

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, June 9, 1954.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

NORTH-EASTERN MINE DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—There is a rather persistent rumour in the north-eastern part of my electorate that the Railways Commissioner intends to build a substantial number of houses—about 30—at Mannahill, that a well-known mining company is to develop a mine near the existing Peterborough-Broken Hill railway, and that a new railway line costing about £750,000 will be required to that field from Mannahill or some other point on the existing line. Has the Premier any information to give on this subject?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The question has two aspects: the opening up of a mine, and the building of a railway and houses. As to the opening of a mine, the rumour may possibly be associated with the activities of the Government in investigating various mining sites in the Crocker Well district. As to a railway diversion and the building of houses, neither I nor the Minister of Railways has any information, and no proposals have been placed before the Government.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Can the Minister of Works indicate what progress has been made on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and also the general position on water supplies in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Speaking generally, the work on the pipeline is so far advanced that, despite the magnitude of the job and shortages—sometimes of materials and at other times of labour—delivery of water via the reservoirs and mains is expected during next summer. The water may be available in October or November; it will certainly be available during the period of the most acute dryness in later summer. I do not say the work is advancing as quickly as we would wish; there have been restrictions and bottlenecks beyond the control of the Government. We have had to go abroad for materials, and, although at present we are getting the materials, there is an acute shortage of labour.

The work on the pipeline involves three pumping stations to lift the water 1,500ft.

over the Tungkillo hills, and the laying of nearly 50 miles of large diameter steel pipes, together with the construction of two big service reservoirs (each of 30,000,000gall. capacity) and a large number of reinforced concrete tanks, etc. At Mannum, 16 miles of pipeline have been laid. The inlet to Hope Valley is being enlarged. This work is 75 per cent complete. Eight miles of the Hope Valley-Findon main have been laid. This main will be 10½ miles in length. The member for Hindmarsh will be glad to know that that work is nearing completion, for his district will benefit from it. No. 2 pumping station near Palmer has been completed. Work on No. 1 station at Mannum and No. 3, east of Palmer, is well advanced. The installation of pumping machinery has been commenced. The construction of eight tanks (each of 2,000,000gall. capacity) at the pumping stations has been completed. Another tank of the same capacity is under construction near Tungkillo. By November it is hoped that the pipeline will be completed from Mannum to Angas Creek near Birdwood—a distance of 23 miles. At the same time the first pumping unit should be under test at each pumping station so that in the coming summer assistance can be given by pumping Murray water into the Millbrook reservoir by delivering water into the Torrens at Angas Creek. By the same time a large main will have been placed in service from Hope Valley reservoir to the western suburbs, terminating at River Road, Findon. Good progress has been made, especially over the last few months when materials have become more readily available, but we are still short of the necessary manpower.

HANSARD VOLUMES AND PROOFS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker, as protector of the rights of private members. Members have been handicapped in carrying out their work this session because the bound copy of 1953 *Hansard*, with index, has not been available. Today we meet again after some important speeches have been made, including one by the Leader of the Opposition, yet copies of those speeches are not available. Some members have to carry on this debate and would like to be sure of their facts, which is not easy if they must depend on their memory of the spoken word. During the 16 years I have been a member it has been the usual practice for the *Hansard* proofs from the previous day to be available before 2 p.m., although there have

been exceptions when Parliament has sat late on the previous night or for some other special reason; but after a short sitting such as yesterday's there should be no difficulty at all, with a properly equipped Government Printing Office and Reporting Department, in having those proofs available in time. Will you, Sir, take steps to see that these pulls are promptly made available to Parliament at the beginning of each session. I have been informed that the Printing Department is so starved of finance that compositors and other operators have been taken away by private enterprise, namely, the *Advertiser*, the *News*, and other printing establishments. It is impossible for private members to carry out their work in this place unless reasonable facilities are given to them.

The SPEAKER—The Treasurer may like to say something in reply, so I shall let him answer the question if he desires.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I only want to reply to the implication that the Government Printer is starved of finance. This matter, of course, comes directly within the province of the Treasurer, and is not within the province of the Speaker. The Government Printing Office has not been starved of finance, and all possible assistance has been given to the Government Printer in carrying out his work. The Government expresses great appreciation of the work that he has done in a very difficult period. Over a long period members have not had much ground for complaint, but under the laws of the land the Government is permitted to pay only the wages and observe only the conditions laid down under awards prescribed by duly appointed authorities. Parliament has appointed certain tribunals to fix the wages and conditions of the various classes of public servants. Recently another newspaper was started in Adelaide and we lost a considerable number of our operatives from the Government Printing Office.

Mr. LAWN—They were offered more money.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They may have been offered inducements to leave. My point is that the Government is bound by decisions of Parliament to pay the salaries and wages prescribed by the proper tribunals.

Mr. LAWN—The Treasurer said that the Government was obliged to stick rigidly to Arbitration Court awards because Parliament only approved of the payment of amounts prescribed by them. The inference is that Parliament refuses the Government the right to pay more than award rates. Will the Government seriously consider

increasing the margins paid to its loyal employees who are prepared to stay in the Government service rather than go to private enterprise where they can get much higher wages, or will it consult the trade union movement about increased margins for Government employees or the introduction of a system of incremental payments based on length of service?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At present there is a fairly wide shortage of technical men throughout Australia. If the Government met the honourable member's request and paid attraction rates to secure additional employees it would only start a system of competition much the same as we now see working in reverse in regard to the sale of wheat, where one seller makes the market for the rest. If the Government paid an attraction rate everyone else would pay it, and we should be in the same position as we were. However, the Government pays rates which are fully comparable with private enterprise; in fact, the Government's salaries and conditions are recognized as being extremely good. The honourable member knows that the Government faithfully observes all arbitration awards, and in addition gives a number of advantages which private industry does not normally provide. The Government will not enter into attractive competition, because it has a very large labour force and is ultimately bound by the Grants Commission's determinations as to revenue. If the Government started a reckless expansion, as could happen, and paid attractive rates to secure labour, it would not be long before it would find itself in the position of other Australian Governments—having to undertake serious retrenchments. The Government prefers to provide good pay and conditions for services without infringing the general scheme laid down by arbitration.

Mr. DUNKS—Only a little while ago I heard a complaint from a private printer that he was losing employees to the Government Printing Office because they were being offered very much better conditions in the way of leave and so on. I was therefore surprised to hear the Premier's statement. Can he indicate how many employees have left the Government Printing Office to go into private enterprise, and also the number who have left private enterprise to enter the Government Printing Office? Can he also say whether the Government Printing Office is recruiting as many printing apprentices as possible to keep up the standard of work?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In my statement I was making no complaint. I consider it is reasonable for any person to change his employment if he thinks he can better his position. I also hold the view that any employer has the right to employ any person he desires. I have never heard the numbers who have left the Government Printing Office, but it came to my knowledge that the Government Printer was being embarrassed because of the loss of employees. I will endeavour to get the information sought by the honourable member.

WHEAT PRICES.

Mr. HAWKER—In view of the fact that Northern America has considerably reduced the selling price of wheat can the Minister of Agriculture say what effect this is likely to have on the sale of wheat in Australia and on export wheat?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I am afraid I cannot enlighten the honourable member beyond what the Commonwealth Minister for Commerce and Agriculture stated in this morning's press to the effect, as I understood it, that Australia will have to meet the market. I completely concur in that. We, as a State, have no jurisdiction over the price that the Wheat Board aims to obtain for Australian wheat, nor can we influence its policy in this matter. Unless we meet the market we shall have to meet high storage costs and probably losses through deterioration from the ravages of pests, and other causes. I believe the architects of the International Wheat Agreement did the Australian wheatgrowers a great disservice when they haggled over 5d. a bushel in respect of Great Britain. Through that policy I think we lost our best customer, and now we shall be hard put to get rid of the accumulated stocks of wheat.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—After hearing the Minister of Agriculture express what he believed to be the official view of the Federal Government on the present situation, it is only fair that an opportunity should be given to Mr. Stott, a representative of the wheat-growers, to set out the position. Will he make a statement on the sale of flour to the United Kingdom, and also on the wheat industry generally?

The SPEAKER—One member may ask a question of another member and he may answer it, but not make a statement involving controversy and argument.

