking could successfully maintain itself. These are only tentative figures. When we budget so far ahead undoubtedly adjustments become necessary.

Later the report continues:—

The Hon. T. Playford—At present each council is a joint owner of the undertaking and the Government does not desire to dispossess it of any of its rights. The Government wants to deal with the matter in a manner satisfactory to all councils. Naturally there will be a big divergence of opinion in regard to schemes 2 and 3.

Mr. Woollacott—The City of Unley is the highest assessed city outside the City of Adelaide, yet it would have only two votes. Our council gave valuable evidence to the Paine Commission. We have affirmed and reaffirmed that the Government should take complete control of all transport.

Mr. Pattinson—Did all the members of the Unley Council subscribe to that statement?

Mr. DUNNAGE—I have not heard any of them object to it. They said that over two years ago when we sent Mr. Rogers, the Unley City Engineer, to appear before the Paine Commission. Later in conference Mr. Playford said:—

The Adelaide City Council is responsible for one third of the obligations. Should it have only one vote?

The issue involved in that question has led to the controversy that has raged. The Premier said he was prepared to set up a committee to inquire into ancillary transport services, and all councils will view that statement with pleasure, for councils are more concerned over ancillary services such as taxis and private buses on uncontrolled routes and over the parking of private motor vehicles than over the Tramways Trust. Taxis are becoming more popular with the younger generation who are in a position to afford them. Opposite my home is a taxi stand, and, although I would never dream of catching one, for I cannot afford it, many young people from the ordinary working class homes use the taxis to ride to town. Today the community is prosperous and looks on such services as the necessities of life. We have tended to give our children the things we did not have, and that policy is having its effect today. As I stand at my front door I can see the traffic coming along Unley Road, and often, when a line of traffic is banked up behind a stationary tram, I can see that two out of every three cars going into Adelaide are carrying only a driver.

In this debate it has been said that frequently motor vehicles are used to transport other people, but I remind members that a motor car is expensive to run. Recently, I received my insurance notice and found that I had to pay £26 for a year's insurance on my Holden. If the money invested in a modern car were left in the Savings Bank at 2½ per cent it would earn £25 a year, thus insurance and interest account for £1 a week before the car is taken out of the garage. The value of my vehicle has dropped about £300 in the past 12 months, therefore insurance, interest, depreciation, and running charges combine to make the total cost of running my car £8 a week. In the city cars are parked in every street as far north as St. Peter's Cathedral and as far south as South Terrace, and most of the owners of those cars at one time travelled to town by tram. Even members with free tram passes probably have cars in the vicinity of this House at this moment. Many young people are using push bikes as a means of transport, and one has only to see the number of cycles hanging in the racks outside Holdens to realize why the trams do not pay. If the Premier makes them pay he will be doing more than I think he can do.

If we do not prohibit parking in the city streets, soon we will find that the parklands around the city will be used daily instead of weekly as at present for parking purposes.

and the tramway system will be even worse off than it is today. The member for Kidley criticized councils who, he said, had done nothing to rectify this problem which faces us today. He made a very impassioned speech about his own district, but he forgot that for many years, while a member of the West Torrens district council, he did nothing about the problem. Yet he comes here tonight and talks about his own district. I presume that copies of his speech will go into that district and that people there will say what a good chap he is, but it is just as well he is not now on the West Torrens district council for other council members would surely say what sort of a gentleman he is. I would like the Premier to delete the provision giving the councils the right to petition asking that the trust shall not be re-constituted.

Mr. O'Halloran—I am attending to that.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I am glad to hear it. I support the Bill.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I have listened with great interest to speeches on this matter, but I do not like the Bill. I also listened attentively to Mr. Shannon's remarks about councils and to Mr. Dunnage in support of them. I feel that if country councils were in the same position as metropolitan councils are today over this matter they would not get a hearing. We have been asked to help the metropolitan councils out of their troubles and Mr. Dunnage asked where we would get men to run the Tramways Trust. My answer is that we will have to educate younger men in transport control. Mr. Stott gave some interesting facts about the establishment of the trust and the early legislation connected with it. In those days there were able men in control of our tramways, but evidently a generation that is not so well versed in transport matters has been placed on the board. Members of the younger generation and many metropolitan mayors have not taken an interest in the trust's affairs, nor do they possess the business ability of the men who were first appointed to the board. We still have younger men who could render good service on it. If the trust's affairs are to be handed over to a board of five we will only widen the breach between the trust and councils. I would like to see a small sub-committee from the councils appointed to the board. I agree with Mr. Macgillivray that the Bill should operate for a limited period and feel certain that at the end of five years we will have a new, young and efficient board capable of controlling the trust's affairs.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I approach this Bill in a manner different from that of some members. I also do not like the Bill.

Mr. Moir—What is wrong with it?

