

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 8, 1952.

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

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

Mr. MICHAEL—In this morning's *Advertiser* appears a notice with reference to next week's Abattoirs market, that the board has decided to allot 240 vans (including country markets) for the Abattoirs market to be held on October 15, and the number of sheep and lambs which are to be delivered by road has been fixed at 12,000. How are country areas notified that road deliveries are to be limited to 12,000?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The notification is made through the press; also all stock agents are advised. Practically all the stock coming into the Abattoirs for sale come in through one or other of the stock agents operating, and experience has shown that the information is widely disseminated and it is generally observed thoroughly both by the stock agents and by the people concerned. The information I have at present is that the position at the Abattoirs has eased considerably. The sheep that were on hand have been killed, and as a result the Abattoirs will be able to increase the number of vans available for next week, but will be killing lambs only for export.

PRICE CONTROL.

Mr. McKENZIE—Since price control has been lifted several cases have been brought to my notice of people saying they have been fleeced. Yesterday I learned that a householder was charged £3 for the fitting of an electrical plug or two. This case was taken up with the Prices Commissioner and the person concerned is now due to get a rebate of £1 19s. because the Commissioner said the job was worth only about £1. Controls should be reimposed on jobs like this because many people have told me they have been robbed. We shall never retard inflation if we allow this to continue. Many people, such as pensioners, have only a meagre amount to live on and cannot afford to pay exorbitant prices. Will the Premier, who is in charge of the Prices Department, see what can be done?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member did not give me any facts which

would enable me to identify the case concerned, but if he will let me have the information later I will examine the case for him.

ADDITIONAL IRRIGATION PLANTINGS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—On September 30 I asked the Minister of Irrigation whether he could give any information about additional irrigation plantings. The Minister stated that a report was available on this matter. Will he make it available to the House?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—A survey has been made of the present irrigated areas, which shows there are limited areas that could be planted. Having secured that information it is now the intention of the department to make those areas available for applicants, so I suggest to the honourable member, who I know has had representations made to him by several persons in the area, that he get in touch with them and ask them to apply again to the department, and their applications will be considered.

POOCHERA SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—For over two years the Poochera school committee has been endeavouring to have a residence erected for the local teacher because he can now only get accommodation at the local hotel. Of course, that is much too costly for a departmental officer and, furthermore, he finds it unsuitable. Despite all these efforts, for various reasons they have never come to fruition. I do not know what the real obstacle is, but the committee has made requests from time to time for a pre-fabricated building to be sent there for erection, as there were no contractors available at one stage to erect a more permanent structure. However, nothing came of that proposal either. I have raised this matter here on two occasions this session, and I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Education whether he has anything definite to report, as this is really an urgent matter?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Following on representations by the honourable member I took up the matter with the Minister of Education, and the facts are that over a period of years it has been necessary to concentrate on educational buildings for children, and as men, money and materials have become available they have had first priority. The position now arises that more manpower is available, and even materials, but as the honourable member knows the Loan programme has of necessity

been curtailed and that has obviated the possibility of any work being done on school residences during this year. The reply of the Minister of Education is that he regrets that funds are not available for the purpose, Loan moneys being appropriated for work of a higher priority. We have had to find money to make up the deficit on the pipeline leading to the area, and we cannot do everything at the same time. I understand that the department subsidizes, in certain approved cases, the board allowance, and if that is one of the problems I will take it up to see if relief can be given in that direction—that is, if it has not already been done.

PRICE OF CORNSACKS.

Mr. McALEES—As the price of cornsacks has been reduced to 34s. 8d. a dozen, why is the Australian Wheat Board asking farmers to pay 70s. 6d. a dozen?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—About two or three weeks ago I sought information from the Wheat Board on this matter, and in reply to a question I gave it to the member for Flinders, and I take it that it is still accurate. The information was that the price of cornsacks to farmers was 70s. 1d. a dozen cash, and 70s. 7d. booked. If there is any variation in this price I will be pleased to bring down the details for the honourable member.

DEEP SEA PORT IN SOUTH-EAST.

Mr. McLACHLAN—Can the Premier indicate what progress has been made in regard to the establishment of a deep sea port in the South-East?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As the honourable member knows, this project, which has been advocated by the Government for a considerable time, was referred to the Public Works Committee. I understand the committee has now obtained official evidence from the various departments and is awaiting an opportunity to take local evidence in the South-East, after which I believe its report will be presented. The Government still believes that it is an important project, and still favours it. It cannot go any further at present until the recommendation of the committee is available.

LAND SETTLEMENT AGISTMENT FEES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yesterday I asked the Minister of Lands a question regarding the agistment of stock on Kangaroo Island. The question obviously dealt with ex-servicemen who had been allotted land on the Island. In

reply, the Minister said "Grazing fees are charged to employees who choose to graze stock on pastures on properties under development." Was the word "employees" the one the Minister intended to use? Can he say whether the agistment fees were charged with the concurrence of the Commonwealth and State Governments, or was there an arrangement between the various Government departments concerned?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Replying to the latter part of the question first, there was an arrangement between the Commonwealth and State departments. The word "employees" was used, but I could have used the word "allocates," because whilst the properties are being developed the settlers are really employees of the department.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's report for the financial year ended June 30, 1952. Ordered to be printed.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-35. Read a first time.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Burnside), having obtained the suspension of Standing Orders, moved without notice—

That the Deputy Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, 1934-1939.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I move—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, 1934-1939.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—The honourable member for Burnside has stated no particular reason why his Bill should be founded in Committee. Is there a money clause involved and, if so, is he, as a private member, within his rights in moving for the introduction of such a Bill?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Christian)—In my opinion according to Standing Orders the honourable member, as a private member, is in order in moving the resolution.

Mr. STOTT—I do not dispute your ruling, Mr. Acting Chairman, but I desire to know is this a money Bill? Does it need to be founded in Committee?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Until I have seen the Bill I cannot say whether it contains a money clause or not.

Mr. STOTT—Then when will the honourable member be known to be in order or out of order, assuming it is a money Bill? I understand from the Standing Orders that a private member cannot introduce a Bill containing a money clause.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—When members see the Bill and understand its nature.

Mr. STOTT—You get a different ruling every time you bring the matter up. I was ruled out in Committee when I moved in a similar way.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House.

Bill introduced by Mr. Geoffrey Clarke.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I move—That this Bill be now read a first time.

Mr. STOTT—I desire your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to whether this Bill is in order; whether it contains a money clause and, if so, is the honourable member for Burnside, as a private member, in order in moving the first reading of a Bill of this character?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—I had no knowledge of this matter before the House sat, and I have not had an opportunity to look it up, but I should think it could require a message from His Excellency the Governor before the Bill was carried. With regard to the other part of the question, I cannot advise the House as there has been no opportunity to look at the Bill only just presented.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This question is important, and I think it is governed by Standing Order No. 418, which states:—

No amendment for the imposition or for the direct or indirect increase of a tax, rate, duty or impost shall be proposed except by a Minister.

There are money Bills which come under Standing Order No. 410, which deals with motions authorizing the borrowing or expenditure of money. I believe that such motions, or Bills having something to do with financial powers, if they do not increase taxation, could be founded by any private member, although according to Standing Order No. 418, amendments for the imposition or for the direct

or indirect increase of a tax, rate, duty, or impost shall be proposed only by a Minister. I submit that it would not be competent for any private member to introduce a Bill to increase taxation, but, I believe that it would be quite competent for a Bill not increasing taxation to be introduced by a private member, although, if it involved expenditure of public money, it could not be carried until there had been a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending the appropriation of the necessary money.

Mr. RICHES moved the adjournment of the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—The honourable member cannot do that. A point of order is before the House, and I have been asked to make a statement on it. As I said previously, I have not had time to look the matter up. However, having had my attention called to it by the Premier, I should say that Standing Order 410 covers what the member for Burnside has done. Obviously it would require a message from the Governor if it involves the appropriation of revenue.

Mr. STOTT—I have not seen the Bill, but I want to know whether it contains a clause providing for an impost or has anything to do with taxation. I should say that if it has anything to do with the expenditure or the collection of money and it is not introduced by a Minister it is out of order under Standing Order 418.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—On a personal explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill does not impose any impost and it does not deal with public money. It relates only to unclaimed moneys temporarily in the hands of the Registrar of Companies.

Mr. RICHES—I understood you to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I was not in order in moving the adjournment of this debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—There is no debate at present. The honourable member for Burnside has moved that the Bill be read a first time.

Mr. RICHES—Under what Standing Order do you rule that I cannot move that the debate on the first reading be adjourned?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—On the first reading Standing Order No. 292 provides:—

When any Bill shall be presented by a member . . . the question "That this Bill be now read a first time" shall be decided without amendment or debate.

I am sorry, but the honourable member cannot move the adjournment of the debate when there is no scope for debate. The time for

him to do that will be when the second reading comes on. The question now is, "That the Bill be now read a first time."

Motion carried. Second reading made an order of the day for Wednesday, October 15.

HOMES FOR AGED AND INFIRM.

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

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the Government should take steps to provide suitable houses both in the country and the metropolitan area for aged and infirm persons who are pensioners.

(Continued from September 17. Page 566.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I take it that the term "homes" in the motion relates to collective homes rather than individual homes.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not say that. I made it very clear in my speech that the term must have the broadest meaning possible.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member discussed at length conditions in England where the large majority of people to whom he was referring live in private homes. What I wanted to know was whether the honourable member wished to have private homes provided for individual pensioners or collective homes for pensioners.

Mr. O'Halloran—I meant both. I made the position very clear when I moved the motion.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When one refers to old folks' homes the accepted meaning is collective homes of the type so admirably provided by many religious and charitable organizations. I have one grave objection to the motion. In considering any problem the House should take into account the widest possible basis. I contend that the honourable member has placed his problem on a narrow basis. Evidently his objective is to provide suitable homes both in the metropolitan area and the country for aged and infirm pensioners. I have every sympathy for pensioners and always have had. I know many estimable people who, because of circumstances over which they had no control, have been obliged to apply for a pension, but there are many aged persons, formerly servants of the State, who are on superannuation and are in exactly the same position as—

Mr. O'Halloran—They are still pensioners.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Superannuation is not regarded as a pension. If the honourable member desires to submit that

argument, I would say there are many people who are in a worse position than either of the two classes referred to.

Mr. Shannon—Perhaps a superannuated judge of the Supreme Court is a pensioner?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not think he is the type that the Leader of the Opposition had in mind.

Mr. Pattinson—Many single women and widows on small, fixed incomes are in a difficult position.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, as difficult as that of many pensioners. No honourable member would argue that it is not desirable to do the utmost to provide homes for aged people, but I oppose the motion for two reasons—firstly, it is not necessary to carry it because the Government has not been unmindful of this problem and has made and is making the utmost provision possible for the care of these people and, secondly, it is not desirable to carry it, because the Leader of the Opposition proposes to provide homes only for pensioners. The houses erected by the Housing Trust are available to applicants in all walks of life, whether they are pensioners or not. The trust is at present constructing flats for aged people with no families.

Mr. O'Halloran—To be let at what rental?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At an economic rental. The motion does not say that housing is to be provided at concession rates. The Housing Trust does not discriminate between people: it tries to allot houses fairly to all sections. It is now building houses for aged persons without family obligations.

Mr. Riches—Where?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Two blocks are being erected in the metropolitan area. The trust has built houses in about 80 country centres, so the metropolitan area hasn't any monopoly in this matter.

Mr. O'Halloran—Can you tell me one pensioner that has been allotted a trust home in the country?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, and I could not name one non-pensioner either. Every month the trust sends me a list of the persons allotted homes. I have looked through those lists without taking particular notice of the names, but I study their previous accommodation, and I believe there has not been a house allotted without ample justification. The trust does not let houses to people already adequately accommodated.

Mr. O'Halloran—That was never suggested.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I know that, but if we are dealing with housing as a problem let us deal with it on a broad basis, and not confine its consideration to one group. The motion seeks to favour one class.

Mr. O'Halloran—Because down the years it has been a forgotten class.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I anticipated that interjection. When the Constitution of Australia was drawn up it was approved by the people. Section 51 sets out the powers of the Commonwealth Parliament. One of the original clauses was placitum 23, which gives that Parliament power to provide for invalid and old age pensioners. Therefore, the motion covers a matter that can be dealt with on a national basis. If pensioners have been forgotten down the years, as the Leader of the Opposition interjected, I point out that there have been several changes of Government in the Commonwealth sphere in recent years. I do not think pensioners have always been happy with their lot, but probably no problem is raised more frequently in the Federal House than that of the adequacy of the pensions.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Federal Parliament has never considered the question of housing pensioners, and I doubt whether it would have the Constitutional power to do so.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has considered housing because recently it liberalized the means test for obtaining a pension. If a person is occupying his home he may receive the full pension no matter what the value of the house may be. Therefore, the honourable member's statement that the Federal Parliament has not considered housing is incorrect.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is only considered in relation to the means test.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Parliament has only considered the general question of pensions in relation to the means test, but now a person adequately housed may still receive the full pension. A person does not have to be without a home to get it.

Mr. O'Halloran—My point is that a person can have a pension but not a house.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is so, and many people have a house but no pension. In these circumstances, it was wrong for the honourable member to limit the scope of the motion. The housing of aged people presents considerable problems. Our gravest shortage of accommodation for aged people is in infirmaries, where special care is given. The proposal to provide homes for aged people

in the country needs examination. In saying that I do not want it to be taken that I do not advocate their provision. I believe Mount Gambier is making a laudable effort to deal with the problem, and I congratulate the Mount Gambier authorities.

Mr. O'Halloran—And Riverton?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. At Riverton there is a laudable project, but when applications were called for aged people to occupy the houses only two came from nearby districts.

Mr. Pattinson—Many old people do not like going to institutions.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, I come across many distressing cases. The most distressing case of all is that of an aged couple who have lived together for many years and who have great affection for each other, and then find it necessary for one of the partners to go to an institution for special attention. It is a problem when the old man or lady cannot look after his or her life partner. It is most distressing when the home has to be broken up. That matter is not mentioned in the motion. The attention these old people require is given in infirmaries, where the accommodation is limited. Lately the Old Folks Home at Magill has been extensively improved, in order to provide greater comfort for the inmates. Two new modernized infirmaries have been there for a short time and there are sufficient patients awaiting admission to keep them full. Apart from the infirmaries, vacancies exist for 70 male ambulatory cases, which has been the position for some time. There is a great need today for more infirmaries. In some of our hospitals infirmary cases occupy accommodation which should be used by medical cases.

Mr. O'Halloran—Have you any figures to show the number of such cases in the various hospitals?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have not seen any recent figures, but from the distressing cases which come under my notice I know there must be a considerable number.