Mr. STOTT—I shall be delighted to answer the question without debating the matter. I welcome the opportunity to answer the many rumours that have been current about the matter. The Australian Wheat Board has been making every possible attempt to meet the market and for many months the price of Australian wheat on the United Kingdom market has been the equivalent of the Canadian price within 30 days of London. That means that it has met the price and the market. For many months Australia has been trying to meet the flour trade by reducing the price by at least £3 3s. a ton. Since September 1 last year the United Kingdom has reverted to open trade, which means now that flour-millers in London have become buyers. Consequently it cannot be expected that the London flour-millers will close their mills to keep the Australian mills open 120 hours a week. The statement has been made that we can sell more flour to Pakistan, but that country will not take our flour. It uses the wheat for wheatmeal. India has indicated to the board that she does not want wheat in future, consequently there has been an effect on the market there. There is a terrific surplus on the wheat market today and it has become a buyer's instead of a seller's market; consequently it is difficult to sell wheat. Without the International Wheat Agreement, which fixed the minimum price at 13s. 10d. a bushel, it is quite logical to assume that the history of 1932, when the price of wheat fell to 1s. 8d. a bushel for overseas sale, could repeat itself. Australia did all she could to get the United Kingdom to come under the International Wheat Agreement. It is not generally understood that the 18s. 3d. a bushel agreed to at the conference is the maximum and not the compulsory price. Therefore, the United Kingdom was not compelled to pay 18s. 3d., but only the minimum price of 13s. 10d. a bushel. Australia's price for the last few months has been near the International Wheat Agreement's minimum price. The recent reduction of 10 cents in Canada, equivalent to 10½d. a bushel Australian, means that if Australia reduces her price accordingly our price will be below the agreement minimum price.

OPENING OF PORT AUGUSTA POWER STATION.

Mr. RICHES—Last year I suggested that it would be advantageous if members of Parliament visited Port Augusta to inspect the work so magnificently accomplished at the power

station site and also, if time permitted, to inspect the areas that the Tourist Bureau is endeavouring to preserve as tourist resorts. I understand that the Electricity Trust expects that the first boiler will be operating within the next few weeks. No ceremony has been performed at the power station so far, and this will be an occasion of significance for the whole State. I ask the Premier whether consideration has been given to fittingly marking the beginning of operations at the power station, and whether consideration will be given to my suggestion that members of Parliament should visit the site.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I agree with the honourable member that we should not pass over the opening of this power station, which is the biggest public work that the State has ever undertaken, and one that will ultimately extend the power capacity of South Australia by about 270,000 units. I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the trust, and it is proposed to ask the Governor to perform the opening ceremony, I think on Friday, July 23. Members will certainly be invited to attend that function. If I may anticipate questions by the honourable member and the member for Port Pirie, the opening of the power station will mark the inauguration of a new tariff of electricity charges at Port Augusta and Port Pirie.

JUSTICES ASSOCIATION.

Mr. TRAVERS—I understand that a little over 50 years ago the Justices Association was incorporated in South Australia under the Associations Incorporation Act. One of the objects of the association was, and I believe still is, the rostering of justices for work in courts of summary jurisdiction. I understand that the association has a membership of over 2,000, but that a certain limited number of justices have now broken away and are reported to be about to apply for incorporation of another competing association. In view of the fact that the element of competition is completely inconsistent with the proper judicial functioning of justices, will the Government consider taking such action as may be necessary to prevent those disgruntled few from striking such a blow at the status of justice in general?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I will refer the statement and question to my colleague, the Attorney-General, and bring down a reply in due course.

DISPOSAL OF FURNITURE AT WALLAROO.

Mr. McALEES—An advertisement recently appeared in the press advertising the sale of furniture and other things at the building previously erected for a grain distillery at Wallaroo. I should like to know from the Premier whether that property is the property of Pascoe Ltd., or was it associated with the original grain distillery?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the firm referred to ceased to function its affairs were placed by the Government in the hands of a receiver, who has the duty of winding up the company, selling its assets and applying the proceeds in the first place to pay back to the Government any moneys owing. Any residue will go to the firm. I have not seen the advertisement, but I am sure it would be in connection only with its assets.

MONEY SPENT BY SCHOOL COMMITTEES.

Mr. PEARSON—Some time ago I approached the Minister of Education with the request that at schools, especially those in outlying country districts where the services of the Architect-in-Chief are not readily available, the chairman of the local school committee, in co-operation with the head teacher, should be able to expend money without direct reference to the department for approval. This would enable school committees to do many small maintenance jobs around the buildings which need urgent attention. The net result would be of benefit to the school, the children and the Department. Has the Minister any statement to make?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I was very impressed with the arguments advanced by the member, principally because they coincided with my own views. I have given the matter some consideration with several ideas in view, one being to decentralize the carrying into effect of minor works, and another to relieve the pressure on the Architect-in-Chief and avoid the unnecessary delay caused by requiring his men to go throughout the country to do what are relatively small jobs. Only this week Cabinet acted upon my recommendation for the necessary amendment of the regulations. The effect will be that the amounts for expenditure on minor works for schools of 1, 2, 3, or 4 classrooms have been doubled and a new allotment of £100 for schools of over four classrooms has been approved. The old scale was:—Schools of one classroom

£10 a year, two classrooms £20, three classrooms £30. In each case the allowable amount has been doubled. Instead of "schools with more than three classrooms," for which the amount was £40, we have made a new class, namely schools with four classrooms for which the amount is £80, and for schools with more than four classrooms £100. There have been similar increases for high schools. The result is that a very large sum is needed. A wide discretion has been given to school committees, and I believe it will have a very beneficial effect upon schools throughout the State. From my knowledge and experience of school committees both in the country and the metropolitan area, I am sure the Government is running no risks, because I believe members of school committees are, with a very few noticeable exceptions who for the time being shall be nameless, very responsible people.

WESTERN DISTRICT SEWERAGE PROJECT.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Following upon the installation of a drainage scheme in the western districts a certain area of land was reclaimed in the Henley Beach area, where private builders have built many homes. By sanction of the Health Department they were allowed to install a type of drainage which did not require septic tanks. These wells have now become seeped, and drainage is no longer effective. This practice was accepted under the belief that the Engineering and Water Supply Department would soon install a sewerage scheme in the area. What steps have been taken to provide sewerage services for the locality known as Fulham or Viaduct area situated on the southern side of the Henley Beach Road and on the western side of Tapleys Hill Road?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member indicated that he would like information on the subject and I had it investigated. I find that a scheme for that locality would require the construction of 12,600 feet of sewers as well as the erection of a pumping station and rising main to handle the discharge. The area is low-lying and on account of the waterlogged nature of the ground heavy sewer construction costs would be involved. The estimated cost of the scheme was £42,400 and the estimated revenue amounted to only £366 a year, being the equivalent of a return of only .86 per cent on the estimated cost. There are 97 houses and 111 vacant allotments in the area, and in view of the relatively few

householders concerned, the high cost involved and the low return on the outlay the scheme cannot be given a high degree of priority. It is very difficult to say when the sewerage facilities will be given to the area until there is more building activity and the locality is more thickly built upon. The suggestion having been raised, it will be kept in mind and as development takes place in the area it will come into line when appropriations are made for such areas to be sewered.

RECLAMATION OF MURRAY AREA.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Opposite Jervois and Wellington on the other side of the Murray River there is a big tract of land now submerged by water which I understand was previously under pasture. It is known as McFarlane's. I believe it runs back for a considerable depth from the river and could be reclaimed at reasonable cost, because only a small retaining bank would be required along the river. Does the Minister of Lands know about this and, if not, will he have the matter investigated and negotiate for the purchase of the land if found practicable?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have a report on the matter, which reads as follows:—

Following arrangements made with the owners of the area referred to as McFarlane's Swamp, approval was given for its suitability for reclamation and development to be investigated by the Irrigation Development Committee. A contour survey has been completed. The soils have been examined by the Division of Soils, C.S.I.R.O., and it is understood that this report will be available in a short while. If the report on the soils is favourable, the Irrigation Development Committee will secure estimates of the cost of reclaiming and developing the area, and will then submit its report and recommendations.

COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement provides for rental rebates according to the income of tenants in houses built under the agreement, and, if so, in how many cases have rental rebates been given?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Commonwealth-State agreement provides for rebates in certain cases. I think the rebate has operated in every State where the agreement applies, except South Australia, which came under the agreement only last year. I believe that up to the present the Housing Trust has been able to arrange tenancies in such a way that rebates

do not have to be given. I understand the trust is putting the lower income people into cheaper houses, thus avoiding having to give rebates. The question of rebates has been causing other Governments considerable concern and its introduction has not been a happy one. It has been extremely expensive in some instances and has led to a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst tenants. For instance, tenants in one street cannot understand why house No. 1 is charged, say £1 a week and house No. 2 £4 a week, when both houses are identical. We hope to be able to avoid the rebate system by letting cheaper-priced houses to persons on the lower range of incomes.

RAILWAY BRIDGE AT TANUNDA.

Mr. TEUSNER—Last year I asked a question of the then Minister of Railways about the erection of an overhead bridge at Tanunda railway station. I was informed that provision had been made on last year's Estimates to meet the cost of erecting such a bridge, and that every effort would be made to have the bridge erected by the end of June this year. So far, no work has been done at Tanunda in connection with the bridge. Can the Minister say whether the work will be carried out at an early date so that the inconvenience experienced by persons patronizing the railway station will be avoided in future?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am glad to be able to confirm the statement that the work will be undertaken. The bridge is at present being fabricated and the actual construction work on the site will be undertaken as soon as staff can be made available for the purpose. The object of the department is to go ahead with the work at the earliest possible moment.