Mr. HEASLIP—Everything, but if our transport services ceased tomorrow all of us would be directly affected. Workmen have to get to their employment in factories, which must continue to produce, as primary producers are dependent on their goods; so with certain reservations I support the Bill. One matter that concerns me is the power that is to be given to the board. In his second reading speech the Premier said:—

After the proclaimed date the trust will consist of five members appointed by the Governor. The term of office of each member will be five years, but during the first five years of the existence of the re-constituted trust one member will retire at the end of each year.

Like many members I do not want to see the Tramways Trust become a Government instrumentality. I do not agree with many members that the trust cannot be made to pay, as I believe it can, provided that the board comprises experts who know their job. My experience of boards has been that they can be too big, when worse results follow than with a small board. In my opinion three members, one being the general manager, could run the tramways at a profit. They should have power to run the trust as they consider fit, but I am not clear as regards the powers to be vested in them. I do not think any members are clear upon that point; everything will depend on future events. I am very much afraid that the board will be controlled by the Government of the day, and if that is so the tramways will not be able to pay. Certain tram routes that should be paying today are not paying. In certain sparsely populated areas private enterprise is operating at a profit, and it is only a matter of handing over enough of the routes to private companies and they will make them pay. If that were done it would be only a matter of time before the Government could be relieved of the liability of which so many members are afraid.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you know how many buses would be necessary to carry the passengers?

Mr. HEASLIP—I am not competent to say whether trams should be scrapped and whether all passengers should be carried by buses. I would leave that to the experts. It is only a matter of paying enough and we will get the brains to do the job, but unless they are

employed full-time they cannot be expected to do it. They must be allowed to use their ability without Government interference.

Mr. O'Halloran—In other words, we should give people over whom we have no control a blank cheque to spend the people's money?

Mr. HEASLIP—They would still be answerable to the Government for the money spent. Possibly the difficulties with which the tramways are faced could then be overcome, although in many instances services equal to those operating today may not be available to the public. Mr. Lawn lamented the fact that he had to wait half an hour for a bus. That is not a very big hardship and does not occur all the time. There may have been a breakdown. In the country people have to wait an hour or perhaps two hours for a train and often they get bogged on country roads and have to wait perhaps two or three hours before they get out again. If we pay enough we can get the services required, but the question is can we afford to pay the price. Evidently we cannot, because the public are not prepared to be rated to meet the expense. Mr. Dunnage said that everyone has too much money. If that is so, why not make them pay for their transport services? I regret the introduction of the country versus city argument. Country railways cannot be compared with metropolitan tramways. Such a comparison would be ridiculous. I intend to support the amendment foreshadowed by the Leader of the Opposition to delete the provision giving councils the right to petition against the reconstitution of the trust. I support the second reading.

Mr. McLACHLAN (Victoria)—I do not think the Bill is half as bad as some of my country colleagues have led honourable members to believe. Mr. Stott referred to the proposed Government grant as a subsidy on inefficiency. I contend it is a responsibility brought about by unfortunate circumstances, and the Government must stand up to it. Country people enjoy numerous amenities which would not be available to them if they had to finance them themselves. I feel that I am only voicing the views of right-minded citizens in my electorate in saying that they would like to make their contribution in providing an amenity so vital as the tramways to people living in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I thank honourable members for their prompt attention to the Bill, which was introduced only late last week. Already

nearly all members have expressed their views on it. One embarrassing thing to me was that my friends opposite did not seem to have any strong fixed convictions about the Bill. It is true that the Leader of the Opposition and his Party say that it does not go far enough, and that the proper procedure would be for the Government to set up a Ministry of Transport, take over all transportation in the State, and run it strictly as a Government undertaking. I can follow the reasoning of the honourable member and his Party, but I find other members sitting opposite strangely illogical in their arguments. In the first place they say the Bill does not go far enough. One honourable member said that we should have a Ministry of Transport, but then went on to say it was a socialistic piece of legislation which would impose upon country districts certain obligations which should be borne by the State. How could we have a Minister in charge of this undertaking as a Government department unless it did the very things he mentions? He then says we should give private enterprise a better go, but forgets that only a few moments before he advocated a Ministry of Transport controlling all forms of transport in the State.