Mr. O'Halloran—Not long ago there were over 400 in mental institutions alone.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Cases come under my notice where aged people are not sufficiently well to occupy accommodation at the Old Folks Home and have to go to hospital for medical treatment. That problem has not been overlooked by the Government, which submitted the matter to the Advisory Council on Health and Medical Services for consideration and recommendation. Following

on the examination the Government submitted proposals to the Public Works Committee. They provided for the erection of suitable buildings at Northfield for the accommodation of selected mental patients and for prefabricated structures at the Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital to accommodate patients now in the Magill wards, which were to be handed over to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department as an old folk's home, thus providing accommodation for old people not mentally or physically ill to a degree requiring hospital care. That matter has been investigated by the Public Works Committee, and over £90,000 included in this year's Loan Estimates for this purpose. When the Loan Estimates were before the House I did not hear one criticism of the amount provided for their care. I hope that amount will be used, and I know that the Minister in charge of this department is doing his utmost and more than has been done for many years to solve this problem. The resolution in its present form is both undesirable and unnecessary, and I ask the House to reject it.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I desire to add my blessing to this motion, but would have preferred it to contain a reference to Government assistance for this worthy cause. The Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, has had evidence placed before it by the Hospitals Department showing that there were about 400 patients who could be taken from one institution alone, and that state of affairs applies in hospitals throughout the State. Such folk should be looked after in suitable homes, for that would afford a wonderful relief to our hospitals. I was pleased to hear the Premier refer to what had been done in the Mount Gambier district where a strong movement is on foot to establish an old folk's home, for citizens there feel that their old folk should be able to spend the sunset of their lives in the environments of a home in the district where they have spent most of their years. Such institutions should definitely be started by the citizens of the various towns and districts and given local support. I was present at the first meeting called by Mr. A. F. Sutton in Mount Gambier to establish this old folk's home there and I pointed out then that the building of a suitable home would not be the end of the matter, but that its continued existence would have to be supported, and I

am pleased with the support that has been given to that project for which many functions and efforts have been held to raise money. It behoves each district to look after its own old folk, and when these homes are established the Federal or State Government should assist in their upkeep.

The Premier said how sad it was when one partner of an old couple who had reared their children and lived together for many years fell ill, the other partner being unable to administer the necessary medical care. I had the privilege of looking over the old folk's home in Western Australia, where there are several two-roomed cottages where old couples may retire, taking with them their valued treasures such as furniture and other possessions, and where everything possible is done to make them happy and contented. The lotteries of Western Australia are to be complimented on what has been done in this regard, for the money to maintain those cottages is raised by those lotteries. This motion deserves the consideration of members. The Premier said that its terms were rather restricted, and I would have preferred it had it embodied a request for Government assistance to be given to people in country areas to build, equip and staff these institutions so that they might accommodate old folk who today are cluttering up our hospitals simply because they have nowhere else to go. Too often we ask the Government to do certain things which are the duty of local people, and I am certain that either the Federal or the State Government would be only too pleased to assist those charged with the responsibility of running these institutions.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the motion. I listened with interest to all speakers in this debate and was somewhat astounded when the Premier gave as his reasons for opposing the motion—that its scope was too limited and that it was entirely unnecessary. His first reason is an admission that such a motion is necessary and that it should be carried and put into effect. I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on moving the motion. We who have the honour to serve as members of Parliament quickly realize how easy it is for people in such positions to become materialists, but there are many dangers in that. In this country we are reminded of high ideals by many signs. For instance, on our cathedrals and in our memorial grounds are crosses which represent the great

ideals that have inspired men in the spring-time of life, when they are inclined to be reckless, to go on to better things. In the wintertime of life, when men and women are lonely and cold, they are reminded by such signs that they are not alone. Flags flying from our flagpoles show how the various crosses have been brought together in the one great flag to remind us that we are a people united for the protection of one another, but to a materialist these crosses and flags are but pieces of wood and rag. Members of my Party can feel justly proud that they have as a leader a man in whom is ingrained those Christian principles that make him conscious of his responsibilities to his fellow men, no matter what their age. The following figures compiled by the Government Statistician indicate the ever-growing expectancy of life:—

	Male.	Female.
	Years.	Years.
1881-1890	47.2	50.8
1891-1900	51.1	54.8
1901-1910	55.2	58.8
1920-1922	59.2	63.3
1932-1934	63.5	67.1
1946-1948	66.1	70.6

The difficulties of many people become harder to bear as their years advance. I offer my congratulations to a committee of the Council of Social Services of South Australia which inquired into the problem and submitted a most valuable report. Information was obtained from the Commonwealth Department of Social Services, the Commonwealth Employment Service, the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, the South Australian Police Department, private hospitals and rest homes which cater for aged people, non-profit-making institutions, denominational and other charitable organizations interested in the welfare of the aged, Cottage Homes, the District and Bush Nursing Society of South Australia, trained social services, workers' welfare organizations, the Old Age and Invalid Pensioners' League of South Australia, the South Australian Branch of the Australian Pensioners League, and others. The findings of this committee completely support the proposals contained in the motion. This inquiry was made long before the motion was mooted. Also, before it was placed on the Notice Paper an article appeared in *The News* of August 5 last under the heading "7s. 6d. Just Won't Do. Mr. Fadden!" and it contained the following:—

No-one who has really considered the question for five minutes can believe that 7s. 6d. a week will pay for the crime of being

old and poor. For most pensioners an extra 7s. 6d. a week will mean only a little more butter for their bread, a little more meat, and—if they're exceedingly thrifty—a few second-hand clothes. They will still be committed to a life of poverty and fear, dependent on charity and the goodwill of neighbours.

With food costs rising and about a third of their income going out in rent, the pension increase will quickly be absorbed. Unable to save for emergencies, they must still face up to that dread day when age or illness confines them to bed—where they are more than ever dependent on others. What happens to them then? Their plight is brought to the notice of a mission or welfare worker who tries to arrange transfer to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. But unless they are in need of immediate medical attention or have a specific complaint which can be relieved by treatment, they will not be admitted to the Adelaide.

The next step is to try one of the homes for the aged. But these are all full, and have long waiting lists. Perhaps they could go to a private nursing home? Yes, if they could raise the money. The cheapest is about six guineas, and even with hospital benefits of £2 16s. a week, this is beyond the average pensioner. With his pension of £3 a week, he still needs 10s. a week to pay the account. But most nursing homes charge more than that, anyway, and unless the patient has relatives who will pay part of the bill, he must try something else.

What else is there? Nothing except to return to his quarters. That means he will not be properly fed, despite the efforts of church and welfare workers, and it is quite possible that his death will be hastened by malnutrition—a common complaint among old age pensioners. The Rev. E. D. Shaxted, of St. Luke's Mission, Whitmore Square, told me he tried for two years to get rest home accommodation for a 74 year old woman living in the district. "When she became ill she refused to allow the people with whom she was living to call a doctor or a nurse," he said. "Nothing was done for her, and by the time the district nurse heard of the case, the woman was in a semi-conscious condition and her room was alive with fleas. She died soon afterwards, but her last days must have been agony for her. She was the sweetest, cleanest woman I've ever known, yet she was reduced to near squalor because she could not get into a home where she would be looked after. She is only one of many who might have lived longer if she could have been sent to a good home."

Secretary of the Pensioners' League, Norwood (Mr. J. Millikan), has grim stories to tell of the suffering of sick old age pensioners. "Some time ago I heard about an old lady who was living in a bathroom," he told me. "I had to fight my way past the owners of the house, who were taking her full pension for board. She was lying completely helpless, crippled with arthritis on a bed in a small bathroom. She had not been properly fed. Milk beside the bed was sour, and the room was in a filthy state."

Mr. McKenzie—Was that in China?

Mr. HUTCHENS—No, in South Australia where the Premier claims that the objective of the motion is entirely unnecessary. The article continues:—

Boiled down, the recommendations amount to this: All pensions should be adjusted according to rising living costs. Housing is desperately needed for single and married pensioners. Hospitals and rest homes for the sick and infirm are an equally urgent need. Nursing services and housekeeping services are necessary to assist sick pensioners in their homes. But, most important of all, the survey points out that there is no agency in this State whose sole function is the care of the aged. Until there is, the aged must exist on their pension and hope that God and the neighbours will do the rest.

That article provides sufficient evidence to induce all decent-thinking people to support the motion. I know of cases just as bad as those mentioned. I will relate the story of one aged couple and should any member question the facts I refer him to the member for Thebarton for confirmation. For 26 years this dear old couple occupied a home in Brompton and paid their rent in advance regularly but it suited the owner—and I do not blame him—to sell the home. On appeal to the court the new owner was given the right to occupy portion of the house. The old gentleman, who was 80, had served his employer and the State loyally over the years and had taken an active part in the training of young men in the right ways of living, but owing to an accident and lack of care he has been bed-ridden for seven years. Because of the court order, the old couple found themselves literally in the street. For months I tried to secure accommodation for them, but even the efforts of the Women Police in this direction were unsuccessful. I asked the Premier for assistance and am grateful for what he did. I acknowledged his kindness by letter, but the old man was taken to the Enfield Hospital and his wife to Magill. They are parted and have fretted. The old man has been bed-ridden for seven years because he was unable to secure proper medical attention, but with the attention he is now receiving he may be able to walk again. How much better it would have been had he received the necessary attention earlier, as envisaged by the motion.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Public Works Committee's report on the Parkside Mental Hospital (new admission treatment block for females) presented to Parliament on August 17, 1949. I do not propose to read from it now, but when speaking on the Address in Reply last session I

drew the House's attention to a report submitted in 1949 by Dr. Birch, medical superintendent of the Parkside Mental Hospital, in which he said that 38.3 per cent of the patients there were over the age of 65. He said "Far too many senile patients are sent to the mental institution in the terminal weeks or even days of their lives and these people are those who, in most instances, have served a most useful life in various vocations." The report showed that many old people who gave their sons and daughters to the fighting forces in the belief that they were fighting for a high standard of living are in their eventide condemned to a mental asylum and restricted to 50 sq. ft. of accommodation. If the motion is not carried the conditions of these old people must go down as peace-time atrocities, a blot on South Australia, and a cause for shame. The member for Murray, in seconding the motion, recited the following lines:—

To the scrapheap we are going
When we're overworked and old,
And our weary heads are showing
Silver threads amongst the gold.

He then urged us not to allow our pioneers to be thrown on the scrapheap, but he was far too modest in applying those lines to present-day conditions. Many of our old folk put themselves between this country and a brutal enemy in 1914, and again endured the agonies of war between 1939 and 1949 when their sons and daughters were in the fighting forces. They endured the torture of suspense during the long wait for news of son and daughter who were fighting in the cause of freedom and security. Further, the old people laboured on long after the natural retiring age. It was of such people that an unknown London journalist wrote a poem called *The Australian*. It reads:—

The skies that arched his land were blue,
His bush-born winds were warm and sweet,
And yet from earliest hours he knew
The tides of victory and defeat;
From fierce floods thundering at his birth,
From red droughts ravening while he played,
He learned to fear no foes on earth—
"The bravest thing God ever made!"
Bravest, where half a world of men
Are brave beyond all earth's rewards,
So stoutly none shall charge again
Till the last breaking of the swords;
Wounded or hale, won home from war,
Or yonder by the Lone Pine laid,
Give him his due for evermore—
"The bravest thing God ever made!"

It may well be that an elderly man or woman will write of those of his or her own age:—

To the mental asylum we are going
When we're overworked and old,
And our weary heads are showing
Silver threads amongst the gold.

I cannot understand how anyone can say that the motion is unnecessary. I return to the report made by the South Australian Council of Social Services, the Returned Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen's Imperial League (S.A. Branch), the Australian Pensioners' League of South Australia, and the Aged and Invalid Pensioners of South Australia. The claim was put forward that pensioners should be cared for and given the type of cottage envisaged by the motion, and provided with any necessary after-care following discharge from hospital. The usual institutional type of administration should be avoided wherever possible. Those needing these homes could be cared for by existing organizations. Many inmates would be glad to accept the responsibility of looking after their fellow pensioners and friends, for the similarity of age creates a bond of friendship. There is everything to recommend the

carrying of the motion. Some reports have stated that there is no social agency in this State whose sole function is to care for the aged. I have prepared a table showing the numbers and percentages of aged persons who have approached certain agencies for assistance during a certain period. It is rather lengthy and ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without reading it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—I think I should have a look at the table first. Is it very long?

Mr. HUTCHENS—No, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—I think there should be a limit as to length and perhaps the House should consider whether the table should go in *Hansard*.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move that leave be granted.

Leave granted.

Agencies.	No. of aged people requesting assistance.	Percentage represented by aged people in total number of cases handled.
Social Service Department of Commonwealth Department of Social Services	Males 12 Females 64	5½% (approx.)
	76	
Local Board of Health	Males 9 Females 20	1.5% (approx.)
	29	
Welfare Service of Australian Red Cross Society	Males 732 Females 19	30% (approx.)
	771	
Repatriation General Hospital (Medical Social Work Branch)	Males 23 Females 2	7% (approx.)
	25	
Royal Adelaide Hospital (Almoner's Department)	Males 498 Females 673	33½% (approx.)
	1,171	
Tuberculosis Association of South Australia Inc. (Civilian)	Males 27 Females 20	9.4% (approx.)
	47	
Church of England Social Welfare Bureau	Males 20 Females 109	17% (approx.)
	129	

Mr. HUTCHENS—The figures show the great need for an infirmary. Many aged pensioners today are living in houses that are far too big for their requirements and that are a burden for them. It may be argued that they should let portion of the house, but it is difficult for young people to mix with the

aged; in fact, they should not be expected to do so. Many years ago there was a man well versed in the Mosaic law, which, compared with the law of Grace, was a materialistic law. This learned person persecuted those who preached that man should have life and have it more abundantly, that

life was more than meat, and that no man liveth unto himself but is his brother's keeper. The time came when he had the scales removed from his eyes and had a vision. Later he said:—

When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child, but when I became a man I put away childish things.

That explains the different views of people of different ages. When a young couple take on the responsibility of parenthood they should be enabled to bring up their children in accordance with the beliefs and customs of the age in which they live. If houses were provided for aged folk more accommodation would be available for young couples. The Premier mentioned the activities of the Housing Trust, but Mr. Tapping will support my statement that it is almost impossible for people nearing the retiring age to get a trust house. The trust has to make its undertaking pay; therefore, it is inclined to let houses to young couples who are able to pay the rent of £2 a week. That is why it is difficult for aged people to get a trust home. Old folk would be happy if they could be housed together in a small colony, and it would make the position much easier for representatives of welfare organizations who do wonderful work in caring for them. They would be able to live a more comfortable life and have happy moments sitting in their homes talking to their friends. The locality of the houses referred to in the motion would be determined by the need.