DRUGS FOR STOCK.

Mr. MICHAEL—Some time ago the Commonwealth Department of Commerce and Agriculture made available a publication that was of great assistance to dairymen especially those living in districts in which no veterinary officer resided. However, I understand that its value was depreciated because it did not list those drugs that were not obtainable from chemists without a veterinary officer's certificate. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up this matter with the Commonwealth authorities so that future publications will contain a list of such drugs and outline the procedure to be adopted to obtain them?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I shall be glad to examine the matter.

HAMPSTEAD GARDENS SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS—I have previously been in correspondence with the Minister of Education on the urgent need for a school in the rapidly-growing Hampstead Gardens area. Has the Minister any further information on this subject?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am pleased to inform the honourable member that a tender has been let for the construction of a new primary school at Hampstead. It will be a substantial school of about 10 classrooms, numerous other rooms, and conveniences.

BARLEY BOARD POLICY.

Mr. SHANNON—My question is directed to the member for Flinders, who is a member of the Australian Barley Board, with a view to ascertaining the policy of that board on overseas selling arrangements and in an effort to clarify the rather foggy conditions obtaining in the overseas sale of wheat. Can the honourable member say how much of the last South Australian and Victorian barley harvest has been sold and what quantity remains to be sold? Has the Barley Board any fixed agreement on price with any other authority or is world demand and opportunity for sale the basis of its selling policy?

Mr. PEARSON—I believe the chairman of the board has already published a statement to the effect that this year the board has sold about 511,000 tons of a total South Australian and Victorian crop of about 600,000 tons. The board is set up to function on its own initiative, and it has done so; selling is carried out as opportunity offers and as markets present themselves. It has been careful, as far as it has been able, not to depress a market that has already shown a strong downward tendency, but generally speaking its selling policy is to meet whatever selling opportunities develop. It has an organization that completely covers the world's potential market for our barley, and it has lost no opportunity to sell where reasonable offers have presented themselves. I do not wish to be involved in any discussion on the policy of the Barley Board or any other board, but I can say that the Barley Board has succeeded in making a good clearance at satisfactory prices.

RADIUM HILL WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier a reply to my question of yesterday on the conditions under which water will be supplied to the residents of Radium Hill?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The charges to be made to residents of Radium Hill for their water supply are as follows:—

Season.	Gallons per month at 3s. per 1,000gall.	Additional gallons per month at 5s. per 1,000gall.	Additional gallons per month at 30s. per 1,000gall.	Remarks.
Winter	2,000	1,000	Unlimited	May, June, July, and August
Autumn and Spring	3,000	2,000	Unlimited	March, April, September and October
Summer	4,000	3,000	Unlimited	November, December, January and February

This is equivalent to an allowance of 60,000gall. per household per annum, made up as under:—

Gallons per Annum.	Rate per 1,000gall.	Amount.
	s. d.	£ s. d.
36,000	3 0	5 8 0
24,000	5 0	6 0 0
		<hr/>
		£11 8 0

MILLICENT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Before the last State election the Premier promised the Millicent people a water supply in due course. A long time has expired since then, but nothing has eventuated. I ask the Minister of Works whether this scheme is still under investigation? If finality has been reached, what is causing the delay?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am astounded at the question. A questionnaire that ran into at least four pages of closely written questions was sent to the council through the honourable member. I do not know whether it is a question of looking a gift horse in the mouth, but the council raised many questions which I answered in full, and I offered to answer any others that it might put forward. That is the last I have heard of it. The whole matter is now before the Public Works Standing Committee. The Government cannot carry out any scheme costing over £30,000 until the committee has reported upon it. The matter is still before the committee.

Mr. Coreoran—You said that last time I asked the question.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It is still before it, and I cannot say when it will deal with this question. It is a non-party committee and some of the honourable member's colleagues are on it.

COMPOSTING OF GARBAGE.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I thank the member for Chaffey for asking a question yesterday about the disposal of garbage, in the metropolitan

area in particular, because I have often brought this subject before the House. In his reply yesterday the Minister of Works said that Mr. Hodgson had gone overseas and would inquire into the disposal of garbage. A publication issued by the Australia and New Zealand Bank Limited shows what is being done in Canterbury, N.S.W. Many councils in this State are having much trouble in disposing of garbage. Some are burning it in incinerators and others, such as the Unley corporation, are burning it in old quarries. Canterbury has a population of 120,000, and its composting plant and equipment cost £110,000.

The SPEAKER—I think the honourable member is now arguing the question.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I am only telling the Minister what is happening in a city in Australia. Will he study the magazine I have or send an officer to Canterbury to inspect the plant there, or contact the Canterbury council to see what they are doing? Disposal of garbage by means of equipment could be of great benefit to our State, the only difficulty being that our small municipalities have not sufficient money to install the equipment.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I cannot advantageously add much at this stage to what I said yesterday. An officer has gone abroad to investigate certain matters, and it would be unwise of me to anticipate his report. However, this matter is primarily the responsibility of local government. It has been so in New South Wales, and if one council here cannot install the equipment perhaps a number could amalgamate for that purpose. The honourable

member might better direct the question to councils than castigate the Government for what it has not done. When the officer's report comes to hand it will be made available as part and parcel of a complete report by a man competent to form a judgment.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am pleased to notice the interest taken in the production of compost. I first introduced this subject into the House some years ago, but I then received a flat refusal to my suggestion. Some time ago a letter was addressed to the Premier by the Municipal Association of South Australia regarding the subject, but up to a fortnight ago it had not been acknowledged. The association has been wondering why a reply has been delayed. I assume it is due to the overseas visit of Mr. Hodgson (Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment), and that the Government is awaiting his return.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I regret that a prompt reply to the letter was not forwarded. I will see that the Association receives a communication as quickly as possible, in which I will suitably express my regret at the delay.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—On a personal explanation, I will take the responsibility for any apparent delay, which I assure the honourable member was not intentional. In the interim since the receipt of the communication another Minister of Local Government has been appointed, and Mr. Hodgson, who is a world recognized authority on the subject, was deputed to visit overseas and investigate this and other matters and to report on this problem. Cabinet then returned the docket to me, and I had not had the opportunity to give a full reply as two departments are involved—Local Government and Public Works. The Premier was in no way remiss.

MURRAY VALLEY TRANSPORT SERVICE.

Mr. STOTT—As the Minister of Works will remember, last year I suggested that alternative bus services should be provided, particularly to serve the Murray Valley area, to take the place of trains which are not patronized by the public. I asked that the Railways Department should consider running a bus similar to that provided by the tourist service, but my proposal was rejected. A bus service is now being run to Jamestown through Clare by a private contractor under the licensed control of the Railways Department. Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague, the Minister of Railways, whether the Railways

Department could run Budd cars to the Murray Valley area and, if that is not practicable because of the ballast on this line, will he consider introducing an alternative service similar to that now run to Jamestown?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Thirty Budd cars have been ordered for a long time, but unfortunately delivery has been retarded. It is the responsibility of the Railways Commissioner and his department to decide that they shall be run where they will give the best service, having regard to the requirements of the population. These cars will come into operation as they are delivered, the first to be used in July. The other question raised is one of policy, which concerns not only the Minister but also the Government. The use of a co-ordinated service, such as the one referred to, is not unique because a similar service is linked with the train at Morgan for the conveyance of passengers through to Renmark. I will have the two questions referred to my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

BRICKS FOR EYRE PENINSULA.

Mr. PEARSON—I believe the Premier knows that for many years there has been an acute shortage of red bricks on Eyre Peninsula. I recently received from one of the people interested a copy of a letter which had been forwarded to the Premier regarding the supply and price of bricks. Has he any information to give on the matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At the moment I have no precise knowledge of the position at Port Lincoln. The price of bricks has been fixed with the idea of encouraging production, rather than tying the industry down to a tight limit. One brick organization, of which I have some personal knowledge, is making substantial profits and repaying to the Government a large sum each month to reduce the advance made for its establishment. I have no doubt that the prices being paid for bricks are generous from the point of view of the brick industry. I will ascertain whether any special disability which renders a special price necessary is being suffered at Port Lincoln. From my knowledge of the metropolitan area, I should say that the present price is entirely satisfactory to the industry.

GAWLER SEWERAGE SCHEME.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—In reply to a question last year the Minister of Works informed me that the proposal for a sewerage scheme for

Gawler had been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee some years ago. Has it yet reported on this question?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—No.