We have only one or two alternatives to follow. The first is that the trust remains the responsibility of the councils concerned, in which instance they would be faced with certain obligations and would receive certain benefits. The other is that it become the responsibility of the Government, and the burden of it, or any advantages must be reflected in the Budget; there is no intermediate position. It is true this Bill seeks to avoid either of those alternatives, but, as I pointed out when introducing it, it was never intended to be a permanent burden upon the State. I said that I believed the State would have to make substantial grants for a number of years to assist this undertaking to get back on its feet and that there was justification for this action. Members will have seen that the Bill makes surprisingly few alterations to the Metropolitan Tramways Trust Act. I go so far as to say that had the Bill been brought down in other circumstances there would probably have been 20 amendments to be considered, for it is a considerable time since this legislation was reviewed by Parliament and there have been many changes in circumstances. The Bill was brought down to deal with an emergency. The Government would like to have brought it in earlier, but where a large number of bodies

with conflicting viewpoints are concerned there is always difficulty in reaching agreement, and the time taken up by negotiations has meant that the Bill has not come down as soon as the Government would have liked and as a consequence has become an emergency measure. The Parliamentary Draftsman had a big list of all sorts of amendments, but I asked him to discard them all and to deal only with the vital issues of an emergency nature. Doubtless it will have to be reviewed. Some members have said that this is not a final conclusion. I do not know any legislation ever passed by the House that has been the final conclusion on any topic. I should hate to think that we are not growing and developing, and while we are growing and developing our problems will grow. To say that this is not the final conclusion is merely to state the obvious. How many times, for example, have we amended the Local Government Act, or the Crown Lands Act, or the Bush Fires Act? We discuss Bills which are often referred to as hardy annuals and no member says that he will not consider them because they are not final conclusions. I do not for one moment say that this is the final conclusion, but unless we pass this legislation I say that we will have complete chaos in our metropolitan tramways service which will affect, not only the metropolitan area, but production generally and the whole economics of the State.

As I see it this is not a problem to be regarded as of metropolitan *versus* country interests, but a very real one for the whole of the State. I do not think it possible for this House to get a nicely balanced judgment on what are the prerogatives of the city and of the country. If we adopt that attitude on every occasion we will do irreparable harm to the State, for many services which the Government hopes to take to the country, and many which it has already taken are not upon a payable basis; they have not paid and they cannot pay because of the relatively few people in the country receiving the benefits. We must deal with these matters on a somewhat broader than a parochial basis. There are many activities in the country which are very valuable and which must go on, but they have not paid, and I suggest that they will not pay in the future. As an example, and not by way of criticism, for this is something I approve of myself, consider the reticulation of water on Eyre Peninsula. It has never paid working expenses and makes virtually no contribution to the interest liability on the capital cost. When the Government referred the more recent

proposals to the Public Works Standing Committee I was very interested in its report. What did I find? The committee did not make a recommendation and the reason was this: that if it found that the financial obligation was very heavy it would probably be embarrassed in the future if it had recommended it. I did not worry about that and the Government took the responsibility. All that the committee said was that the water would be desirable. If my memory serves me correctly the Public Works Standing Committee did not make any recommendation for the reticulation of Yorke Peninsula. Again we had to be content with a finding, for had the committee been forced to make a recommendation upon the financial aspect of this undertaking it would have been obliged to say that it could not recommend it. The committee found that there would be a very great amount of progress if the water were supplied and I supported this view.

Mr. Christian—The committee is not obliged to recommend.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Quite so, but when it comes to the question of taking these facilities to the country the Government has never taken the attitude that it will not do it if it does not pay. It believes that that would be the most hopeless attitude for a country like South Australia to adopt.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, hear!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If we took that attitude half of the progress of this country would be held up. The member for Chaffey this afternoon made a very powerful speech on this topic. After we have written off millions of pounds on irrigation projects on the River Murray we still find that, on the Auditor-General's method of compiling a balance-sheet, they still make heavy annual losses.

About £250,000 is lost every year in pumping water to irrigation areas on the Murray, but it would be entirely wrong for us to say that because of these losses we should discontinue pumping water, for irrigation from the Murray is most beneficial to the State. If we viewed all projects from a pounds, shillings and pence aspect we would be viewing them on a fallacious basis. The criticism levelled against the management of the trust, like all general statements, has been exaggerated. Over a long period the management was remarkably good, but I think that in recent years it has not been so good. Recently, not sufficient attention has been given to effecting savings. This view is borne out by the general conclusions of the

Committee of Inquiry. Much of the trust's rolling stock has become obsolete and extremely costly to maintain. Further it probably does not give the service to the public that it should. The trust's power station is obsolete and when it draws a supply from the Electricity Trust it will probably save up to £150,000 a year. It will take some time to put the trust back on its feet—perhaps about five years. During the transitional period it will be necessary for the State Budget to support the undertaking, so I commend the Bill to members.

The House divided on the second reading:—

Ayes (26).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, John Clark, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, and Hutchens, Hon. Sir George Jenkins, Mr. McAlees,

Hon. M. McIntosh, Messrs. McLachlan, Michael, Moir, O'Halloran, Pattinson, and Pearson, Hon. T. Playford (teller), Messrs. Riches, Shannon, Stott, Tapping, Teusner, Frank Walsh, and Whittle.

Noes (3).—Messrs. Fletcher, Macgillivray (teller), and Quirke.

Majority of 23 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.12 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 8, at 2 p.m.