Women police have provided definite evidence on where the houses should be situated and it was available long before the motion was moved. They stressed the need for accommodation in country areas, and Port Lincoln was particularly mentioned. I pay a tribute to the women police for the work they do in helping our aged people. They can go into homes where possibly representatives of welfare organizations cannot go. There are no more noble women than our women police. They say that old people living by themselves who are lonely have become careless in their personal habits, yet the Premier says there is no need for the motion. They also say that those who are living with relations and friends are experiencing great difficulties in adjusting their way of life to that of the young people. I have mentioned this previously. The old person living with a young couple is put into the back room and not properly cared for, and not wanted, because the young people are

fully engaged in rearing their children. The women police also say that old folk who are ill are unable to find accommodation in hospitals because of the high fees or shortages of beds, and that those who live in sheds and back rooms often wander away because of the lack of supervision. Despite all this the Premier says the motion is not necessary. The women police have endeavoured to assist the aged people who live in their own homes, or rent homes, and cannot care for themselves adequately. For example, where rooms are rented the women police arrange for meals to be provided for the old folk, or see that additional money for board is obtained for them in order to meet rising charges. Sad is the plight of old people. Total number of aged pensioners 30,315. Of this total, the following numbers became eligible during the year ended June 30, 1950:—

	Males.	Females.	Total.
Married	832	1,002	1,834
Single	144	272	416
Widowed	214	773	987
	1,190	2,047	3,237

These figures do not include service pensioners of World War I. The following table indicates the number of aged people assisted by the women police during July-October (inclusive) 1950, with comparative figures for 1948:—

	1950.	1948.
Placed in institutions and hospitals	28	36
Placed with relatives and friends	48	19
Placed in rest homes	8	12
Placed in other ways	187	124
Total	271	191

This gives the story of the plight of our aged folk. It should be stated clearly that it is desirable for the Government to take steps to supply homes, both in the metropolitan area and in the country, for aged and infirm pensioners. Our ever-changing way of life demands a greater service for our old folk than they have had previously. Mechanization of industry means that workers have to move more quickly than in years gone by and as they get older, and their physical capacity is impaired, they have to make room for younger men. It is economic only to use machines to the greatest possible extent; therefore the older men have to retire from industry earlier than previously. Medical science has shown that in these days there is a greater expectation of life; and therefore when men retire earlier their days of misery are lengthened. The motion should be carried, in order to retain our Christian and democratic ideals and the democratic principle

of government of the people, by the people for the people. If the motion is not carried we must admit that that is not the kind of government we have. The author of our Christian way of life, according to the good Book, said, "As much as ye have done it to the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me." The motion brings before us the plight of our aged pensioners who say, "Give to me the right to live as you live," and having heard the call, I wholeheartedly support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I support the motion. I thought that it was free from any suggestion of Party politics and that it would be considered on its merits, with members being able to express their views without bias. I did not expect any serious opposition to it, because the need for houses for old folk is great; but apparently the Government feels that if any Opposition motion is carried it will be regarded as a reflection on the activities of a Government department, and it takes every step to oppose the motion, even when it deals with an important social matter. I see no logical ground for any opposition to the motion, and the fact that members opposite are content to retain their seats and refrain from speaking in this debate seems to indicate that the extraordinary statement of the Premier this afternoon will be the excuse for the attitude they are adopting. The Premier is an astute gentleman capable of side-tracking a question, and he has excelled himself on this occasion. He gave as his reasons for opposing the motion that it caters for one section only and that it is unnecessary. He went on to say that the Government, through the Housing Trust, is building homes in the metropolitan area and in the country for all classes of people, but I point out that those home are being built only for those people who can pay the economic rent. Members realize that the Government is building homes, and it would not make sense to move that homes should be built generally, but homes are not being built for old people in the country. After years of agitation by various city members, an agitation which dates back to the days when Mr. Dale represented Adelaide, the Government is building two blocks of flats in the suburbs, but this motion asks that suitable homes for old folk should be built both in the country and in the metropolitan area. To my knowledge in no country town is the Government providing for the housing of aged people. No-one can tell me that three-bedroom Housing Trust homes to be rented at £2 7s. a week are being provided

for old people. Mr. O'Halloran quoted from the report of the Nuffield Organization to show the various types of institution which should be provided to care for our old folk, so the interpretation placed on the motion by the Premier is quite wrong, and is merely designed to cleverly cloud the issue.

Mr. O'Halloran—You flatter him when you say "cleverly."

Mr. RICHES—It was clever enough to satisfy all his followers. The grounds stated by the Premier cannot be accepted by this Parliament as valid grounds for opposing the motion, for members must have regard to the feelings of people outside and to the well-being of our aged citizens. The Premier said that the motion catered for only one class of people and that it was circumscribed, but I remind members that in introducing the motion Mr. O'Halloran said that there should be small institutions where the restrictions on inmates would be as few and as light as possible. He continued:—

These institutions should be provided for the aged of both sexes, whether single, widows, or widowers, and certain amenities for recreation and enjoyment should be provided to enable them to spend their last years in comfort.

The member for Glenelg interjected that this motion did not provide for widows or spinsters, but Mr. O'Halloran asked members for an expression of opinion that all such people should be included. He continued:—

There should also be groups of small homes established for couples where they could live their independent existence and where recreation facilities could be provided.

Surely no pleading is needed to demonstrate to members the necessity for such homes. If it is, I remind members that requests have been made by religious organizations, municipalities, and other bodies in places as far apart as Mount Gambier and Port Augusta to the Government to pay attention to this matter, and everyone interested in the social well-being of our people knows that this is one of the greatest problems facing this community, but this Government has turned a deaf ear to every representation made for assistance for our old folk. It is not subsidizing a home for the aged anywhere in this State, although it is maintaining one in the metropolitan area. Representations have been made in this House that the Government should help in the maintenance or extension of such services, but the Government has rejected such approaches. I cannot discern in any of the replies that have been given to such

representations any appreciation of the problem which faces the community and which is regarded by the ordinary citizen as being of such importance. It stands to the discredit of the State that the Government is not prepared to assist by subsidy or some other means any religious or other organization that is prepared to do something on its own account.

This motion gives members an opportunity to express an opinion, and members on this side call on the Government to take some positive action to relieve the plight of many of our old folk. Doubtless, every member can cite case after case of old folk who have been neglected and who must wait to enter some institution. Only a fortnight ago I was told by officials at the Home for Incurables that they have a waiting list of over 60 and that any person interested must put his name at the bottom of the list so that he may be admitted in turn at some future date. Is that a satisfactory arrangement for people who can be certified as incurable? Furthermore, the same may be said of almost every other institution catering for our aged people. The Premier spoke of accommodation at Northfield for some of our aged men, but Mr. O'Halloran reminded members of the need for accommodation in the northern pastoral areas from which people do not like to come too far south, for they suffer from rheumatism and joint ailments which make the cold unbearable. There is a special need for facilities for these people and, from my knowledge of representations made from our own hospitals and people in close association with these matters in the north, I can say that Mr. O'Halloran's statements can be substantiated.

The Premier said that under the Constitution the care of the aged was the responsibility of the Commonwealth, but that is one of the most specious arguments I have ever heard him try to put over members. Surely he does not intend us to accept as a valid reason for opposition to this motion that, because under the Constitution the Commonwealth Parliament is charged with the responsibility to meet obligations in respect of pensions, both invalid and old age, the provision of homes for the aged is also its responsibility. That is an entirely new argument and one which completely belies other statements made by the Premier. Recently, in asking for support for a Bill, he said that without it the Commonwealth could not put one brick on another, but now he says the responsibility for building homes, if there

is a responsibility, rightly rests with the Commonwealth. It may be argued that the Commonwealth should provide finance, but the provision of homes for our old folk is the responsibility of this Government, although it may ask the Commonwealth for financial assistance. If there is a Commonwealth responsibility in that regard, that is where it begins and ends. The Commonwealth has not provided a single home for the aged in any part of Australia. It is recognized as the States' responsibility, and it would be wrong for this State to try to pass it on to the Commonwealth. Is it to be the attitude of members to have nothing to do with the housing of the aged because it is an affair of the Commonwealth, or is it our responsibility? Members can do nothing wrong by carrying the motion, but will certainly be doing wrong if they defeat it. If the only opposition they can bring to bear is support of the weak arguments advanced by the Premier, then the motion should be carried, and I hope it will.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I support the motion. If it goes only part of the way, as the Premier chose to say, then I support it as far as it goes. I hope other members will not follow the Premier and destroy the effort of this motion by saying that it does not go far enough. He never suggested adding anything to it, and he, as Premier, is the one who would be responsible for putting into effect the opinion of the House. If the motion does not go far enough, as he says, there is nothing to stop him from adding to it. Undoubtedly, there is a need for homes for elderly people who, probably through no fault of their own, have been unable to provide themselves with a home. I claim to know the position in the country. Mr. Riches has my support when he says that people in the country have a horror of living away from their environment and having to come to the city to be jammed into an already overcrowded institution. They need security in their own environment, and who can blame them? There are people in the country prepared to make great efforts on behalf of these aged persons, but the financial strain in these days of extraordinarily high costs is too heavy for them. On Friday I shall have the honour of opening at Riverton one of these institutions referred to by the Premier. That well-known social worker, Padre Strange, has, through the beneficence of one of his flock at Riverton, obtained a fine residence which is

to be converted into a home for old people. All honour and praise to the gentleman who gave of his substance towards such a worthy cause. At Clare the Country Women's Association has purchased some land and is striving with might and main to raise funds for a home for the aged. They take a pleasure in exercising that Christian charity of maintaining the well-being of their fellow men.

Mr. Macgillivray—Does the Government subsidize these organizations for such purposes?

Mr. QUIRKE—No. The burden of meeting the needs of these people is terrific. If these public-spirited efforts were subsidized by the Government pound for pound to meet the building costs, then the old people could be maintained by those who have their interests at heart. Pensioners with their little home free, could maintain themselves on the pension. Surely the responsibility of providing homes is one for the State. It is useless for the Premier to advance the argument that it is a job for the Commonwealth. He knows it is not, and he also knows as Premier of a sovereign State that it is the Government's responsibility to maintain the well-being of its citizens.

Mr. Macgillivray—The State has often been anxious to sell its sovereign rights to the Commonwealth.

Mr. QUIRKE—Apparently the Premier is prepared to sell into oblivion the rights of citizens who have probably done much in the interests of the State, until he can induce the Commonwealth to take over what is at present not constitutionally its duty. I have never heard the Premier to worse advantage than today. His speech in opposition to the motion was completely unworthy of a man of his calibre. I hope that he will review his statement and consider the motion further. Sometimes country pensioners are ordered to Adelaide by their doctor to get treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but often it is impossible for them to undertake this treatment because they cannot afford to pay for the accommodation in Adelaide. Consequently, they go without the treatment and that necessarily shortens their lives. There is a very great need for temporary accommodation in the city for people who are ordered to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for treatment which they cannot get in the country. They would be out-patients. Only today I received a letter concerning an invalid pensioner who came to Adelaide for treatment, but owing to the conditions under which she was forced to live the

treatment did no good and she returned to the country probably worse than when she left it.

I support the provision of homes for elderly people, whether single or married, in environments to suit them. The Housing Trust is not building that type of home. I am reliably informed that the rentals which will be charged for the block flats being built by the trust will amount to almost the full pension received by aged pensioners, and I understand it can possibly reach £3 a week. It would be far cheaper for the Government to subsidize the efforts of people who are prepared to work in the interests of the aged. That would mean subsidizing the efforts of organizations such as the Country Women's Association, the Good Evening project of Padre Strange, and any other charitable organizations which are prepared to do something for these people. The Government is shirking its responsibility. The Premier's speech was one of equivocation from beginning to end. He acknowledges that there is a need when he says that the motion does not go far enough, but at least it goes part of the way. The intention of the motion was clearly expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. Obviously the Premier did not take into account its objective, otherwise he could not have made such a shocking statement. He is the leader of a sovereign State and the responsibility for relieving suffering of those who are dependent upon him lies at his door. There is no denying that. Therefore, I hope he will take the first opportunity to retract the speech he made today and show that, as other people are prepared to be charitable, he, too, is prepared to extend the charity of the State to those in need of it. I urge the House, and the Premier particularly, to give full consideration to the subsidizing of the efforts of people who are prepared to do the job which apparently the Premier at the present juncture is not prepared to do.

Mr. McALEES (Wallaroo)—Many elderly people who can no longer work are forced to exist on a miserable pension. It has always been a mystery to me, and to many others, how they can live on such a small income. They could not do so without the help of friends. The Leader of the Opposition, in his second reading speech, said that many people have been brought to indigent circumstances through no fault of their own. Many of them have been the backbone of the State. I was disgusted by the Premier's final remarks. He shed crocodile tears in expressing sympathy

for these people, but said it was not the responsibility of the State Government to make their closing years a little more comfortable. Whose responsibility is it? I trust that some of the Premier's supporters will be touched by speeches from members on this side and support the motion. It is hard enough for pensioners to live on their meagre income if they have a home of their own, but far more difficult when they have to pay rent. The speeches made so far show where the real sympathy for pensioners lies. I notice that Government supporters are busy talking to each other now. I hope they are considering the Premier's speech and that the motion will be carried, despite his remarks. Then the Government, which will shortly go out of office, will be able to take credit for supporting the motion of the Leader of the Opposition. I have often had the pleasure of being present at old people's gatherings and have always been struck by the harmony amongst them. Every year at Christmas time elderly people in my district have a social. Perhaps they have not seen each other for months, and greatly enjoy the gathering. If the motion is carried I shall have great pleasure in announcing at the social next Christmas that the Government intends to provide homes for aged people in both the metropolitan area and the country. If members opposite have a conscience they will support the motion.

Mr. WHITTLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CITIES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 570.)

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Local Government)—I have considered this short Bill and have consulted the Director of Local Government and the chairman of the Local Government Advisory Committee on it. So far as I can see, if the House accepts the Bill there will be no repercussions in regard to by-laws, assessments, or powers to assess and declare rates. From the departmental point of view of administration, the position would not in any way be complicated. It therefore becomes a matter of opinion whether or not a country town should become a city if it has a population of 10,000. The sponsor of the Bill instanced the growth of some of our country towns. The figures he quoted do not coincide with those I have received, but that is neither here nor there. No doubt in time

the towns will grow to reach the populations he has ascribed to them. In any case, only one country town now has a population of over 10,000, that is, Port Pirie. Queensland lays down a minimum of 7,000 for a town to qualify as a city, and I think in New South Wales it is 15,000. Therefore, by accepting the Bill, we would not be out of step with some of the other States. I point out that in local government matters, and in other directions, South Australia has often led instead of following the States, so if the House feels that the status of a country town would be improved by designating it a city there can be no real objection to the measure providing we stipulate a reasonable minimum population. As 10,000 is half of the number required in the metropolitan area I submit that it is not an unreasonable minimum, so I support the second reading.

Mr. WHITTLE (Prospect)—I support the Bill. The Minister has made comparisons with other States and I have often thought that the law governing this matter in South Australia was too circumscribed. Twenty thousand people is a great mass to be congregated in a country town. Many townships in Queensland have developed into cities, but they do not have the population suggested by the member for Mount Gambier as the qualification for a city. The Government should from time to time consider requests of councils to raise their prestige. Many people say, "What's in a name? A rose by any other name would smell as sweet." However, Mr. Fletcher hopes that Mount Gambier will soon become a city. It is close to Victoria and there are many municipalities just over the border which are now designated cities, so it is only natural that the people of Mount Gambier, which has the appearance of a city, should like to have their town recognized as such. Moreover, that town has possibly more of the appearance of a city than some suburban municipalities with a population of over 20,000 because their shopping and business areas are so scattered.

Mr. Pattinson—West Torrens is one.

Mr. WHITTLE—Yes, and there are a number of others designated cities which have not the same civic centre as Mount Gambier.

Mr. Pattinson—A compact town like Glenelg cannot grow any more to become a city.