ADDITIONAL LAND FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. SHANNON—Yesterday I asked the Minister of Education a question regarding the acquisition of land by the Education Department for the extension of schools, and also inquired regarding the general policy of the department on this matter. I have in mind the Aldgate School, which is on a very small area that is now almost completely occupied by the original building, plus temporary classrooms. Has the Minister any report on that matter and on the general problem?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I repeat what I said yesterday, that the Education Department is alive to the need for additional land for educational purposes, and in the six months I have been Minister there has hardly been a week in which new areas have not been acquired, either for new schools or principally additions to existing schools. It may be of interest to the honourable member and members generally that since the cessation of World War II. the Education Department has purchased 1,178 acres of land for school purposes, 506 in the metropolitan area and 671 in the country. A large proportion is for additions to land at existing schools. I have made inquiries about the position at Aldgate and I am aware of the urgent need to purchase additional land, so urgent consideration will be given to the problem of acquiring it.

DISPOSAL OF BRICKS.

Mr. JENNINGS—Is the Premier aware that some sort of agreement exists between the brick manufacturers that does not allow a manufacturer to sell bricks to a private builder, and will he negotiate with the manufacturers to get them to make available at least some percentage of their production to people endeavouring to overcome the housing shortage by building their own homes?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—From time to time I have had referred to me a number of cases of the type mentioned by the honourable member and I have passed them on to one or other of the brick manufacturers. In many instances the request has been met and bricks have been made available. I felt that the arrangement was not a good one because some manufacturers were prepared to honour the obligation, whereas others neglected it. Recently I had a discussion with Mr. Tom Hallett, a leading brick manufacturer in this

State. He can speak substantially for the industry, and when I asked whether it would be possible for the manufacturers to have a small committee to make an allocation of bricks to people held up in their building operations he said he would take it up with the manufacturers, and I have no doubt that they will do the fair thing. Bricks are generally in short supply, not because there are no alternative building materials, but because there is a decided fashion in the matter of red brick houses. That type of house will bring an attractive price on re-sale and is more popular than other types. Under these circumstances there will always be a desire for red bricks, but in some cases there is no hardship if red bricks are not supplied. The matter raised by the honourable member has been considered and I am pleased to inform him that some steps have been taken towards having an arrangement of the sort suggested.

SETTLEMENT OF EX-SERVICEMEN.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Will the Minister of Lands make a statement regarding remarks by Mr. Kent Hughes, Minister for the Interior, mentioned in my question reported on page 1139 of 1953 *Hansard*, in which he deplored the delay in soldier settlement in South Australia? Will he also make a statement on remarks made by Mr. T. T. Colquhoun, Commonwealth Director of War Service Land Settlement Division, as printed in the *Advertiser* during April, 1954? He referred to the activities of State Governments and the causes of delays in soldier settlement. Will he also make a statement, which would be of particular interest to people in river districts regarding the area known as Loxton South, which was approved by the Land Settlement Committee some considerable time ago? Will he also set out the position generally respecting future soldier settlement in South Australia?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—On Friday last the honourable member conferred with me regarding some of these matters and I told him that I would get a reply as soon as possible. Regarding the remarks by Mr. Kent Hughes, a statement in the press of October 15 by him dealt with war service settlement generally and not only with settlement in South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania. The actual statement to the House of Representatives by the Minister was as follows, as reported in Federal *Hansard* of October 14, 1953, pages 1346-7:—

Consequent upon the best information I have been able to obtain from the States I should

say that, as a rough estimate, the problem of soldier settlement has been overcome to the extent of 50 per cent. In other words, there are about as many genuine applicants for allotments as have already been allotted blocks.

I think that at this point there was an interjection by an honourable member, Mr. A. A. Calwell, regarding what was meant by "genuine applicants." Then Mr. Kent Hughes replied:—

I mean those who are still eager to go on the land. The number was considerably larger shortly after the war, but information I received from the various State authorities suggests that a large number of those would not go on the land even if they were given an allotment. However, the problem is still grave enough, seeing that seven or eight years have elapsed since the war ended. As I explained recently, we are engaged in finding out what would be involved in, say, a five year programme.

We have read reports about a five year programme to complete soldier settlement schemes, but they have arisen because the Commonwealth Government has been seeking information from the States about the possibility of completing soldier settlement in that time. It does not mean that the schemes must be completed within five years. Mr. Kent Hughes continued:—

As soon as we have done so, we shall make plans accordingly, but such a programme would involve a very big effort and I should not like to guarantee that we would be able to do all that we wanted to do.

When the Commonwealth Director of War Service Land Settlement Division, Mr. T. T. Colquhoun, was in Adelaide recently his attention was called to statements accredited to him in the press of April 7 and 8, 1954, relating to the speeding up of settlement in South Australia and the rise in costs. Mr. Colquhoun stated that the information he gave to the press was applicable to the whole of the States and not directed specifically to South Australia. It appeared clear that the Commonwealth desires to obtain information from all of the States as to the possibility of completing the planning of the development of suitable areas within the next five years. On the matter of the increase in development costs, Mr. Colquhoun agreed that settlement costs have risen in all States, and that this was largely accounted for by increases in the basic wage, shorter hours, increases in the cost of machinery and materials, and the comparative isolation of some of the areas under development. He was assured that every known effort was being made to keep costs within reasonable bounds and after extensive questioning he seemed satisfied that no more could

be done in this direction than was now being done. The following figures give some indication of the extent to which the increase in costs can be attributed:—

	1948-49.	1953-54.
	£	£
Cost of tractor—		
D4 tractor	1,655	3,250
D7 tractor	3,650	7,680
Cost of plough—		
Majestic plough	221	467
Twin disc plough	230	408
	s. d.	s. d.
Labour (per hour)	6 1	11 8

The position regarding the additional area at Loxton South is that the sub-division has been completed and construction materials have been ordered. As these items arrive the work of development will be proceeded with, and every effort is being made to have the blocks ready for planting in 1955. Applicants are inspecting the 37 blocks on the 28th instant with a view to allocation. Regarding the question of settlement generally in South Australia, I refer the honourable member to the reply given yesterday to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I think he will there get all the information required. If a five year plan were brought into operation, provided we got the Commonwealth Government to agree to land suitable we could complete settlement within that time. We have all the plant necessary to carry on with the additional area. There was a delay some years ago. The then Commonwealth Government deferred the selection of further areas for irrigation, which has made the position a little more difficult. However, if the present Commonwealth Government accepts the additional area suggested all applicants for irrigation areas will receive a block. We have sufficient plant, either in hand or on order, to carry out the programme within five years.

ALBERTON EVICTION.

Mr. STEPHENS—Today's *News* contains the following report:—

An evicted Alberton family slept by their furniture under a tarpaulin in a vacant allotment last night.

It states that Mr. Kelly, the father, said that he had approached Mr. Tapping, my colleague, last December and that Mr. Tapping had referred the case to the Housing Trust, but that nothing had been heard since. That statement gives the impression that Mr. Tapping has neglected this family, but that is not so. He made representations to the trust on behalf of this man while I was in hospital in December

last, but neither my colleague nor I heard anything further from the man until Sunday last, when he told me that he was to be evicted on Monday. That did not give me very much time to act on his behalf. This morning I interviewed officers of the trust on his behalf. Will the Premier have inquiries made and bring down a report so that members and the public may know the facts of this case?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE STAFF.

Mr. STOTT—Will the Minister of Agriculture inspect Roseworthy Agricultural College with a view to providing, in this year's Estimates, improved accommodation, particularly sleeping quarters, for students? Further, as the staff at the college now includes a number of older men, necessitating much work and longer hours by students, will he investigate the possibility of employing additional younger men there?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The provision of additional accommodation has been approved, but I cannot say when the work will commence. I will look into the other matter.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from June 8. Page 50.)

Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, £229,900.

Mr. JENNINGS (Prospect)—The amount of £229,900, provided as a subsidy for institutions for the aged, should be well spent, but, instead of taking credit for its provision, the Government should apologize for its belatedness. On the other hand, the Opposition can afford to be proud of the fact that, despite its lack of a majority in this House, it has once more, by its insistence and logic, forced the Government into adopting what it advocates. The Leader of the Opposition said this was another example of the Government's stealing Labor policy, but I do not agree with that: it is another example of the Government's inability to withstand public clamour for the progressive measures advocated by Labor. The Government does not adopt those measures as policies: it accepts them as inevitable if it is to retain one iota of public esteem.

However, it is gratifying to see that the State is at last bearing some of its responsibility to provide accommodation for the aged,

and I have no doubt that the religious organizations will use this money wisely and well. They have struggled on for so long in the face of tremendous difficulties without State assistance that they can be relied on to ensure the best possible use of the money. A tribute should be paid to these religious organizations that have for so long carried out such valuable work for the aged, despite discouragement and apathy from so many quarters whence encouragement and help might have been expected. However, although these subsidies will assist aged persons who are admitted to an institution, no provision is made for those aged people, especially pensioners, who need accommodation but who are capable of looking after themselves. Many of them are being evicted from homes they have occupied for years, and because of their meagre means they are being spurned by other landlords with the result that their chances of obtaining another home are negligible. Frequently they are forced into rooms or the humiliating position of sacrificing their independence by accepting the help of relatives and friends. All too frequently, we see the pathetic spectacle of an old couple, who, after living together for a lifetime, raising a family, and serving the community well in every way, are forced to separate in the evening of their lives and spend their few remaining years apart from each other in loneliness and misery, simply because no provision has been made for their accommodation.

Some months ago the Housing Trust announced that it would build about one hundred homes for pensioners, but that number is nothing more than a gesture, for it only scratches the surface of the problem. In any case, no pensioner has, as yet, been housed in such a home. I plead with the Government not only to continue this system of subsidies for institutions conducted by religious associations, but also to provide, as soon as possible, sufficient homes for those aged people who are not acceptable to institutions of the type mentioned.

Members are asked to agree to a further grant of £100,000 to enable the Tramways Trust to carry on. This is a large amount, especially when we realize that it is in addition to the £600,000 already granted this financial year for the same purpose. This total of £700,000 does not belong to members, but is public money of which members of Parliament are supposed to be the custodians. Can any member be completely at ease in making money

available to an organization that is not responsible to Parliament? Members do not know what is to be done with this money and whether it will be expended in a way of which they would approve. Indeed, if experience is any guide members have reason to entertain serious doubts as to whether this money is not being poured into a bottomless pit. In any case the trust should be under the direct control of a Minister answerable to Parliament, and then members could question him and share with him the responsibility for the proper conduct of this transport system. In this debate the Tramways Trust has been described as a dictatorship. I regret to say that I believe this is a fairly accurate description. If it is, the responsibility rests with Parliament which has, undoubtedly, the power to remedy the position.

Mr. Brookman—Why is it a dictatorship? Isn't it a type of management?

Mr. JENNINGS—It is, but it is using public funds and is not answerable to the people's representatives; apparently it is answerable only to itself. This state of affairs has been designed to save the Government from embarrassment. It is easy for the Government to say, as it does now, "This is not a Government matter; the Tramways Trust has the full responsibility." The Government is in the same happy position in regard to the Housing Trust and the Electricity Trust. This enables the Government to take the credit for those things that are creditable, but obliges the organization to take the blame for those that are discreditable. The Government may say that the Tramways Trust must take full responsibility for its unhappy financial position, but the ultimate responsibility lies with Parliament. I can think of no more effective way of jeopardizing the Parliamentary system of government, which I am sure we are all so anxious to preserve, than to allow Parliament to surrender its rights and neglect its responsibilities. We shall get on much better when we accept our responsibilities and no longer hide behind boards, committees, and advisory councils.

I would not feel so badly about this matter if we could feel we were subsidizing an efficient and adequate transport system, but we cannot. We are pouring money into an inefficient, inadequate and chaotic transport system without any sign of improvement. I am particularly concerned with the deterioration of services in several parts of my electorate; also with the fact that

it is virtually impossible to get any information from the Tramways Trust about its intentions except its 10-year plan. Whatever the subject under discussion Mr. Dick, an eccentric character in *David Copperfield*, always referred to King Charles's head. Such an obsession seems to be shared by the Tramway Trust which when any problem is raised, can talk only about its 10-year plan. This real or imaginary 10-year plan may or may not be beneficial, but I am worried about what will happen in the next 10 years. I shall now refer to the quaint reasoning of the member for Burnside when he spoke on this subject yesterday. He said he was gravely concerned at the plight of the Tramways Trust, yet he made only the lamest apologies for its position. He said the trust's difficulties were the inevitable result of our prosperity, and referred to the large number of people who now travel to work in motor cars. To say the least, that was a very strange premise, because a cursory examination shows that in peak hours people obliged to travel on trams and buses do so in the greatest discomfort through overcrowding. During the peak traffic hour this morning I saw many people hanging on almost by their eyelashes, yet the member for Burnside talked about others coming into the city in motor cars. Of course they do; they have to. Others arrange with neighbours to bring them in. Many people have bought bicycles and pedal through cold and rain rather than be almost asphyxiated in an overcrowded public transport after being practically worked in with a shoe horn.

The Tramways Trust makes a loss on every passenger it carries, but if we were not so prosperous and many people could not afford their own transport the trust would lose much more. Obviously, if more people had to depend on public transport there would be more passengers on which to make losses, and the burden of subsidizing the trust would be greater. We can approve only with the greatest misgivings of an additional grant of £100,000 to the trust. I hope that as soon as possible the responsibility for tram and bus services in the metropolitan area will be taken over by the Government and put under the control of a Minister answerable to Parliament.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—For 16 years I have been listening to debates in this House without becoming blasé. I am always interested to see how those who support certain legislation before Parliament often put forward an entirely different argument when

things go wrong. I have not been able to check this, but I believe we passed the legislation setting up the present Tramways Trust Board in 1952. I believe both major political Parties supported this socialistic legislation in its entirety. The only criticism from the Opposition benches was that the attempt to socialize the tramways did not go far enough, that not only should the tramways be brought under the control of a central organization, but all other forms of transport should be. Only those who opposed that measure have any right to criticize the Government on the results of the steps that were taken. In 1952 I said that we were simply pouring money down the drain by setting up a body such as that proposed in an effort to solve the transport problems of Adelaide. As we are now being asked to pour another £100,000 down the drain it is only fitting that I should give a brief review of what lies behind this type of legislation. Public transport is entirely the responsibility of local government, and when debating the Bill in 1952 I pointed out that those who sponsored the Tramways Trust in the first place said that they would strongly oppose the State Government ever having any control over it. They pointed out that if the trust at any time made a loss councils would only have to slightly increase assessments. Before the tramways were introduced suburban land a few miles from the city was of little value. Immediately the trams started running land values rose by leaps and bounds.

Mr. Lawn—How would you compare the value of land, say, 1½ miles from a tramline with land near it?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Land close to the tramline increased more in value than that farther away. Had the councils carried out their responsibilities the Tramways Trust would be a successful and prosperous undertaking. They fell down on their job and now we are faced with this problem. When the original trust came into being the councils, as a hand-out, appointed councillors to the board. The chairman was a Government appointee—a high official from the Treasury—and I cannot believe that he would have been so remiss in his duty that he did not tell the Treasurer that a landslide in the finances of the trust was taking place. The trust got into such difficulties that the Premier said, in effect, "We will have to do something about it." With his well-known ability for solving problems the Premier drew a plan out of the hat in the same way as a conjuror draws a rabbit. He formulated a plan to solve the problems of the trust.

Mr. Lawn—He hasn't solved them.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The honourable member is as guilty as the Premier because his Party supported the plan. At that time the Labor Party was just as keen to socialize the trust as was the Government. The control of the trust was complete and absolute when that plan was introduced because the Government had the right to appoint those who were to sit on this board. The Government also controlled the finances, and if that is not complete control I would like to know what is. No longer do the ratepayers have any say in the matter. When control is taken away from councils and invested in central government the difference between that and what is happening in other socialistic governments like Russia is a difference only of degree, not kind. Russia would take over an undertaking and appoint a board suitable to its central government.

Mr. Lawn—Are you comparing this Government with the Government in Russia?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am stating what I think and anyone can take it as he likes.

Mr. Lawn—I will agree with you if you are.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The Labor Party supported the Government in this socialistic endeavour. There are only three members in this Chamber who can speak on this matter with a clear conscience, and their vote against this measure is recorded in the annals of this Parliament. Those members are Messrs. Fletcher, Quirke and myself. We told the Government exactly what was going to take place and with an accuracy that a weather prophet would envy. The results have been exactly as we predicted. Every member of the Labor Party gives lip service to the theory of socialism, but is not happy with the net result of it. The member for Hindmarsh, who lives near a tramway line, said yesterday that when the new board took over the administration it immediately commenced to increase the inspectorial staff until now there are 90 inspectors, and that number is increasing almost daily. Their wages vary from £819 to £930 a year, or a total of £73,000 annually. In the traffic staff there is about one inspector to every 12 members. Parliament, of necessity, must have been astonished to hear that. Once a Government department is established, and I don't care what the department is, its first responsibility is to itself and I hope some of the new Ministers will remember that. Its first responsibility is to protect the department, and the more it can build itself up the more status the head of the department gets. Mr. Hutchens thinks the appointment of so many inspectors

is an imposition on the taxpayers, but the trust is running true to form and doing exactly what anyone who knows anything about the bureaucratic or socialistic system would expect to be done. In 1952 the three Independent members I referred to drew attention to what was likely to occur.