Mr. WHITTLE—If the honourable member moved for a municipality of over, say, 12,000 to be recognized as a city he might get

some support. The Government should consider the question of the appointment of aldermen. Glenelg, and many other old councils, such as Henley and Grange, Brighton, St. Peters, and Kensington and Norwood, can have aldermen even if they are not cities. The Act has been amended in recent years so that aldermen can only be appointed when a municipality attains the status of a city. However, the older councils were established as municipalities long before the Act was amended, so they can have aldermen as well as councillors. A man cannot become an alderman unless he has served as a councillor. The difficulty of the younger municipalities is that once a man has served as mayor he has to contest another election to become a councillor, or go out of local government. The Walkerville Council has felt it has been hampered because of this and I took up the matter with the Minister of Local Government. He did not seem antagonistic to the council's request about the appointment of aldermen and, if it were granted, local government bodies could take advantage of it, but would not have to appoint aldermen if they did not wish to do so. Some cities in the metropolitan area have not appointed aldermen. I hope that with the added prestige of being a city prosperity will come to Mount Gambier, which is visited by many people.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I thank the Minister of Local Government for the consideration he has given to the Bill, and Mr. Whittle for his support. I hope that as the years go by the provisions of the Bill will be of benefit to many of our larger country towns.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 573.)

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I commend Mr. Christian for bringing this matter before members. It is a short Bill and I do not think it will create much difference of opinion. The practice of lounge drinking has increased in recent years, and without discussing whether or not it is in the best interests of the community it will be conceded that undesirable habits can be associated with it. All over the world in the sale of intoxicating liquors there are various restrictions. I do not propose to speak on the need for them, but the

proposal in the Bill is desirable. The measure sets out the definition of "public lounge" and says that after the expiration of 12 months from the passing of the legislation no licensee shall be permitted to conduct a public lounge unless it has been approved by the Licensing Court. The Bill also provides that children under 16 years of age shall not be permitted in a public lounge. No-one has suggested to me that the proposal is undesirable. People to whom I have spoken say that it might cause a difficulty in some directions, but there is no law which does not impose a restriction on people at some time or another. Obligations are imposed on the majority of people because of abuses by the minority. I cannot say that I am well informed as to what generally happens in public lounges, but on my travels through South Australia I have had to go into many hotels and on occasions I have seen undesirable practices in front of children in public lounges; therefore, I have no hesitation in supporting Mr. Christian's move. It is said that there will be a difficulty for the travelling public if the Bill is passed, but it could be overcome by having a separate lounge where travellers could take their children. I agree with Mr. Christian that we have an obligation to the children in the community. Members have spoken of the undesirable effects on children of comics and other things, and we must do what we can to prevent it. As I have seen children in hotel lounges witnessing undesirable happenings I support the Bill.

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—I support the Bill, which makes certain amendments to the principal Act on which there should be general agreement. I think that the public, members of the trade, and of this House, will be in general agreement with it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you say that members of the trade support this Bill?

Mr. PEARSON—I did not say that, but I have not heard any objection to it. Whatever our views on the general question of the Licensing Act most people, I think, are of the opinion that indulgence in alcoholic beverages is a matter for adults only. It has always been a principle of our licensing laws that people who are not of mature age should be prevented from drinking liquor, and there is nothing in the Bill which departs from that principle; indeed, it rather adds to it by seeking to exclude from the atmosphere of the public drinking lounge people of immature age. As stated by previous speakers, the growth of

lounge drinking is something which has occurred in the last few years and I shall not express any opinion on it. However, it is an obvious fact that many people take their children into lounges and spend quite a lot of time there, and this I believe to be undesirable; the atmosphere of the bar-room is not suitable for children. Our licensing laws have hitherto provided that no person below the age of 16 shall be permitted in a bar or saloon, and all this Bill seeks to do is to apply the same provisions to what will become registered public lounges if this Bill becomes law. However, there is one small problem, which I believe can be easily overcome, in respect of those licensed premises where the only lounge is the area from which the stairway leads from the lower to the upper floor of the premises. In such cases to exclude children would deny them access during normal trading hours to the bedrooms on the upper storeys. Therefore, I have drafted an amendment, and circulated a few copies of it, which seeks to provide that children of accepted persons under section 176 of the principal Act, and children who are themselves accepted persons under that section shall be exempted from the provision of this Bill. Children of *bona fide* boarders and guests at hotels, and children who are themselves registered as *bona fide* guests will thus be exempted and may remain in the lounge during the period of their stay. I am aware that this provision takes something away from the Bill, but I feel that the sponsor of the Bill will achieve most of what he desires and I understand that he is prepared to accept this amendment. With that qualification I support the second reading.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I oppose the Bill as I feel that our licensing laws are already very strict indeed. The aspect of the question which interests me most is the exclusion of children from public drinking lounges. There is a good deal of unsatisfactory drinking in public bars, but in the public lounges drinking is under the best conditions available to the public, and I think it is going too far to expect to separate children from the parents who may simply want to have a drink in a public lounge. Mr. Christian, in his second reading speech, said "I consider it our duty to protect children from the influences which are not helpful in moulding their characters." Broadly the tenor of his argument was that the atmosphere of public drinking lounges was not beneficial to children and we should remove them from that influence. However, I feel that that is a rather negative approach to the

question. If he had proved that it was very harmful to children it might be a different proposition, but recent studies have shown us a tremendous lot about the psychology of children which we did not know before. We know now that child delinquency is not, in the main, caused by sights such as seeing people drinking liquor, and that sort of thing. The overwhelming cause is the feeling of insecurity in the home and the lack of love from parents, and the consequential feeling in the child that he is not wanted. I do not think that the sights a child sees in public drinking lounges makes an atom of difference to how it behaves in later life. On the contrary, I feel that it is perfectly lawful, and certainly not a blame-worthy pursuit, for adults to want a drink of alcoholic liquor. Some sections of the community consider that the consumption of alcohol is an actual sin, but I do not hold that view, and if adults wish to consume liquor I do not see why their children should not be with them in public drinking lounges. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 713.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—When the member for Onkaparinga introduced this Bill and did not furnish any very strong arguments in its support I came to the conclusion that there was little danger of its being accepted by the House. But last week, when the Premier in effect gave it his benediction, despite the fact that he said he had one or two doubts which would require to be resolved in Committee before he finally supported it, I realized that this might be a measure introduced by a private member with the blessing of the Government.

Mr. Shannon—The Government did not know I was going to bring it in.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is incumbent on the House to give serious consideration to all aspects of the question before accepting the measure. I shall not go very exhaustively into the history of the regulation of the closing hours of hairdressers' and tobacconists' businesses, but I think there are some aspects of it, particularly associated with country districts—and it is in country districts that this Bill would have effect—of which members should be reminded. I am old enough to remember the

days when we had 11 o'clock closing of liquor bars, and in country towns the liquor bar was the rendezvous where people gathered to discuss the problems of the day—which team was going to win the football match or which horse the big race the following Saturday. When 6 o'clock closing of liquor bars was introduced the rendezvous for those who had to spend an evening somewhere shifted from the hotel to the hairdressers' and tobacconists' shops. It also became a very convenient place to establish a most lucrative business of starting price bookmaking. Those conditions continued with various modifications until 1945 when the then Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable R. S. Richards, introduced a Bill to provide for the closing times of the shops. During World War II. the late shopping night had been eliminated by regulation made under the National Security Act. Prior to that it had been the practice of shops both in the metropolitan area and in the country to remain open until 9 p.m. on the evening preceding the half holiday, whether Wednesday or Saturday, but in 1945 Mr. Richards sought to incorporate that provision in the Early Closing Act. In his second reading speech he said that he did not include hairdressers and tobacconists' shops because no-one had asked for their inclusion, but during the long interval that elapsed between his second reading speech and the continuation of the debate he was approached by both the master hairdressers and the employees in the industry with the unanimous request that the Bill should also apply to hairdressers and tobacconists' shops, with the result that ultimately they were covered by the legislation. The history of the legislation in the House is very interesting. In 1945 there were more Labor members in this House than there are today, and my Party had the support of certain members who sit on the corner benches and one Liberal member, the late member for Glenelg, Mr. Frank Smith, who gave unyielding support to the Bill which ultimately became law after being passed in another place. In his speech on the second reading the Honourable C. L. (now Mr. Justice) Abbott, the Attorney-General, said:—

The Government does not oppose the measure as a Government, but leaves it to members of its Party, as usual, to vote as they may feel impelled.

In other circumstances I may have commented on the phrase "as usual," but I will not at this stage.

Mr. Pattinson—He should have said "as always."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The second reading was carried on the voices, and in Committee Mr. Richards said that he desired to include hairdressers and tobacconists' shops because that section had asked for it, and the member for Eyre (Mr. Christian) sought to amend the Bill so as to restrict it to the metropolitan area with provision for its extension to the country after petition. The Committee divided on Mr. Christian's amendment as follows:—

Ayes (14).—Hon. C. L. Abbott, Messrs. Christian (teller), Dunn, Goldney and Hincks, Hons. Sir Herbert Hudd and G. F. Jenkins, Messrs. Lyons and McDonald, Hon. M. McIntosh, Mr. Michael, Hon. T. Playford, Messrs. Shannon and Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Corcoran, Dale, Duncan Lacey, and Macgillivray, Hon. J. McInnes, Messrs. McKenzie, Nieass, O'Halloran, and Quirke, Hon. R. S. Richards (teller), Messrs. Riches, Shard, Smith, Stephens, Stott, Thompson, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunnage and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Fletcher and Baldock. Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Thus Mr. Christian's amendment was negatived, and some debate followed in Committee before a vote was taken on Mr. Richards' amendment to include hairdressers and tobacconists' shops. A division on that amendment resulted as follows:—

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Corcoran, Dale, Duncan, Lacey and Macgillivray, Hons. J. McInnes, Messrs. McKenzie, Nieass, O'Halloran, and Quirke, Hon. R. S. Richards (teller), Messrs. Shard, Smith, Stephens, Stott, Thompson, Frank Walsh and Fred Walsh.

Noes (14).—Hon. C. L. Abbott, Messrs. Christian, Dunn, Goldney, and Hincks, Hons. Sir Herbert Hudd and G. F. Jenkins, Messrs. Lyons and McDonald, Hon. M. McIntosh, Mr. Michael, Hon. T. Playford, Messrs. Shannon (teller) and Teusner.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Fletcher and Baldock. Noes—Messrs. Dunnage and Pearson.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

It is remarkable that during the debate which preceded that vote Mr. Shannon mentioned the same hairdresser's business in Aldgate to which he referred in introducing this Bill. It appears that he has only one little bone and, although it has very little meat on it, he has protected it from the elements so that after seven years it could be brought to light as robust as ever.

Mr. Riches—And it smells just as strongly.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes. In 1945 Mr. Richards' amendment was supported by the same members who opposed Mr. Christian's

amendment, and I suggest that in the past seven years during which this legislation has operated no reasons have been found for amending it because the only reason stated by the honourable member for Onkaparinga in introducing this Bill existed prior to 1945, and, if that hairdresser has been able to carry on his business for the last seven years, despite the restrictions imposed by the 1945 Act, members are entitled to presume that he has not been subject to any serious hardship as a result of the provisions of that Act. Despite the fact that Government supporters would have people believe differently, Labor members have much sympathy with country people in their shopping difficulties, and inspection of the 1945 legislation will reveal that Mr. Richards was instrumental in having included a clause providing for people living a certain distance from a town to be able to do their shopping outside the prescribed hours, for section 5 of the 1945 Act states:—

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a shopkeeper of a shop outside the metropolitan shopping district, in which no other person other than the shopkeeper his wife and children and his manager are employed may at any time—

(a) sell or deliver goods to any person who resides at least five miles from the shop and has within six hours previously travelled from his residence to the shop;

(b) keep his shop open for so long as is necessary to effect such sale and delivery.

(2) The distance between a person's residence and a shop shall be calculated according to the shortest practical route.

That proves that the then Leader of the Opposition was prepared to meet the genuine needs of country people. I am prepared at all times to consider any measure irrespective of which side of the House it comes from, provided that it can be shown that there is a substantial need for it in order to correct some outstanding grievance or to remove some disability from which a considerable number of people are suffering, therefore I shall be quite happy to consider this Bill if it can be proved that there is a substantial demand for it, but in the course of this debate members have heard of no demand for it except the case cited by the member for Onkaparinga. I sought the opinion of people who are interested in the hairdressing profession, both the master hairdressers and the employees in the industry.

Mr. Shannon—Were they city people?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Even if they were, their views are entitled to some consideration, because after all their organizations have mem-

bers throughout the State. Nearly every country master hairdresser is a member of the Master Hairdressers' Association, and practically all country employees in the industry are members of the Australian Hairdressers', Wig-makers', and Hairworkers' Employees' Federation. The reply of the Master Hairdressers' Association was:—

1. The association would oppose the amendment in the metropolitan area and bigger country towns, where there are two or more hairdressers.

2. Country master hairdressers are legally restricted to 6 p.m. closing, but in small country towns they cut hair at any time and no one bothers about policing the Act.

3. The association has not received any request for or protest against the proposed amendment.

The employees went into the matter much more fully and it is wise that I should put their point of view on record, as it is entitled to serious consideration by members. I received the following letter from the secretary of the Australian Hairdressers', Wigmakers' and Hairworkers' Employees' Federation (G. H. Barney) this afternoon:—

We are receiving numerous requests from country hairdressers asking us to protest against the proposed Bill to amend the Early Closing Act so that hairdressers' trading hours may be extended. As a result I am directed to place before you some of the objections to the Bill and to request that it be opposed. Hairdressers in the past have spent an enormous amount of time and money in securing reasonable trading hours. A great amount of our early closing was obtained by means of petitions under the Early Closing Act which provided that a petition signed by the majority of shopkeepers and shop assistants could be presented to the Minister. If this petition after investigation proved to be signed by the majority the petition would be granted and the hours fixed as requested in the petition. Separate petitions had to be presented for each shopping district and anyone who has had any experience in organizing and presenting these petitions knows the work entailed. Later early closing for hairdressers was done by a direct amendment to the Early Closing Act with the full consent of both shopkeepers and shop assistants in the industry. Our early closing has stood the test of years, but now after we have spent years in getting reasonable trading hours this Bill seeks to take it all away in one sweep. We desire to point out that hairdressers have to keep on the job all the time the saloon is open as being skilled operators they cannot leave any other person to do the work. As a result most country hairdressers who operate one-man saloons find it difficult to even have a lunch hour for themselves and extending their trading hours would only make matters worse.

Long trading hours are detrimental to a hairdressers' health as they are continually

breathing air which is impregnated with perfumes, antiseptics, permanent waving solutions, setting lotions, etc. Ulcerated stomachs and dermatitis due to these lotions are common in this industry. It is essential to the health of hairdressers that they have trading hours which will permit them to enjoy a certain amount of out door life to counter the ill-effects of their inside work. Usually country hairdressers open earlier than most businesses and there is no necessity for late trading.

Under the provisions of this Bill any portion of a shopping district may be exempted from the provisions of the Act and we could have one hairdresser exempted while another would still be compelled to close at the time specified in the Act. Such a position would be both ridiculous and unfair and can only lead eventually to all hairdressers being exempted. This Bill would also permit the return of the "pirate hairdresser" who operated in country towns before the advent of early closing. A pirate hairdresser was a person who did not earn his living as a hairdresser, but worked in another industry all day. At night and during the weekend he would visit a country town and take the trade from the local hairdresser after he had closed his business. As any place can be registered as a hairdressing saloon under the Early Closing Act (even a room in a private house) it is quite an easy matter for them to find a place to operate. As the Early Closing Act came into force these pirates could be stopped as they could not trade after the hours fixed for closing. Suspending the Early Closing Act will permit these pirates to return to the detriment of the local hairdresser. It may be said that the hairdresser would not be compelled to open, but one hairdresser by trading late will compel all others to do likewise or lose their trade. Although no mention has been made of ladies' hairdressers the Bill would apply to them also. We can confidently say that the great majority of shopkeepers and shop assistants do not want any extension of their trading hours and we desire to request that this Bill be opposed.

I draw attention to two most important points. The first is that any portion of a shopping district could, if the Bill becomes law, be proclaimed. This applies in the more thickly populated parts of the country, particularly in hills districts, where towns are close together. We might have the spectacle of some hairdressers being open only for certain hours whereas their competitors several miles away could open at any time for seven days a week. These proclamations could be extended until the whole area was covered and there would be no closing hours for hairdressers. The second point made by Mr. Barney is that if we have no closing hours the gate will be thrown wide open to the pirate hairdresser who, after doing a day's work, could go into a room of his house or a rented room and cut hair for as long as he liked to the detriment of the genuine hairdresser in the town, who

seeks to make his living out of that service to the townspeople, and the position of the people whom Mr. Shannon seeks to assist would be worsened. Mr. Barney states that that position existed before. I do not know, but I know Mr. Barney, who is a most estimable gentleman. He has occupied prominent positions in the Hairdressers' Union for years, and I am satisfied that when he says something was done the information is correct. Not only has no case been made out for the Bill, but a very strong one could be made out against it, especially in view of the dangers to which it would subject those whom members who support it seek to assist.

Mr. Riches—Have you received protests from hairdressers who conduct their own business?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—There have been protests from both master hairdressers and employees. It is felt in country districts that if this legislation is passed it will eventually spread throughout the country and that the closing hours which have been secured as a result of efforts down the years and have continued unassailed for the past seven years will be lost to those in the industry. A pirate hairdresser could still be a qualified man and become registered. I know hairdressers who are not working in the industry today, but could return to it at any time because they possess the necessary qualifications. The Premier made a remarkable statement. He pointed out that difficulties were associated with the shortening of hours during which chemists could supply medicines to people in Port Pirie as a result of petitions signed by some employers and employees. He said there were only a few, but they could inconvenience the people of Port Pirie. He concluded by saying:—

I want to examine one or two aspects in Committee and, if possible, widen the scope of the Bill.

How far will the scope of the Bill be widened in Committee, if it reaches that stage?

Mr. Shannon—The only way you will find out is to wait until it gets that far.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Knowing the loyalty that the Premier's supporters show when he makes certain proposals, if the Bill once gets into Committee my fears as to its possible impact on early closing will be realized sooner or later. Certain Government supporters do not like these restrictions, but think people should be able to go to a country town in the same way as was done in the days of bell-bottom trousers and button boots and purchase commodities at any hour of the day

or night when people could be roused to serve them. They contend that there should be no compulsory half holiday and that those who serve in a shop should not have an opportunity of enjoying any social recreation. As a matter of fact, they consider that these people should be the slaves of the customer who, in those days, was always right. Since then, due not to the action of employees engaged in the business, but to shortages of goods and various effects on normal trading as a result of the war, customers have had a pretty thin time. I am not prepared to relax the early closing conditions which were established as a result of years of agitation and effort and it is unnecessary to do so in order to compensate customers for that thin time. The Premier mentioned the possibility of difficulty in administering the measure. He said that most hairdressers also sold tobacco and, as the sale of tobacco would not be permitted after 6 p.m., they would have to close their businesses then if they were open for the purpose of hairdressing.

Mr. Shannon—Many mixed businesses are doing the same thing today.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Those mixed businesses have been built in a manner suitable for that purpose, but hairdressers' shops are almost invariably opened for selling tobacco when hairdressing is being carried on in the same premises.

Mr. Shannon—He only has to have doors on his shelves.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—He might have to do more than that. I have seen some where it would be difficult to effectively prevent the illegal sale of tobacco after hours. If we are to make it easy for the illegal sale of tobacco at any hour of the night and on Sundays, what about the unfair competition with the man with a mixed business, the general storekeeper, or the man who is only a tobacconist? If the practice should become widespread, there will be difficulties of administration which will continue to grow and there will be a breaking down of the general conditions of shopping hours. Before we know where we are, the whole question of closing hours will have gone by the board and we will be back where we were in the early days.

The member for Onkaparinga made a plea on behalf of certain men in his district who worked in the metropolitan area and who, he said, had difficulty in getting their hair cut because of the long time it took them to travel from their place of employment to their home

town. They are not the only workers who are disadvantaged in that regard. I know of men living at Colonel Light Gardens who work on the wharves at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour and when working at the latter port have to travel as far to their homes as any of the workers in Mr. Shannon's district. I am opposed to the Bill in its entirety because of the danger of breaking down an established custom, which eventually would be destroyed. I suppose most of the workers in the honourable member's district whom he claims are at present inconvenienced are employed for five days a week. A hairdresser's shop is open until 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays and a latitude of a quarter of an hour is permitted, and, as was pointed out by Mr. Frank Walsh and the secretary of the Hairdressers' Employee's Association, these shops frequently open early on Saturday so that a long morning is available to meet the convenience of those whom Mr. Shannon says will be inconvenienced by the passing of the Bill. I hope it will not pass the second reading. There is no demand for it either by the public who are served by the people sought to be covered by the Bill, the Master Hairdressers or their employees; and most important of all the move represents a danger to the general question of shopping hours throughout South Australian country districts. Therefore, it should be resisted by everyone who wants fundamental justice done to the great majority of the people employed in shops throughout country districts.

Mr. WHITTLE (Prospect)—I do not intend to give a silent vote on this measure. Before the Premier had spoken I had advised Mr. Shannon, who is my personal friend, that I did not intend to support the Bill. Members who have been here some years know that that is no reversal of my form. I remember that when the Early Closing Act was first introduced to provide for closing shops at 5.30 p.m. I was the only member on this side who supported it. I have consistently held the view that the early closing of any shops would inconvenience someone, therefore, the public dependent on those shops must make their plans accordingly. Only last Saturday while engaged on a public errand I arrived at a petrol station after 11.30 a.m. and was unable to obtain supplies. However, I always keep a four-gallon can of petrol in my garage and had to depend on that. Other people could take the same precaution. I do not favour an extension of general trading hours. The people most concerned are the employees. To

agree to an amendment of the Act now will only lead to applications for further extensions. The Premier indicated that he desired to consider other phases of early closing restrictions which might be affected by the passing of this measure. I remind members that people in the city, as well as those in the country, have to suffer inconveniences. This applies particularly to women who sometimes have difficulty in arranging an appointment with their hairdresser. I consider that these things can be worked out without an important industrial Bill having to be amended. In opposing the second reading I hope I am not disappointing the Leader of the Opposition, who says that everyone on this side of the House must follow the Premier.

Mr. JOHN CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC OFFICERS' SALARIES BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 7. Page 811.)

Clause 4—"Amendment of section 5 of principal Act—Interpretation."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I think this clause requires further explanation from the Premier. In the *Advertiser* of June 28 the three proposals for the future constitution of the trust were set out as being:—

1. That the tramways continue to be run under the present control and management.
2. That a more efficient type of control be established with the local governing authorities still having a voice in its management.
3. That the local governments in the metropolitan area entirely divorce themselves from transport and traffic considerations, and that Parliament appoint some other authority to take over control of these matters.

My view is that the Bill does not provide for any one of these proposals but is something between proposals 2 and 3. This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act but why have not the interpretations been amended further? Various definitions are contained in section 5, including "councils of group 'A'," "councils of group 'B,'" and "district."

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—The honourable member would be out of order in discussing those things.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If I am not allowed to discuss the matters that I consider most vital I shall have to move an amendment for the purpose of obtaining the information I desire. Am I debarred from discussing any matters contained in section 5?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Clause 4 makes only a limited amendment to section 5.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Would I not be entitled to seek information on all matters relating to section 5?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—I do not think so.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Then to obtain information I shall have to move in clause 4 to strike out all the words of the clause after "is" in the first line and to substitute the word "repealed." Would that give me the right to discuss the matters contained in section 5?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Yes, I think so.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Then I shall have to move that amendment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Why?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I will have to move it unless I am permitted to ask the Premier why more consideration was not given to the interpretation section in the principal Act. May I ask a question on the matter?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—I will allow a question but I warn the honourable member not to develop the argument.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Premier say why more amendments have not been made to section 5?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It became necessary to amend the definition of "trust" contained in the principal Act, which reads:—

"Trust" means the Municipal Tramways Trust created by the Municipal Tramways Trust Act, 1906, and continued under this Act and any person authorized by the Trust to do the particular matter.

A consequential amendment is necessary to that definition because under the Bill the trust will no longer be appointed in the manner set out in the principal Act, but by the Governor. There are a number of amendments that will

ultimately be necessary to the principal Act because for instance, many of the places mentioned in it have acquired a new status—former district councils are now municipalities, but this measure was introduced because the trust required urgent financial assistance and what may be regarded as technical amendments have not been attempted in it.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Re-constitution of trust."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Proposed new section 8 (1) reads:—

The Governor may by proclamation fix a day on and after which the trust shall be re-constituted as provided in this Act: Provided that no such proclamation shall be made if within seven days after the day on which the Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment Act, 1952, is assented to, any metropolitan council presents a petition to the Minister of Works praying that the trust shall not be re-constituted as provided in this Act.

I move—

To delete all the words after "Act" first occurring.

This will strike out the proviso. I do not know why it was included in the Bill, because it is unwise. The Bill seeks to implement the result of long negotiations between the Treasurer and the councils responsible under the Act. It does not exactly follow any of the three proposals originally submitted by him to the councils, but it represents the compromise finally accepted by the councils, and which was acceptable to the House. If any council acts under the proviso and petitions the Minister of Works all the Treasurer's and Parliament's efforts to save the tramway system will be frustrated. The proviso is most anomalous, undemocratic and undesirable.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The original draft of the Bill did not contain the proviso, but there were protracted negotiations between councils and for some time we could not get any agreement from them. Some councils seemed to change their minds from time to time. The Bill has never been submitted to any of them, but it represents, in my opinion, the results of the negotiations that have taken place. One council said that it was not in favour of proposal No. 2 as amended, but since the Bill has been before the House its mayor has publicly stated that he is in favour of the Bill and that his council accepts it as a fair compromise. I do not think any council has expressed opposition to the measure since it has been before the House. In those circumstances there is no question of pushing this legislation through against the

wishes of any local government body and I have no objection to the proviso being deleted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If it is the desire of Parliament to strike out the proviso, which gives municipal bodies a chance to voice their opinions, why is it necessary to retain other parts of the measure that safeguard the interests of municipal authorities? I hope the new board of management will be able to put the tramways on a sound financial basis.

Mr. SHANNON—The Bill is now being moulded into shape, and will go through the same process in another Chamber. How it will finally emerge is anyone's guess. The measure is of great importance to local government bodies. The Treasurer is satisfied that at the moment it meets with the approval of all the municipalities concerned and, if that is so, we have nothing to fear from leaving the proviso in. If any council lodges a petition, which would wreck the legislation, they will do it with their eyes open to the fact that financial assistance will not then be forthcoming from the Government. That will give them cause to think before exercising their right. When the Bill has passed both Houses it may not be in a form that meets with the approval of some municipalities, and in that case they may have to take the drastic step of lodging a petition. For that reason, and because the Treasurer believes there is little possibility of such a happening, I see no harm in retaining the proviso. After all, is it not a democratic thing to permit people to have a say in their own affairs? Some councils, after the Bill is amended and passed, may say, "We would rather have anything than this." It would be a negation of democracy to deny people whose transport system is to be placed on an entirely different footing the power of veto. This place is not the final arbiter.

Mr. O'Halloran—Only by amending this clause can I do what I want to do.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member is denying to the people a democratic approach to the matter. He is giving them what he thinks is good for them, which they must take. I am a little unhappy that the Premier so readily agreed to delete what I thought was a safeguard. The Premier would be well advised to adhere to the Bill, because it has been fairly drafted in this matter.

Mr. STOTT—I disagree with the argument put forward by Mr. Shannon. Who is to have the final say—Parliament or the councils? The Bill has been introduced because of mismanagement by the councils. Parliament should be

supreme and the councils should not have the right to veto what Parliament has decided. The authority to say what should be the law should not be the councils. The Premier called a conference of councils and after giving them several weeks to make up their minds they accepted a proposal, with the exception of the Kensington and Norwood council. Now it has agreed to the proposal. I cannot accept the argument that we will not know what this legislation will be like finally because it has to go to another place. We cannot be concerned with what might or might not happen there. We must pass the legislation in accordance with how we see the position. Then, if another place amends the Bill we can debate the matter again.

Amendment carried.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Proposed new section 9 reads:—

On and after the proclaimed day the trust shall, subject to this Act, consist of five members appointed by the Governor.

I move to add the following words:—

One of the members shall be appointed on the nomination of the Australian Tramway and Motor Omnibus Employees Association (South Australian Branch).

I want the new form of control to be a success, and my proposal will assist in several ways. If the amendment is accepted there will be at least one man on the trust with a practical knowledge of tramway working from the standpoint of the operative. In other transport undertakings the management has encouraged suggestions from employees to improve the working of the systems and to save money by the adoption of new practices. Rewards have been offered and given to employees for suggestions. I do not know whether such a system operates in the tramways at present. There would be better results from placing a direct representative of the employees on the board than from a suggestion system. One difficulty with this type of system is that a man who might make the best possible suggestion is not present when the management meets to consider it. Because he is not there to explain his views the important point is missed. The appointment of a direct representative of the employees on the board would also lead to more industrial peace. The changing order of things demands that workers engaged in production in industry shall be entitled to share in the control of the management of the industry. My proposal is not

new to this Parliament. Already in two public utilities the principle has been adopted. Some years ago we provided for a member of the Meat Industry Employees Union being appointed to the Abattoirs Board.

Mr. Shannon—It did not prevent a strike.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No, but it went a long way to confining the strike and settling it before serious damage was done. Compared with similar undertakings in other parts of Australia the record of industrial peace in our Metropolitan Abattoirs is favourable. That is due largely to a representative of the men being on the board. More recently a representative of the Electrical Trades Union was appointed to the Electricity Trust. He has been of great value to the trust, particularly in helping to maintain the amicable industrial relations which are so essential in an organization of that kind. Also his wide practical knowledge must be of considerable value to the trust in controlling that great organization. I am not without support in this move for only today my attention was drawn to a leading article in the *News* of Saturday last under the heading "New deal for the Tramways" which described at some length the various proposals contained in the Bill. The point to which I draw particular attention is that relating to the appointment of the new board, namely,

The Government will appoint all members of the new trust. Much will depend on the qualifications and ability of the men chosen.