Mr. Lawn—Do you suggest that the Tramways Trust, Railways Department and Irrigation Department are doing that?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes, and I have no hesitation in saying so. The first duty of a department is to itself, and if it does not protect itself it is no longer a department. The member for Burnside said, in effect, that the big problem of the tramways is that people are too prosperous and therefore the trust failed. That is not original, because the member for Unley, when discussing the original legislation, made that point. If what he said is correct, that the City of Adelaide, which embraces the suburbs, is so prosperous, why should the responsibility of paying for the losses on the system, which is entirely local, be put on to the backs of the taxpayers in the country; men, for instance, from Oodnadatta and other parts who may never see a tram? Why should they be responsible for the losses which are incurred through maladministration? The member for Burnside makes an apology for the misdeeds of his Government, which is an offence to the intelligence of members of this Chamber. The net result of this venture is exactly what one could expect and even so-called supporters of Socialism must know that in every instance Socialism has been a complete and utter failure. An example is the well-known ground-nut scheme in Africa, in which millions of pounds were lost and millions of acres of country ruined.

Mr. Lawn—Come nearer home.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I shall. Wasn't it a fact that a big socialistic scheme was started in Queensland and weren't we all told that thousands or millions of pigs could be fed on sorghum grain. That was a complete failure. I could refer to various undertakings on the River Murray. I could also tell you about a fine man who led a party of pioneers from Australia to South America. His party contained the best men the Commonwealth could produce. In spite of the virtue of the leader and the men the same horrible result accrued—misery, disaster and want—and men who left Australia full of hope finished up accepting charity. Those on the Government benches have gone to the electors and told them that they favour private enterprise, but they

divide the community off into Socialists and anti-Socialists, use that argument to get votes and then betray the very people who sent them here. It is time that the Government and its supporters realized that Socialism has been an utter and complete failure in every country and in every instance in which it has been tried. Whether one considers the experience in Italy or Germany or socialistic proposals which have been sponsored by the Australian and British Governments, without exception they have been a failure. These schemes generally emanate from people with a very kind heart but a weak head who are carried away by sentimental feelings. By the time Socialism is finished with us we shall all be dead of starvation. We should finish playing with socialistic schemes and give private enterprise an opportunity to operate.

We are told that now the Government has failed with its first plan to revive the tramways, it will bring forward a super plan—a greater and better plan. This is another way of saying that the new plan will be a bigger and more abysmal failure than the old one. That is a logical deduction from the facts as we know them. It is futile for the Government to set up committees to investigate the tramways, the railways or road transport. If I were given the opportunity to elect a committee of inquiry on any subject I guarantee I could get any result I wanted. At present there is an argument in one metropolitan area about unimproved land values rating and I understand there is to be an inquiry. Let us assume that there will be. If the Government gave me the right to appoint the committee I could get a report to the effect that unimproved land values rating is the correct principle, but if on the other hand I wanted to retain the old system of rating I could select a committee and guarantee what report it would submit. Those men who presented the first report for suggested alterations to the operations of the Municipal Tramways Trust could not think on the lines of private enterprise because all their lives had been spent in Government departments. If it is proper to set up a committee, then it should be selected from members of Parliament representing the Government Party, the Labor Party and Independents. I remember the Premier on one occasion saying that he had a higher regard for the decisions brought before this House by committees composed of members of Parliament than for those of any other committee. However, in recent years the Premier has not put that into

practice but has gone outside and got other people to submit reports. If members of this House have enough intelligence and ability to be sent here by the electors they also have enough intelligence and ability to solve the problems placed before this Parliament. We should not be ignored. If I were a dictator or the Premier—it is probably the same thing—I would immediately appoint a committee composed of representatives of the various parties represented in Parliament and ask them to review the whole question of the operations of the Tramways Trust, and those demands from the public it could not successfully meet would be left to private enterprise.

The difference between private enterprise and Socialism is that with the former there is the incentive to succeed. Those in private enterprise know that the money for any project comes out of their own pockets. The member for Prospect said that the provision of £100,000 for the trust was a lot of money. It is only a fleabite compared with the £3,750,000 worth of assets which were written off last year; and on this amount interest still has to be paid under the present financial set-up. If Parliament could get out of its liabilities by providing any reasonable fixed sum I would support such a proposal. I would agree to the trust's receiving £1,000,000 if that were to be the last penny it would need. No one would be happier, but I know we shall not get out of it so cheaply, but that millions upon millions of pounds will be poured down the drain before we are finished. We are only at the beginning. Unless the so-called Liberal Government is prepared to do something about its policy and at least hand over some of the responsibility to private enterprise, then I have no hesitation in saying that the future for South Australia is very black. Recently I read a very wonderful book entitled *The Passing of Parliament* which would be of particular interest to the legal members of this Parliament. It was written by G. W. Keeton, one of Great Britain's best known constitutional lawyers, a man who has been a professor of law, has practised law and has written books about law. In most parts of the British Commonwealth there is always some member of the legal profession prepared to stand up to the obligations of that profession and warn the people of the danger of a change from a democratic system to one of bureaucracy and Socialism. One of the points made in the book referred to is that in effect the only difference between the East and the West at present is that in the Eastern

regions there is only one political party, whereas in the West there are two and in the clash of parties we have the protection of democracy. If under that system there are two different parties I say they do not exist in South Australia. There is only one—the Socialistic and the cum-Socialistic Party. In every instance where something is likely to be detrimental to democracy, whether it relates to death duties, the tramways or the electricity operations, it will be found that members of the Labor Party and those supporting the Government benches vote together. In practice we have what Mr. Keeton fears—a one-Party Government.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I intend to confine my remarks to the amount of £100,000 to be voted for the Municipal Tramways Trust. As mentioned by previous speakers, Parliament voted £700,000 for this organization in 1952-53 and a similar amount for the following year, so in two years this liability amounts to £1,400,000. If this were the last vote to the trust we would be asked to support I should feel almost satisfied, but I consider that next financial year and for years to come, unless something is done about the administration of the trust, the position will be aggravated and become chaotic. When members on this side criticize the maladministration of the trust, some members opposite are not inclined to accept our view. I propose to refer to facts and figures to show that the trust's administration is far from efficient. When the new board was appointed a couple of years ago we had reason to believe that that would be the answer to the problem. Although not one member on either side would contend that it would be the complete answer, or that it could turn a deficit into a profit, we did expect to see a vast improvement. As mentioned by Mr. Jennings, the trust's position has deteriorated during the last two years. I consider it has failed in a number of directions. First, on May 25, 1952, the trust reduced the average length of sections from 106 chains to 86 chains. At that time I was a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and with some other members of that august body I expressed indignation at the proposed reduction because it would amount to an increase in fares. For instance, those travelling from Semaphore to Adelaide would have to pay for another two sections. The policy of the trust for a number of years has been to say, "Our overhead has increased so we must increase fares," because it has become panicky. However, when

increases were made, firstly by decreasing the size of the section and secondly by increasing fares, its financial position worsened because people resorted to other means of transport.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—That shows they must be prosperous enough to have other means.

Mr. TAPPING—Unfortunately most of the people who use the trams and buses have no other means of transport, but have turned to people with cars, some of whom take three or four passengers to work, and some are using bicycles instead of public transport. In the *Advertiser* of May 28 appeared a report from Hobart, as follows:—

Results of the City Council election confirmed a trend evidenced in country municipal elections three weeks ago that retiring members were out of touch with public opinion. The feeling against the council in Hobart was most pronounced. Perhaps the greatest grievance Hobart electors had against the old council was its approach to tram and bus fares. Its negative attitude in merely increasing fares each time there was a rise in the cost of living instead of seeking means of popularizing travel, went against the council. As a matter of interest, the Government under a "gentleman's agreement" with the council has now taken over the city's transport services. So far fares have been reduced by about 22½ per cent., and further reductions will follow.

The policy followed in Hobart is a sound one because by reducing fares thousands more patrons have been enticed back to the tramways, yet the trust here on many occasions has resorted to panic-stricken methods of increasing fares.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Wouldn't the owner of a motor car reduce his charge if the trust reduced fares?

Mr. TAPPING—Perhaps some who use private cars pay a penny or two more, but at least they always have a comfortable seat. Some time ago the trust, because it was losing revenue, eliminated the city section that existed within the confines of the four terraces of Adelaide. Before then a city section cost 2d., but this was changed and the same journey costs 4d. Whereas people were prepared once to travel two or three streets by tramcar they now walk, and this has reduced tramway revenue. A little time ago the trust decided also to discontinue the issue of weekly bus tickets, which granted some concession to patrons but this short-sighted policy was abandoned. A few months ago it was announced that the issue of monthly periodical tickets was to be stopped. That was another retrograde step and the public seized on this opportunity to let the authorities,

including the Premier, know how they felt about it. Public opinion was so inflamed and repercussion so great that the Premier, I suggest by pressure, caused the trust to reverse its policy so that now monthly periodicals can be purchased. The mistakes are being repeated and are a reflection on men who claim to have high administrative capacity.