With that I entirely agree. If this board is to succeed in reorganizing our street transport system it will depend entirely on the calibre of the men appointed.

Mr. Pearson—Why direct the Government whom it shall appoint?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—For the best part of 10 minutes I have been trying to explain to the honourable member why it was wise that this direction should be given in relation to only one of five appointees. He would not be able to dominate the trust, but he would be able to do two things; namely, bring practical knowledge to bear on traffic problems and assist in maintaining amicable relations between the board and its employees. The article proceeded:—

The suggestion by the Opposition Leader (Mr. O'Halloran) that one should be a representative of employees is well worth consideration. A precedent has been set by the Government's appointment of a union representative on the Electricity Trust.

There we have a great organ of public opinion expressing the view that my proposal is worthy

of consideration, and I submit it to the Committee with complete confidence.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I hope the Committee will not accept this amendment, in which two or three very important matters of principle are involved. The two examples given by the mover in support of his amendment have just the opposite effect when examined closely. First, he said that this Parliament had appointed a representative of the industry on the Abattoirs Board, but I point out that the Abattoirs Board is in fact an industry board. It is not appointed by the Government. All its members, except the chairman, are nominated by butchers, graziers, exporters and stock-owners, but in this case we are just getting away from that principle. We have had an elected body, which we say has not been successful, and we are now considering a nominated body which will be based upon the qualifications of the nominees, without any of the canvassing that goes on to secure election. The second example he mentioned is even further away, because there we have the case of an industry controlled by a trust appointed by the Governor. He in his wisdom saw a man who was remarkably fitted to take a seat upon the board but the employees of the industry neither nominated him nor elected him. Mr. Trevor was appointed to the board because of his qualifications to make a remarkably good administrator. I do not think he was ever an employee of the trust, but the fact that he represented the electrical industry surely should not disqualify him.

The Electricity Trust is the same type of body that we are considering under the Bill as introduced, that is, a Government appointed body, and there is no suggestion that any other authority should have the right to make the selection. I believe that to get a well balanced board it is necessary that its appointment be considered as a whole and not piecemeal. Moreover, it is of interest to note that the mover has suggested that the person concerned is to be the nominee of the Australian Tramways and Omnibus Employees' Association, and I take it he visualizes that a member of the staff of the tramways would be eligible. Clause 5 repeals sections 8 to 15 inclusive of the principal Act, but section 17 is not taken out and will still be the law even if the amendment is carried. That section lays down:—

No person shall be or continue a member who—

(a) holds any office or place of profit in the gift or disposal of the trust;

(b) by himself, his partner, or otherwise, has any interest in any contract

Consequently, any member of the staff who became a member of the board would be automatically disqualified from holding any position in the tramways. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition intended that, but I believe it would be most undesirable. It would be most embarrassing from the point of view of management for the general manager to find that, on one day, a certain member of his staff was subject to his instructions, and on the next to find that he himself was subject to the instructions of that man; it would become a game of see-saw. We have one or two instances in the Government service where this type of administration is still in evidence, and the Auditor-General on a number of occasions has drawn my attention to the fact that it does not lead to the best administration. If this board is to be successful it should be appointed as a composite body.

Many members have laid great emphasis on the fact that we must get the most competent men available, for the whole success of the scheme depends on the ability of the men we can secure. Under this amendment, however, the most incompetent person could be nominated and the Government would have no alternative but to appoint him. I realize that the Leader of the Opposition's motives are good; he wants the organization to run with as little industrial disruption as possible. Although there have been some industrial disputes at the metropolitan abattoirs, by and large the mover's claim in that respect is not unjustified. The union's representative has been a stabilizing force, but I emphasize again that that is an industry board all the members of which, except the chairman, are nominated by the various interests concerned. I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment as I do not believe it will be an improvement. On the other hand I am sure that members opposite, upon reflection, will agree that the Government has not hesitated to appoint men of qualifications to various bodies. Qualifications are essential in these appointments and the Governor should have the widest possible discretion in appointing the best man to the board.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In the second reading debate I said that I hoped the remuneration fixed for members of the board would be such as to permit their devoting a considerable portion of their time to the management and development of the trust so that it might be rescued from its present unfortunate position,

and I visualized no difficulty in an employee of the trust being able to resign his position on appointment to the board so that he could devote his full time to his new job. Neither the fact that the Abattoirs Board is an industry board, nor the fact that the Governor, without any nomination by the employee's organization, appointed Mr. Trevor to the Electricity Trust, affects my argument. The acceptance of the principle of appointing a representative of the employees to the board will not only enable the experience of such a man to be brought to bear on the problems associated with the management of the trust but will also make some major contribution to that peace in industry in which we all believe; therefore I trust the Committee will not be swayed by the Premier's arguments but accept my amendment.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—This clause strikes a death blow at the municipalization of the tramways which has existed for almost half a century. The original Bill in 1906 contained a clause headed "Foreclosure in case of default," and today the trust has been forced into a financial position where, if it has not defaulted already, it will do so if allowed to carry on in the present way. The fact that the original legislators saw the danger in that clause, which was later deleted, is shown by the following passage from the 1906 *Hansard*:—

The Hon. V. L. Solomon asked the committee to strike the clause out because it opened the door to nationalization. The Government had intimated that the scheme was to be purely and simply one of municipalization, and there was to be nothing in the shape of a sidewind which the Government should acquire the lines. By striking out the clause the interests of the public and the Government would be fully guarded. Under Part VIII. the Government had the power to enforce the municipalities to strike a special levy if necessary to keep up the payments. But clause 47 gave the municipalities a chance, if the system was not meeting all its obligations to say to the Government that they could not pay, and the State would have to take it over. If the corporations were to have the financial assistance to begin with, while they had the bulk of the control, they should be ready to accept the full responsibility to pay for their scheme. The ratepayers of Glenelg went into the Patawalonga scheme—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Order! I do not think the honourable member is in order in debating those matters. We have under consideration the constitution of the new trust as provided by clause 5, and the matter with which he is dealing is not in my opinion relative to the clause.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—If you, Mr. Acting Chairman, give me the chance to link it up, I will be able to prove my argument, for I am pointing out that the formation of this new trust was exactly what was feared 50 years ago.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—The honourable member has been dealing with foreclosures and other matters not mentioned in this clause.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am pointing out the effect of foreclosure on the original trust. Today the State Government is foreclosing on the trust and putting in its receivers.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—I cannot allow discussion along those lines, for this clause specifically deals with the constitution of the new trust.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I regret that I am to be limited in that way, for this matter is most relevant. It has been stated that we must get the very best brains in the Commonwealth to rescue the trust from its present financial position, but I point out that the present chairman of the board which has been such a complete failure was a nominee of the present State Government. He is a qualified accountant and should at any time in the past two years have been able to see the writing on the wall. If he did, he should have reported to the Premier that he was not happy about the position.

Mr. Whittle—I suppose he did that a dozen times.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—If he did, the Premier is to blame for not informing this House of the true position of the trust's finances, for he should not have left such action until the trust was a bankrupt organization ready to be foreclosed on in exactly the same way as members of Parliament 50 years ago feared it would be. It is tragic that one of the members, Mr. Rudall, who spoke in the debate on the original Bill in 1906 feared the very thing that is happening here this evening. It is a tragedy that the son of the man who said that should be a party to socialization. The Mayor of Adelaide of that day said, in effect, that the tramways were the responsibility of councils and that the Government had no business to enter into the matter. If the trust is to continue somebody must accept responsibility for the board's appointment. I cannot support the Leader of the Opposition's amendment or the suggestion of the South Australian Road Transport Association, neither can I agree to the appointment of any sectional interests because I want full freedom given to those who make the appointments. It is not an

industrial board and I do not want the Government's hands to be tied in its selection. If the board fails the Government must accept full responsibility.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—The Government should be completely unfettered in its decision as to who shall be members of the board. Even if Mr. O'Halloran's amendment is carried it will not give effect to what he desires because he wants one member appointed on the nomination of the Australian Tramway and Motor Omnibus Employees' Association. That does not necessarily mean that he shall be an association member. I could but I would not advocate the appointment of a chartered accountant. I do not contend that the Institute of Chartered Accountants has any more right in this matter than the Tramway Employees' Association as it could lead to lobbying, which has been a partial cause of the difficulties of tramways management. As the Premier said, we must appoint men who will work as a team. Membership of an organization does not mean that a person can bring to the board the necessary measure of skill that is required. I strongly oppose Mr. O'Halloran's amendment, primarily because it must lead to a form of canvassing, or back-scratching, in order to get support for appointment.

Mr. HAWKER—Every member is aware that the Road Transport Association wants a nominee on the board. That request could be carried further with members of other organizations requesting representation. I oppose the amendment.

The Committee divided on Mr. O'Halloran's amendment.

Ayes (7).—Messrs. John Clark, Hutchens, McAlees, O'Halloran (teller), Tapping, Frank Walsh and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Fletcher, Hawker, and Heaslip, Hons. C. S. Hincks and Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. Macgillivray, McLachlan, Michael, Moir, Pattinson, and Pearson, Hon. T. Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Shannon, Stott, Teusner, and Whittle.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Davis, Lawn, Stephens, and Riches. Noes—Mr. Brookman, Hon. M. McIntosh, Messrs. Jeffries and Goldney.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived. Clause as previously amended passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Payment of members."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier considered the question of how many meetings members of the new board will have to attend? Mr. Whittle said that when he was a member of the trust it was necessary for him to attend considerably more meetings than he was paid for. During recent years members of certain boards have received remuneration greater than was warranted for the meetings attended. Has the Premier considered whether the chairman should be appointed on a permanent salary basis, and what the members will be paid?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Obviously the composition of the board has not been decided, as there is no power yet to appoint the board nor to fix its remuneration. The salary will depend upon the quality of the men appointed. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that a good board will be a cheap board, even if we have to pay the members a relatively high salary. If a competent board is able to minimize the present loss of about £500,000 a year, the amount of fees paid to its members will be relatively small considering the substantial good they can do. We want to get the most effective board possible. Cheap things generally turn out to be unsatisfactory. The matter raised by the honourable member will receive earnest consideration.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Right of trust to operate and license omnibuses."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move to strike out paragraph (c). A similar amendment will be necessary in clause 13. The object of the paragraph is to deal with taxis which are licensed by councils. Since the Bill has been before the House I have given further consideration to the matter, and my attention has been drawn to the regulations which govern the question. I was under the impression that the minimum rate which could be charged was 2s. 3d. for flagfall. As these clauses deal with amounts of 2s. 6d., it became necessary to exclude the proviso. On examination of the regulation I find the following fares must not be exceeded in any case:—Flagfall or engagement charge, 2s. 3d.; for each mile thereafter to any point within 10 road miles of the G.P.O., Adelaide, one way, per mile 1s. For any journey which is more than 10 road miles from the G.P.O., Adelaide, no flagfall or engagement charge, per mile each way 1s.; waiting time for each five minutes 6d.

Then there is the following unusual proviso:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in this schedule a minimum charge of 3s. is permitted. Therefore, the minimum charge of 2s. 3d. for flagfall is really a nominal charge. Actually the moment a cab moves off with a passenger a charge of 3s. is permitted. Even if one had to go from the Adelaide Railway Station to the South Australian Hotel a charge of 3s. could be demanded. So, under the circumstances, the proviso is not necessary, because the position is already covered by regulation.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Are these rates fixed by the Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, by regulation by the Corporation of Adelaide and other corporations.

Mr. Macgillivray—Are they not subject to control by the Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They are subject to control by Parliament. They are laid on the table of the House and can be disallowed. In the circumstances a provision has been made to exclude taxis, and I therefore move the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 11—“Routes and fares for trust omnibuses.”

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move to delete paragraph (c). This is similar to the amendment to clause 10.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 12—“Grants to trust.”

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I move—

To delete from proposed new section 43a the word “grants” and to insert “loans.”

This is the first of two amendments I will move but if it is defeated I will seek permission to amend my second amendment. The Premier suggested that those who criticized the Bill were anxious to see the tramways system lapse, but I have not heard any member suggest anything of that nature. As a matter of necessity the trams must continue although most of us consider the trust brought trouble on its own head. We must consider what is the fairest way of assisting the trust and the premier suggests it should be by way of free grants without limit in time or amount. The committee of inquiry made three suggestions as to how the trust could be financed. The first was by way of overdraft which the Government would guarantee to the State Bank. That would be a simple way of financing the

trust and the trust would have to reveal to the bank how the money was spent before obtaining further advances. Secondly, it could be financed by loans at a fixed rate of interest, and it could be a nominal rate of interest. The third proposal is the one the Premier has adopted—free grants. That is an unjust method of financing this organization. Once money has been spent it cannot be spent again and the Premier has admitted that he has had to make cuts in every Government department. Such important works as schools, hospitals, highways, and water conservation, which do much to develop the State, have been effected, but the Premier now proposes giving an unspecified amount as a gift to the richest part of the State—the capital city. He has suggested that it will be £500,000 this year. As a country representative, and in spite of being regarded as parochial, I would be failing in my duty if I did not refer to what is taking place. This afternoon I received a letter from the Premier in reply to a deputation of all upper river local governing bodies from Renmark to Cadell which asked for certain essential works to be done in their districts, including repairs to parts of the Sturt Highway which are subject to the flood menace. That road is the main highway to the eastern States. The Premier appeared sympathetic to the request, but the relevant part of his reply read:—

To obviate the danger inherent in such obstruction to the flood-flow of the river, adequate bridges are required, and it is in these structures that the greater proportion of the expenditure is involved. Previous estimates indicated the cost at approximately £170,000, which would probably be exceeded under present conditions. There are no great engineering difficulties in carrying out the work if the necessary funds were available. The many demands for road facilities throughout the State, many of which are essential to enable increased production, require that road funds be distributed in a manner calculated to yield the greatest immediate result.

In view of that, are we justified in handing over £500,000 in cold blood? The trust has got into difficulties because city people are too prosperous and will not use trams when they can use their own cars. The Commissioner of Highways states that if we are to develop the State road work is essential. If the trust is financed by a loan and after a period it can show that it is unable to meet the loan through no fault of its own, the Government can ask Parliament to write it off. We will lend money in the hope that the new trust will function successfully. Two of the ablest men in South Australia—including the chairman—were on the old trust

but they did not save it; and it is only assumption that the new trust will do what the old trust failed to do. In the meantime I suggest that instead of making a gift we retain this money to develop the State in places where it can be better used.

In closing the debate the Premier referred to work done by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula. He suggested that the financing of Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula water schemes could be compared with giving monetary assistance to the tramways. If that is how the Premier views the development of the State one wonders what he means by all his talk about providing adequate amenities in the country. How can he expect greater production without providing the necessary water, seeing that we are one of the driest States in the Commonwealth? No section benefits more from the production of the country than the people in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member is moving his amendment so that more money will be available for constructing better roads in his district.

Mr. Macgillivray—Not necessarily.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—He instanced a deputation that waited on me not long ago.

Mr. Macgillivray—Only by way of illustration.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The practice in regard to road grants in this State is being followed in several other States. The moneys used to maintain roads here are obtained from the whole of motor registration fees, less the cost of collection and the amount required to pay interest on moneys previously spent on roads from Loan Funds. Funds for road expenditure are also obtained from the petrol taxation returned from the Commonwealth, and from amounts voted under the Loan Estimates. The amounts voted under the revenue Estimates for roads are only cross entries and merely authorize the expenditure of moneys automatically raised under the Road Traffic Act. The motoring interests of the State desire this practice to continue. The honourable member will see that his illustration is not a good one because the only money that Parliament actually provides for roads by way of vote comes out of the Loan fund. He is now proposing to deplete the Loan Fund to finance the tramways.

Mr. Macgillivray—It was a suggestion by the Committee of Inquiry.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. It said that in future we should limit the amount of Loan moneys provided for the trust, and that the trust should not be dependent upon the expenditure of large Loan allocations because this would only result in greater obligations in meeting interest charges. The committee said that some financial assistance would be required for some time from the State's Budget, but that it should not become a permanent burden on the State. It also said that much of the Loan money already made available to the trust may not have been spent to advantage. Section 2 of the Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment Act, 1949, states:—

Sections 35 to 41 (both inclusive) of the principal Act are repealed and the following sections are enacted and inserted in the principal Act in lieu thereof:—

35. (1) The terms and conditions of any debentures issued by the trust to the Treasurer pursuant to this Act which were in force immediately before the passing of the Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment Act, 1949, may be varied from time to time by agreement between the Treasurer and the trust.

(2) The Treasurer may lend moneys to the trust upon such terms and conditions as are agreed between the Treasurer and the trust.

(3) The Treasurer may arrange for the borrowing on behalf of the State and in accordance with the Financial Agreement of such sums of money as he requires for the purpose of making loans to the trust under this section.

(4) Debentures shall be issued by the trust in favour of the Treasurer to secure repayment of the moneys advanced and payment of interest thereon to the Treasurer by the trust and such capital moneys together with such interest are hereby charged on the assets of the trust in favour of the Treasurer.

It can be seen that the honourable member's amendment, which he thinks will give so much relief to the tramways, is already the law of the land. Incidentally, it was also substantially the law in 1935. The honourable member could achieve his purpose by having clause 12 deleted. Actually, instead of assisting the trust, the amendment would deprive the trust of opportunities to obtain assistance. Under the amendment, after 1957 the trust would be unable to get even borrowed money. The amount of loan money available to the Treasurer this year was limited because the Commonwealth Government would not advance money on the same scale as last year owing to insufficient support for public loans. I think about £400,000 has already been voted by this Parliament to assist the trust this year. Last year it got double that sum. Under the amendment the trust will get nothing extra. If the honourable member wants to avoid making grants to the trust he should vote

against the clause. Under the 1935 Act the Treasurer can, with the assent of metropolitan councils, make advances to the trust. It can be done without accepting the amendment. All the loan money allocated to the Treasurer this year has been allocated.

Mr. Macgillivray—You propose making a grant in this year's Budget to the trust. Why not regard it as a loan?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It will be necessary for the Treasurer to find additional money this year to meet tremendous increases in charges. If the money were lent to the trust the Commonwealth Grants Commission would say that it had not been spent, and the Commonwealth grant to the State would be reduced to the extent of that amount. The honourable member will be happy if the money is lent, but what about his argument that the money should be made available for expenditure elsewhere? He has changed his ground quickly. If the money is made available to the trust, whether by grant or loan, it will not be available for expenditure on developmental work. I ask the honourable member not to press his amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have always considered our financial order to be one of the most stupid things that ever came from human association, but after listening to the Treasurer I regard it as the most crassly stupid thing that has appeared amongst men since creation. We are now told that money cannot be lent but it can be given away. What the member for Chaffey had to say was by way of illustration. He did not ask that the money that is to go to the tramways be allocated to the road in his district. He simply said that a loan was necessary for that work, but in the case of the tramways the Premier says it can be a gift. Have members ever heard anything more stupid? Any doubts I may have had on this matter have been dispelled and I am now firmly convinced that I must vote against this clause solely on the explanation given by the Treasurer, discrediting all previous reasons. I have a letter signed on behalf of one of the Ministers with reference to the things for which money cannot be found. It was stated that it is not the policy of the Department of Education to supply fluorescent lighting. It prefers to use the more expensive, inefficient lamp—another act of stupidity. The reason for asking for the fluorescent lighting was the inadequate natural lighting, but "owing to the shortage of loan money this work has to be deferred." On

the other hand, here is a perpetual drain down which money can be poured, and once this clause has been passed we can do nothing about it.

Mr. STOTT—I am surprised by the illogical attitude of the Premier. The railways are £5,000,000 in debt and he says I may as well talk about whales, but the transport system in the city can get a gift from this Parliament. There is gross mismanagement of the Tramways Trust in a financial mess and comes to this Parliament for a grant, and everyone says "Jolly bad luck! The interest bill has caused the deficit." It seems necessary to remind members what the inquiry committee said under the heading of "Finances," namely,

2. (e) The Government to provide financial assistance by way of a loan or grant. (Page 25.)

That is the committee's recommendation and it is right. Further, recommendation No. 5 (page 27), was:—

That while it appears that some financial assistance from the Government will be necessary for rehabilitation purposes, the financing of the undertaking should not become a permanent burden on the State budget.

The mover wants to limit it to five years, and one of the Premier's own supporters is much concerned about the blank cheque to be given to this undertaking which has proved hopelessly incapable. Recommendation No. 6 was:—

That in view of the fact that a very considerable part of the 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.

That is what we are urging. There should be caution in giving this body free money.

Mr. O'Halloran—The honourable member is suggesting that a loan should be forced on it. That is not exercising caution.

Mr. STOTT—Nothing of the sort. If the railways are to be given a loan and an interest burden built up, why select the metropolitan area and give them this money to remedy a state of affairs caused by mismanagement.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hasn't the Railways Department received a gift of over £8,000,000 in the last three years?

Mr. STOTT—Even though this Bill be passed, section 43 dealing with the borrowing power of the trust will remain in the principal Act. The granting of monies in this case will create a precedent for another grant later.

Mr. Moir—What loans or grants have been made to Loxton in the last five years?

Mr. STOTT—Many loans have been made to soldier settlers in that district, but they must be repaid. This is not a matter of soldier settlers versus the city area. We must consider where we are going in relation to the whole of our transport system. We are completely ignoring section 43, for £500,000 is to be given to the trust to carry on, whereas other State enterprises will not receive such favourable treatment. If this Government is in office next session, what will its reaction be if I move that in the opinion of this House £500,000 should be granted to build a bridge across the Murray? Such a proposal would be treated as a joke and the Premier would tell us why it was impossible, but, if such a grant as this is good enough for the city, surely it is good enough for the country. Where is our financial policy heading when we pick out one transport system and give it grants willy nilly in this way?

Mr. SHANNON—The argument of the member for Chaffey that the Government should lend money to what he called a bankrupt organization is illogical, for it would lose both capital and interest. The committee of inquiry used the term "loans or grants." Why did it say "or grants" if a loan would meet the case and could be repaid with interest within a reasonable period? If the committee had thought that the tramways system could be put back on its feet by means of a loan, it would not have suggested grants. The Government after investigation has decided that the trust must be financially assisted for the time being. The independent members who want the word "loan" in this clause are only putting off the evil day by not facing up to the loss of interest which would be incurred if it were found that within a year or two the trust could not repay a loan.

Mr. Hutchens—The tramways would be gone by then.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not say that, for, although the member for Chaffey described the undertaking as bankrupt, if it went into liquidation tomorrow it might be found to be solvent. If its assets were liquidated to advantage there would not be any question of bankruptcy. We should not saddle the board with a heavy interest burden which would deny it any possible chance of keeping afloat. I support the clause.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Mr. Stott has overlooked a most important point in regard to subsidizing this transport system. If he takes his argument that loans should be made

rather than grants to a logical conclusion would he agree that the Government should change its policy and make grants to subsidize country bus proprietors to convey children to schools? The difficulties of the trust are not altogether due to capital deficiencies. One difficulty is its inability to pay working expenses and it would be most improper to use loan funds to meet them. One problem that stands out more than any other is that the tramways are over capitalized in as much as the trust's capital is represented by obsolete assets. If a prudent business man finds that his undertaking is over capitalized he immediately writes it down.

Mr. Stott contended that a gift could be made but a loan could not be. The Premier's contention that the Grants Commission would take note of all this is undeniable. That commission bases its grants on the needs of a State and it is obligatory on a State to tax itself to maximum severity at not less than the average of non-claimant States. If a State could find £500,000 out of its current revenue its need for a grant would be correspondingly reduced. It is a most important feature, in the assessment of grants, that a State should make adequate and proper use of the revenue which lies to its hand and if a loan is granted it would tend to increase the trust's difficulties by creating over-capitalization.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I shall resist the amendment. I have represented a country electorate for 34 years and have taken more than my share in the fight for justice for country people, but the sponsors of the amendment, who are trying to pit city against country are doing a disservice to those they should be trying to assist. During the last five years the lowest loss which the railways made in any year was a little more than £2,000,000, the aggregate loss during the period being £16,000,000. In the same period the aggregate loss on country water schemes totalled £2,800,000. Taxpayers in the metropolitan area have to find a substantial part of the revenue required to make good that loss. They represent 60 per cent of our people and we do not hear them quibbling about paying extra taxation to make up losses on our railways and country water schemes. As this is the first grant that has been proposed to assist our metropolitan tramways, and as it is part of what might be termed a "salvage scheme," we might accept it with good grace, as I intend to do.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There appears to be considerable confusion on the recommendation of the Tramways Inquiry Committee on this matter. Recommendation No. 5, on page 27 of the committee's final report, states:—

That while it appears that some financial assistance from the Government will be necessary for rehabilitation purposes, the financing of the undertaking should not become a permanent burden on the State Budget.

That does not mean it is necessary to make a grant. Recommendation No. 6 states—

That in view of the fact that a very considerable part of the 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.

The committee also recommended that consideration be given to placing some restriction on capital expenditure similar to that provided in the Victorian legislation. The committee has drawn attention to the fact that the trust is already over capitalized. The report also included:—

That to avoid at least some of the borrowing for the urgent replacement of worn-out rolling stock, consideration be given to the matter of leasing light traffic lines to private operators as authorized by the existing legislation.

The objective is to obviate borrowing. The whole tenor of the report is that too much borrowing money is involved in the tramways operations, and that is a drain on its reserves. The amendment seeks to do exactly the opposite to what I have tried to enforce for a number of years. I have told the chairman of the trust I was quite sure Parliament would not look with favour on the trust's borrowing money to pay its current liabilities. That is fundamentally unsound finance and would only make the position worse. Mr. Stott said the railways have to meet their deficits from loan, but that is not so. Railway deficits are met every year from the Budget. What would be the sense of borrowing money to meet current liabilities for which no asset was created? If members do not want to assist the tramways, they can vote the clause out. The amendment would not assist the trust but only give it another dose of the poison of which it has already imbibed too freely.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I regret that one who holds such a high and honourable position as the Leader of the Opposition should condescend to make the statement he has about Independents. At least they are expressing their opinion. When he suggests that they are simply pitting the city against the country it is not doing an injustice to us as Independents,

but an injustice to himself and his Party. We are not suggesting that all the taxpayers live in the country. Many people living in the city do not favour this legislation. I have been approached many times to oppose the Premier's suggestion regarding a gift to the tramways without any strings attached. The member for Burnside has shown a complete lack of understanding of country areas. He took the member for Ridley to task about his suggestion and asked, "Would the honourable member object because the Government pays subsidies for buses for school children?" That shows he knows nothing about the subject, because the Government does not subsidize the buses. It pays for them because it is its duty to educate the children.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—I approve of that, but it is not a loan, but a grant.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Mr. Shannon took exception to my remark that the new trust would be placed in the position of receivers and said that if the trust were bankrupt it should not receive loans. He should know better. I could submit a dozen cases showing where receivers had been put in to manage businesses and because loans had been advanced they continued to progress. The Premier's argument was that although Parliament can provide moneys to the trust as a gift it cannot do so as a loan. The member for Burnside pointed out that the Commonwealth Grants Commission would hold it against the State if Parliament lent money which eventually would be paid back, but would not if it squandered money by giving it to the trust as a gift. If that is right, then this is stranger finance than was suggested by Mr. Quirke. The Premier said the provision I am suggesting is already contained in the 1949 Act. That is why I have included it in the amendment. It was included by the Parliamentary Draftsman following the practice and procedure which is always accepted. I am not concerned where the Premier gets the money, but about the taxpayers' money being given away as a gift to this organization without considering whether it will ever be in a position to pay it back. We could grant a loan to the trust for a period determined by the Treasurer in such a way that it would not cause any financial difficulty. There is nothing wrong with that and it is a commonsense, logical approach to the problem. Our greatest responsibility as a Parliament is to see that moneys in our care are wisely and well spent. The Government has no moral right to give

away £500,000 of the taxpayers' money—and that amount is only a beginning. I ask members to support the amendment.

Mr. PATTINSON—I regret the unnecessary heat that has been engendered in this debate and deplore the country versus city bias which is growing so rapidly in this House. The time is not far distant when, if persisted in, there will be serious repercussions. The bias is being built on complete mis-statements. The member for Ridley stated that the metropolitan area is asking for a free gift for the tramways but that money granted to the railways is loan money. Any reasonably well-informed member knows that last year £5,050,000 was voted from general revenue to the railways and it is reported in tonight's *News* that the railways have shown an all-time record deficit of £5,194,341 this year. That is a tremendously heavy burden on the general taxpayers, representing £7 2s. 4d. a head of the population, and is due in no small measure to the hidden subsidies which country residents obtain in the form of concession rates on freights. It is no use any member—whether city, country, Labor, Liberal or Independent—trying to deny that: if he deludes himself he does not delude me or the general public.

Mr. Quirke—You cannot prove that.

Mr. PATTINSON—I can prove it by the report and recommendation of the Royal Commission on Transport Services which spent some years of research on this subject. The chairman was His Honor Judge Paine, and one member was the Auditor-General.

Mr. Quirke—As a result of that report the subsidies were cut out.

Mr. PATTINSON—Every Royal Commission or committee of inquiry knows that the railways have never been permitted to use the cost of service standard and the Railways Commissioner has never been allowed to charge freight rates equivalent to the services supplied to country residents. I do not object to that, as I represented a country district for years and it is desirable, if not necessary, that concessions should be granted, but it is no use members trying to suggest that the city residents are responsible for railway losses. Over £5,000,000 a year is voted by the general taxpayer of South Australia to country residents as a concession on railway freight rates.

Mr. Quirke—Nonsense!

Mr. PATTINSON—The same thing applies to our waterworks. For the last financial year the Adelaide water district showed a surplus of £92,296, but country water districts showed a

deficit of £818,349, and the result was that the surplus in the metropolitan area was swallowed up and there was a net deficit of £726,053. Last year £127,009 was allotted from general revenue to meet losses on operating expenses and debt charges for River Murray weirs and dams; there was a deficit of £269,881 on irrigation on the River Murray, and £3,938,000 was expended on maintenance of roads by the Highways and Local Government Department. Most of that expenditure takes place in country districts. I do not begrudge the country people that expenditure, but I take a very poor view of the continued insults being hurled at metropolitan members in this House as if we were pariahs. I say emphatically that from this day I will not be prepared to take them, and I will give back as good as that given to me.