A few years ago the trust decided to continue a bus route to Beaumont, a mile from the then terminus. It will be appreciated that the cost of the extension ran into thousands of pounds and, although the motive was good and based on sound premises, it should have been realized at the outset that it would not pay because most people living in that area possess motor cars. Mr. Chairman, a sub-committee is operating on the other side of the House and I find it difficult to speak.

The CHAIRMAN—I ask honourable members not to converse so loudly.

Mr. TAPPING—Since the inception of that extension extra passengers have been few and far between and if any member doubts this I suggest that he travels to Beaumont where he will find that sometimes there are as few as eight passengers. All these matters are bringing about the financial position of the trust today which is, to say the least, chaotic. I presented cases to the trust on many occasions, but have never met with success. Once inside the four walls one is met by Mr. Keynes or Mr. Coles and to meet with success would need to be Mandrake, because the trust has no desire to co-operate with me or any of my colleagues. It is a dictatorship.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—No-one desires that.

Mr. TAPPING—The Minister would not be treated the same as I or other ordinary members, and possibly his experience has been better. I have approached the trust on behalf of people I represent, members of my Labor Party sub-branch and Progress Associations, and every time my request has been sympathetically received but rejected and no desire has been shown to co-operate. That is why the trust is losing.

In the report and statement of accounts of the trust for the 17 months ended June 30, 1953, 98,100,000 passengers were carried by the trust, compared with 17,124,685 by private bus services. It is rather remarkable that some members, including Mr. Macgillivray, advocate that the trust should be handed over to private enterprise. However, the trust would do better if it took over the prosperous runs now being

operated by private enterprise. The bus service to Kilburn is prosperous and at any time hundreds of people can be seen waiting for a bus.

Mr. O'Halloran—And many people standing in those buses.

Mr. TAPPING—That is true. We cannot divide this issue—either transport is controlled by the Government or it is run by private enterprise. If privately operated bus routes are taken over by the trust the owners should be compensated, but it is desirable that the trust take over the Kilburn service and others too. A report appears in the *S.A. Road Transport Journal* of May 1954 to the effect that the trust should take over non-paying lines, but the reverse is the position.

Mr. Hawker—That is in accordance with the suggestion contained in a report tabled about two years ago in which it is stated that private enterprise is making lines pay that the trust could not.

Mr. TAPPING—In the journal I just mentioned the following report appears:—

The Committee which examined and reported on tramways finance before Parliament passed the present amending Act in 1952 clearly set out that, in their opinion, existing conditions needed altering as a pre-requisite to any steps being taken to bring tramway losses within reasonable bounds. They suggested that the Trust should vacate the non-paying routes and call on private enterprise to service them. A good percentage of the constructive portion of their recommendations was based on Parliament accepting this advice.

The trust should retain all it has and also take over from private enterprise all those routes that are so prosperous. We must decide whether we are going to do the job wholly or give it all to private enterprise, and I feel that the State can do the job if administration is sound.

In 1951, 78,000,000 persons were carried by the trust, in 1952 there were 75,000,000, and in 1953, striking an average because of the of the fewer months covered by the report, 71,000,000. If the £100,000 were to be the last money voted I would not have hard feelings about it, but the position of the trust is getting worse because of the steady decrease in the number of passengers.

The Osborne-Largs North bus service is the most antiquated one could find, not so much because of inferior buses but because in peak periods, which are often, the drivers have the greatest difficulty in collecting fares. Consequently, in a distance of four miles a bus is

often eight to ten minutes late. The passengers are herded into the buses and if an accident occurred it could be serious. Eight out of ten people who use the service are on the basic wage or a little better, and cannot afford to buy a motor car. Because of circumstances they are forced to use the service, and the trust is not giving them sufficient consideration. The matter has been frequently referred to by the local council and myself in deputations. There is only a 25 minute service and the people want something better. Beaumont has a good service but there is no patronage. I am only a layman but the present attitude is not at all allied with sound economics. Some time ago Mr. Hutchens and I waited on the general manager of the trust and pointed out that Woodville South required a service because of its distance from the Port Road. It was thought that a service could run about three quarters of a mile back from the Port Road. It was said that the matter would be considered sympathetically, but nothing has been done. The people are expected to walk to the Port Road to use the bus service, but many of them now travel by motor car or on push bikes. In any Government enterprise the basis of success is the co-operation of the people; if there is not the goodwill of the people the undertaking must fail. Until we can get people in the metropolitan area to believe that the trust is doing something of a businesslike nature its position will never improve. I hope my remarks will be transmitted to the trust. The statements I have made regarding administration are based on facts. I support the vote of £100,000 but for the sake of the people and Parliament I hope this will be the last time we will be asked to vote money for the trust.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I was delighted and amazed when I read the details of the Supplementary Estimates. I was delighted to know that at last assistance is to be given to religious organizations who have been battling long unassisted and doing a wonderful job for the community, and amazed at the change of face on the part of the Government. The highest possible praise should be given to religious organizations for the work they have done over many years. I congratulate them. They have realized for a long time what is due to old folk in the evening of their lives. This is the first evidence we have seen that the Government is of the same opinion. The Labor Party has always fought for old people. It has given evidence of its interest. I am happy that they are to be assisted, but I am unhappy that the Government is not

accepting its complete responsibility in the matter. It is taking the opportunity to shelve much of its responsibility.

I was amazed to hear the Premier say that proper housing and care of the aged has been one of the greatest problems of recent years. I have vivid memories of the 1952 debate in this place when the Leader of the Opposition moved for assistance for pensioners. At that time the Premier said he believed the motion was undesirable and unnecessary. After Mr. O'Halloran had moved the motion the next speaker was the member for Murray, Labor. The member for Albert, Liberal, obtained the adjournment but did not speak. The next speaker was the member for Gawler, Labor, and the member for Glenelg, Liberal, obtained the adjournment but did not speak. The member for Gumeracha, Liberal, was the next speaker and he was followed by the member for Mount Gambier, Independent, the member for Hindmarsh, Labor, the member for Stuart, Labor, the member for Stanley, Independent, the member for Wallaroo, Labor, and the member for Onkaparinga, Liberal. Mr. Shannon moved an amendment to the motion, which was the most outstanding example of the contempt held for an Opposition proposal that I have been unfortunate to witness since being in this place. The next speaker was the member for Port Adelaide, Labor, and he was followed by the member for Adelaide, Labor. There were only two speakers from the Government side and they joined in condemning our proposal, yet today the Government says that it is one of the greatest problems of recent times. It has taken the Government a long time to realize that. I leave it to members to work out why.

The Government is still not measuring up to its responsibility and is only paying a pound for pound subsidy. It should accept the whole responsibility. We should not take away any of the honour due to the religious organizations for their wonderful work. The Premier referred to a deputation which waited on the Government some time ago and said that it led to the subsidizing of the housing of aged persons. I congratulate the people who led the deputation. Apparently they agreed with the Opposition that some help should be given. I am surprised that some Liberal members had not interested themselves in ascertaining the proposals of the Labor Party. That was apparent by the paucity of Liberal speakers when the Leader of the Opposition moved his motion, and is apparent now by the paucity of Liberal speakers in this debate so far. I hope to have the pleasure of hearing them later. It is

proper that members should be reminded of the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition in 1952. It said:—

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

It was meant to be a non-political motion. Surely Government members realize, as members on this side do, that the Government has followers and supporters amongst the pensioners, who apparently give their vote in ignorance.

Mr. O'Halloran—Our people do not vote in ignorance.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so. We did not intend the motion to be political, and remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition supported that. He referred to the increased expectation of life due to modern improvements in medical science, and to the desirability of allowing aged people to spend their late years in suitable homes in districts where they had lived the greater part of their lives. I am delighted that some homes are being established in the country. I know very well the excellent Lutheran home for aged people at Tanunda. The bulk of the financial assistance is to go to the metropolitan area. I suppose that cannot be helped because most of the population is there, but there is not enough encouragement for the establishment of homes in the country. The Leader of the Opposition in his remarks on the motion stressed the fact that the right type of accommodation must be found for old people. At that time many of them were housed in inadequate quarters and paying exorbitant rents, and that still applies. He said in conclusion—and these words strike me very forcibly at the moment—"I feel confident that it will have the unanimous backing of members and that, as a result, the Government will be encouraged to take steps to provide the type of accommodation required." Our Leader, thank goodness, has his share of Celtic optimism, but how wrong he was proved to be for the time being, for that motion was amended to applaud the Government for what it had done for housing.