Mr. STOTT—I am surprised that the member for Glenelg should pursue a line of city versus country. Country members are not responsible for a city versus country dispute, but we are accused of it. We are only trying to discuss ways and means of financing the tramways. The member for Burnside mentioned the question of school transport, but this is a letter I received only today from the Education Department on the subject:—

I have to advise that owing to the number of children on the Schell's Well to Alawoona subsidized service having declined below the minimum number of seven required for subsidy assistance, the Honourable the Minister of Education has directed that the service be cancelled as from the end of this term.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Yet the member for Chaffey just said there were no subsidies for the country.

Mr. STOTT—I do not wish to develop the argument started by the member for Glenelg, but the member for Burnside seems to deplore the fact that school children in the country are provided with transport.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—I do not.

Mr. STOTT—Then why develop the argument? Metropolitan members started it.

Mr. Whittle—Why did you support the second reading?

Mr. STOTT—For the reason I explained in my second reading speech. We are now only debating the merits of grants versus loans. Transport is a matter that affects the whole of the State. Where are we going in making grants willy nilly to a transport system that has got into difficulties through mismanagement? We may establish a dangerous precedent. The member for Glenelg will not agree that city people are responsible for losses on

the railways, but let us look at the facts. Under the Road and Railway Transport Act country people are compelled to use the railways, but firms in the metropolitan area are not. They can run their own buses and trucks.

Mr. O'Halloran—And so can the country people.

Mr. STOTT—No, they are compelled to use the railways. I cannot see the tramways getting out of their difficulties for some time.

Mr. O'Halloran—And their difficulties will be magnified if they are granted more Loan moneys because that will only increase their commitments.

Mr. STOTT—If we set a precedent by making them a grant we may have to come back year after year and make further grants.

Mr. QUIRKE—I do not wish to enter into a country versus city argument, but I represent a country constituency and come hell or high water I will represent it so long as I am returned here and I do not propose to take threats from the member from Glenelg. If he wants to fight on this basis every time he stands up to speak he will "get it." If the Opposition continues to act as a mutual admiration society, as it is doing tonight, and enters into consultations with the Premier on these matters, and absolutely forsakes its duties as an opposition it is the duty of someone else to act as the Opposition. The only opposition in this debate has come from the Independents.

Mr. O'Halloran—Where were you tonight when the only division was taken?

Mr. QUIRKE—I have been in my place all night and I voted in opposition to the motion.

Mr. O'Halloran—With the Government?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes. I can recall the three Independent members sitting together in opposition to the second reading of the Bill, whilst the Labor Party was where it evidently rightly belongs. Mr. Macgillivray said that when it comes to a matter of State socialism Labor Party members are accepted willingly as friends on the Government's side. I went out of the Labor Party—

The CHAIRMAN—I do not think the honourable member is in order in referring to that matter.

Mr. QUIRKE—I don't think so either, Mr. Chairman. Referring to Mr. Pattinson's remarks, country people pay the total freight rates charged by the railways. They pay a freight rate on all produce from their district

to Adelaide, and on goods from Adelaide to their district. Because the country people have to pay so much it is only reasonable to expect some contribution by city people. I can remember the Premier arguing, when we were discussing the Bill to take over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, that in order to give amenities to country people it was necessary to amalgamate the skim milk of country electric supplies with the cream of the Adelaide supplies, with a view to giving whole milk to both country and city. I agreed with that convincing argument and voted for the Bill. There is still much to be done in the matter of supplying electric power before country people will get any real benefit. Only a few people grouped together can stand the cost of a transformer in order to get electricity supplies and many farms still have none. The Premier says it is not possible to lend money to the tramways, but it can be given to it. Is it impossible to have an interest-free loan? Each year we make gifts to undertakings, yet their deficits are becoming greater. Because of the grants the responsibility to be efficient is not there. Why try to balance the railways budget when it is known that each year there will be a hand-out? That will apply in connection with the tramways. Its budget will not be balanced by the making of gifts: it will be only an encouragement to inefficiency. If it is possible to find £500,000 for the trust, why not make it an interest-free loan? We do not know the personnel of the new board, but it should have the responsibility of balancing its budget without getting gifts of money from the Government.

The Committee divided on Mr. Macgillivray's amendment:—

Ayes (4).—Messrs. Fletcher, Macgillivray (teller), Quirke, and Stott.

Noes (20).—Messrs. Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Goldney, Hawker, and Heaslip, Hon. C. S. Hince, Mr. Hutches, Hon. Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. McAlees, McLachlan, Michael, Moir, O'Halloran, Pattinson, and Pearson, Hon. T. Playford (teller), Messrs. Tapping, Teusner, Frank Walsh, and Whittle.

Majority of 16 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I move to add the following words at end of new section 43 (a):—

Every such grant shall be made on such terms and conditions and for such period as the Treasurer determines. No such loan shall be made after the thirtieth day of June nineteen hundred and fiftyseven.

I changed the word "loan" in my printed amendment to "grant" in view of the decision of the Committee on the recent division. I have already dealt with the first part of this amendment in answer to the Premier, but the second part limits the granting of loans to June 30, 1957, and is therefore in conformity with the Premier's suggestion that in five years' time the gifts or grants by the Government will have put the trust on its feet. In any case it is sound policy to have some limiting factor so that the matter must come before Parliament again.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—On a point of order. Mr. Hawker has an amendment on the files dealing with the period of time and I submit that he should have the call.

The CHAIRMAN—I have considered this point and have decided to give the preference to the member for Chaffey.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—May I submit that that ruling is quite contrary to the precedent followed in this place, namely, that a member with an amendment on the file should always have the call. The member for Chaffey has changed his amendment by inserting "grant" instead of "loan" and therefore actually he has no amendment on the files dealing with grants.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member had not moved his amendment until this moment and he is at liberty to move it as he chooses.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The practice has always been to give first preference to those members who have their amendment on the files. Mr. Hawker has one dealing with the question of grants and I therefore submit that under the Standing Orders which have been followed for many years he should have the call.

The CHAIRMAN—I have given further consideration to the matter and refer members to Standing Order 419 which lays down:—

When there comes a Question between the greater and the lesser sum, or the longer or shorter time, the least sum and the longest time shall be first put to the Question.

In view of that I revise my previous decision, and now give the call to the member for Burra in as much as his amendment proposes the longer period. I ask the member for Chaffey to withdraw his amendment temporarily.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am always prepared to support the Chair in every way possible, and I ask leave to temporarily withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted.

Mr. HAWKER—I move to add at the end of new section 43 (a):—

Provided that no such grant shall be made after the thirtieth day of June, nineteen hundred and fifty-eight.

My amendment is very simple and merely limits the time over which the Treasurer may make grants to the trust. The annual grants which will have to be made to the trust should not merely become a matter of precedent and my amendment will ensure that the matter will have to be considered again by Parliament at the time when it is considered that the trust should be again standing on its own feet. The inquiry committee stated that "The financing of the trust should not become a permanent burden on the State Budget" and it visualized the time the tramways would be paying their way. The figures given to the councils by the Premier, which were compiled by Treasury officials, started off with a grant in 1952-53 of £450,000 reducing progressively to £30,000 in 1956-57. It seems to me that by 1957-58 the trust should pay its own way, therefore I have stipulated June 30, 1958, in my amendment. This matter would be reconsidered by Parliament in 1957, for I consider that a shorter period would not allow the rehabilitation scheme to run to finality.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Treasurer cannot grant money without submitting the matter to the House.

Mr. HAWKER—The money to be granted will be included in the Budget which must come before members, but it is my experience that Budget grants are not discussed to the same extent as the financial provisions of this Bill have been discussed, therefore I ask members to support my amendment.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I trust the Committee will not accept this amendment, for there are two objections to it. Firstly, State Parliamentary elections will be held early next year, and I consider that it will be the duty of the Parliament elected then to deal as it sees fit with matters arising during its term and not for us to pronounce, at this stage, that something must not happen after 1958, when probably some present members will not be in this House. To seek to bind Parliaments not yet elected seems to me to be carrying our prerogative a long way.

Mr. O'Halloran—The amendment covers the terms of the two ensuing Parliaments.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. I consider Parliament should legislate for problems as they arise.

Mr. Pattinson—This matter must come before Parliament every year.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, because the only money which can be spent by the Treasurer is that which is voted by Parliament each year.

Mr. Macgillivray—Then you take this as a vote of no-confidence in the Government?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No Government can exist unless it has a majority in this House, and unless the Government can get this legislation accepted by the House it ceases automatically to be a Government. The honourable member may wish to have a Government which would be subjected to being pushed and pulled around from day to day, but I would hate to be associated with such a Government.

Mr. Macgillivray—You were associated with one.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member knows very well that at the time of which he is speaking never, on a vital clause, was the Government defeated and that, when the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Richards, in one day moved five no-confidence motions, on each occasion Parliament supported the Government with a majority.

Mr. Macgillivray—Then what are you complaining about?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not complaining, but saying that that Government had a majority.

Mr. O'Halloran—And survived a record number of no-confidence motions.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. This matter must come up before Parliament every year. If this Bill had a schedule setting out that the grant to the trust this year would be £500,000, next year £400,000, and the next £300,000, I would accept the criticism that that would be an indication to the trust to absorb that money, but under the Bill in its present form money must be specifically budgeted by Parliament; therefore the Trust cannot have all its deficits wiped away without any difficulty, for Parliament may criticize it each year. It would be an effrontery to seek to control what future Parliaments might seek to do in connection with this legislation, therefore I ask the Committee to oppose the amendment.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I placed an amendment on the file because I thought it would be responsible for moving in this direction, but I now support the amendment of the member for Burra. A provision of this kind will receive much more consideration than a line on the Estimates.

If any member moved that a grant of £500,000 be reduced to £400,000 the matter would be debated as a motion of no confidence. The stifling of free discussion is one of the low down tactics of Party politics. Parliament should have effective control over the manner in which money should be expended and a limit should be placed on the amount to be granted. The Premier suggested that a period of five years would be sufficient, but the matter should come back to Parliament at the end of that period.

Mr. STOTT—Members should support the amendment. I was not impressed by the Premier's argument about tying the hands of future Parliaments as they can do what they like.

The Hon. T. Playford—A future Parliament could remove the provision from the legislation if it desired.

Mr. STOTT—Parliament has agreed to make a grant to the trust, but at the same time has placed a time limit in the Bill for membership of the trust.

Mr. HAWKER—I anticipated the Premier's argument and am aware that we cannot bind future Parliaments, but we have agreed to appoint members to the trust for five years. If provision for a grant was not to be made in the Estimates every year I would have moved an amendment to limit the period to 12 months.

Mr. HEASLIP—I support the amendment. It will give the trust a goal to endeavour to achieve. Without it contributions could be for all time. Future Parliaments can do as they like in regard to the matter. We should let the trust know that at the end of five years we expect it to pay its way.

Mr. TEUSNER—I support the amendment. On page 24 of the Tramways Inquiry Committee's interim report it is stated:—

The committee considers that the public street transport system in Adelaide should be made to function on its own revenue in the future as it has done in the past, but drastic steps will need to be taken to bring this about. On page 25 the committee states:—

That whatever method of control is adopted the metropolitan street transport should be paid for by the users and not be permitted to become a permanent burden on the ratepayers or taxpayers.

In its final report the committee deals with the immediate problems of the trust and on page 10 it states:—

The immediate problem is how to carry on until the costs can be reduced to the extent that they can be met by the earnings.

The committee refers to the various steps which could be taken. In paragraph (e) it states:—

The Government to provide financial assistance by way of loans or grants. It may be necessary for the Government to make grants during the rehabilitation period, but the undertaking, as stated in the interim report, should not become a permanent burden on the community.

In face of those comments and in view of other findings by the committee the period of rehabilitation should not be extremely long if the trust is of the nature recommended by Mr. Pattinson. The period referred to by Mr. Hawker is a reasonable testing time for the trust within which it should function efficiently if a proper trust is established. I therefore feel that the period during which the grant shall apply should not exceed that mentioned in the amendment. If after the expiration of that time it is considered necessary to make further grants, and assuming that the board has done its best to rehabilitate the tramways, there is nothing to stop the then Government from introducing a further amendment. The incorporation of this amendment will provide an incentive to the board to put its house in order.

Mr. MICHAEL—I support the amendment chiefly because I believe it will be an incentive to the trust to put the tramways in order.

Mr. PEARSON—I intend to stick to the clause. Mr. Hawker proposes that grants should be permitted until 1958. In the meantime six grants could be made available before the matter came up for review. It is not impossible for economic circumstances to so change that long before that period the trust will be on its feet. If it is able to pay its way before that time elapses, Parliament will be glad to wash its hands of the whole matter. I agree that Parliament should have a full say over the expenditure of public moneys. Whether it likes it or not, Parliament cannot run the tramways itself, but must delegate authority to others; and in doing so it places itself entirely and almost irrevocably in their hands. According to their efficiency, so shall we be required to find additional moneys from time to time.

The Committee divided on Mr. Hawker's amendment—

Ayes (6).—Messrs. Fletcher, Hawker (teller), Heaslip, Macgillivray, Quirke, and Stott.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Geoffrey Clarke, Dunage, Hon. C. S. Hineks, Mr. Hutchens, Hon.

Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. McAlees, McLachlan, Moir, O'Halloran, Pattinson, Pearson, Hon. T. Playford (teller), Riches, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Whittle.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs Brookman, Goldney, Michael, Shannon, and Teusner. Noes—Messrs, McIntosh, Jeffries, Stephens, Lawn, and Davis.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—In view of that decision it seems futile for me to expect any support for democracy in the cause I espouse and I will not press my amendment.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Acting Chairman, is not the honourable member reflecting on a vote of the House?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—It is a reflection and I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I expressed an opinion. The word "democracy" is Parliamentary. I used it in its usual sense and it was no reflection.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—What were the words used?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They were to the effect that in view of the vote which was taken it was not possible to get a democratic view accepted, and I consider that is a reflection on this Parliament.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—In view of that I must ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—If the Chair thinks it is a reflection on Parliament then I am sorry. It was an opinion—that I thought the last vote was not democratic and that it was futile to proceed with my amendment.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Unlicensed motor omnibuses."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move to delete paragraph (c). I have already explained this amendment and it is consequential on amendments already passed.

Mr. STOTT—This clause amends section 94 of the principal Act and I wonder whether this amendment does not go too far. If a person licensed by a council plies an omnibus for hire will he be permitted to charge only 5s. for a return journey if the amendment is carried? In some instances 5s. would be a totally inadequate charge where a long journey was involved.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The position has always been that the trust controls bus operators in the metropolitan area if they do not charge more than a certain amount. If the minimum fares are beyond a certain amount the operators become subject to control by other authorities or not at all. This provision was inserted to apply to taxis. The honourable member was not present when I read the regulations dealing with taxi fares as fixed by council by-laws. They provide for a flagfall of 2s. 3d., and a minimum charge

of 3s and as the regulations bring the charges in line with the amounts prescribed in the Bill there is no need for this proviso.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.40 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 9, at 2 p.m.