Mr. O'Halloran—For all classes of persons, too.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes. Fortunately our Leader also had his share of Celtic guile as well, and he will not allow these things to be forgotten, nor will his followers. What happened will be remembered: the Government was praised for its housing, and Labor aspirations had contempt heaped upon them. Now

we find that, without acknowledgment, the Government has, following its normal policy, taken our scheme and twisted it to suit itself, removing the spirit from it. It has announced it with a great fanfare of trumpets as its own brain child, whereas previously it was "undesirable and unnecessary." The Premier said further in 1952, "The houses erected by the Housing Trust are available to applicants in all walks of life, whether they are pensioners or not." I submit that the Premier knew then that that was far from the facts, and he is acknowledging it now in the arrangements that are supposed to be being made for special Housing Trust homes for the aged and pensioners. But at that time he could not agree to Labor's motion, and for a reason; it would be an admission of Government neglect; but note the difference now. He is now making that admission but not openly; he is as usual not acknowledging his debt to Opposition proposals, which, of course, is the normal tactics we have come to expect. I am led to wonder whether the ghostly figure of votes has anything to do with it. Could the thought of the amazingly strong support in this State for Labor Party candidates in the recent Federal election have made people think that, despite the undemocratic system that we have here, despite the worst gerrymander of electorates this side of the Iron Curtain, Labor could win the next election? I would hate to think that had anything to do with this matter, but one is led to wonder. I am not for one moment criticising Church homes. I have said before, and say again, that they are doing wonderful work, and the Christian spirit that permeates those places is a pleasure to witness, and consequently I was rather surprised yesterday that the member for Burnside should appear to think that the member for Hindmarsh was not in favour of this type of institution.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—He said the people were forced into them and institutionalized.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The honourable member had his opportunity yesterday, but I was rather surprised to think that he put such a meaning on Mr. Hutchen's words, which I am quite sure the honourable member will realize upon reflection was never intended, and I want to make sure that such a meaning is not put into my words. I am condemning the system which has enabled the Government to evade the greater part of its responsibilities.

Mr. Davis—Passing the buck.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Exactly. With regard to earthquake damage the Premier said that

if the House votes this amount without objection he will instruct the State Bank that that is an expression of opinion by Parliament that earthquake damage should be covered as a matter of course. I am happy to say that for once I am entirely in accord with what the Premier said, for it is only just and right. We heard a long oration this afternoon by the member for Chaffey who, with his usual tactics, claimed that everybody who is not an Independent is a Socialist. I am sure that no one in his wildest dreams could consider that the Tramways Trust as at present constituted is a socialistic concern being conducted in a socialistic manner. Who does own the tramways? If we pass bigger and better grants, surely the Tramways Trust should be responsible to Parliament, but no one seems able to tell me just who owns the tramways of South Australia. They appear to be no one's responsibility, whereas they should be the direct responsibility of Parliament, because Parliament is responsible to the people, and we must say that the people own the trams, since we are voting such enormous grants to the tramways administration. We are told by members opposite that losses on the tramways and other transport facilities are not peculiar to South Australia, but that has nothing to do with the point. We are not interested in other places, but we are interested in what is going on here, so I say that we are left very greatly in the dark with regard to the activities of the Tramways Trust. The Premier said that everything is being done by the trust to reduce losses as quickly as possible, but there is little evidence of it. Surely Parliament is entitled to know what efforts are being made. The Premier said that the Government has two alternatives with regard to the tramways—either to abandon some of the services, or steeply increase fares, but he went on to say, "It is not proposed to adopt either." That means that we have two alternatives and will adopt neither, but apparently there is a third undisclosed alternative that at some time in the dim and distant future will be announced to us. Let us have it now. The member for Prospect referred to a character in *David Copperfield*, Mr. Dick, but I am reminded of Mr. Micawber who was always waiting for something to turn up, for I believe that that is the Government's attitude on the tramways.

We heard yesterday from a member opposite a very specious excuse for the failure of the tramways administration to make ends meet.

He said it was because of the enormous growth in the number of motor cars and that, of course, is right, but he did not tell us of the crowded buses and trams. Mr. Hutchens yesterday referred to a recently published cartoon depicting a poor, unfortunate, fat man with his front on the bus and back off, and anxious to pay only half fare, and who could blame him? We must wonder about this enormous increase in the number of cars and why people are not using them at the peak hours of traffic. The answer is obvious—they haven't got them, but there are many who have bought push bikes and are using them at great inconvenience, probably not because they could afford to buy a push bike, but because they did not wish to use the trams in such uncomfortable conditions. The purchase of more and more motor cars is not to a great extent the reason for the failure of the tramways finances, which is due to the inefficient management of the concern; not wholly, of course, but to a great extent. I know many people have formed themselves into groups of four or five and pooled their resources to travel to work in a motor vehicle.

I conclude with a brief word of commendation for the two last-mentioned matters on the Estimates. Firstly, the amount of £30,000 for school buses. I believe that this is most necessary. The growth in the method of transporting children to school by motor vehicles is a growing and good one, but I would urge a more vigorous inspection of school buses. I know that there are many good vehicles in use, but I have observed some buses that are inadequate and unsuitable for carrying children to school, and I strongly urge that all buses used for this purpose should be 100 per cent safe and completely suitable for the work. Secondly, I am entirely in agreement with, and pleased indeed to note the grant to the University in connection with the medical school. As is known, I am a member of the University Council, and I realize how much this will mean to the medical school. More space is needed, and this grant will allow the medical school to become more compact and will enable it to give back to the Institute of Veterinary and Medical Science the quarters which have been used by the medical school for some time, and which are badly needed by the Institute for its own work. I support the first line.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mt. Gambier)—I commend the Government for its foresight in recognizing the good work of those religious organizations that are to receive subsidies.

Mr. Dunstan—Shouldn't you rather commend it for its hindsight?

Mr. FLETCHER—Perhaps so. Four years ago I received the following letter from the Chief Secretary:—

Following the deputation you introduced to me on Tuesday, 27th March, regarding the establishment of an old folks home at Mount Gambier and at which I undertook to obtain a report, I forwarded the memorandum taken at the deputation to the Chairman, Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, for his comments. Mr. McNally points out that the question of establishing old folk's homes in country centres has been raised by other organizations in the past. He says that the opening of smaller homes in country towns to accommodate aged people of that district at first impression appears to be an excellent one. Such homes would, no doubt, provide a very suitable haven for quite a number of elderly country people. The report continues—

“I would point out, however, that the board is charged with the care of elderly destitute people. Whether the demand for this type of accommodation really exists in country centres is rather doubtful. There are many denominational homes which care for old people in bitter circumstances and will continue to do so. The 66 elderly people (old age pensioners) mentioned by the deputation seem to be in need of occasional hospitalization rather than permanent accommodation in an old folks home. With the establishment of such homes in country centres I feel sure that considerable difficulty would be experienced with the staffing. It is a real problem in the metropolitan area and would be more so in rural towns. Also with smaller establishments the overhead cost per patient would be higher. The present difficult building situation would not make the establishment of these homes any easier. Any homes purchased for the purpose would almost certainly need some alterations and additions to meet ordinary requirements. The members of the board have discussed the proposal. They feel that the establishment of old folks homes in larger country towns would, in addition to providing the accommodation for aged people, also tend to create a happier atmosphere if in their own districts. However, the board is of the opinion that the establishment of such homes might well be a matter for consideration by local municipal authorities rather than the Government. Accommodation could then be provided for both the destitute and others who may be in a position to meet ordinary accommodation charges. From the information available relating to present inmates of the Old Folk's Home at Magill I am not satisfied that a real demand actually exists for country homes for destitute aged people.”

In view of that letter, members will appreciate my surprise on being informed that the Government was to subsidize homes for aged persons. About three years ago some residents in the Mount Gambier district initiated a movement to establish a home for the aged, and

that movement has met with wonderful success. I do not know the amount in hand but many of the functions now held in the district are for the express purpose of raising money for that cause. Further, many citizens have pledged themselves to make annual donations to maintain that home. In introducing these Estimates the Treasurer said:—

The Government will require an undertaking from any religious or other body receiving subsidy that the premises will always be used for housing pensioners or aged persons of limited means without further commitments to the Government.

Does that mean that this will be the only grant of this nature for these institutions, or will grants be made in subsequent years?

Much has been said in this debate about the Tramways Trust. As mentioned by the member for Chaffey, I was opposed, in 1952, to the present set-up of the Tramways Trust, and I am no more enamoured of it today. The State can have too many of these trusts outside the control of Parliament. The Estimates provide for a grant of £50,000 to the Medical School. I am by no means satisfied with the set-up at the Adelaide Hospital, particularly with regard to the building used by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. I understand that this grant will assist the University to transfer students from that building, and that will be a good thing because of the proximity of patients suffering from cancer and other almost incurable diseases who are housed in the adjacent wood and iron building. To reach the Institute from North Terrace one must go through a maze of building, and one requires almost a map and a directory to reach his destination. The gate at the back of the building is not opened until just before the evening visiting hours. The gate leading off the Institute's property is always locked, and I want to know why. A few months ago I frequently visited Alfred ward, and it was a crying shame to see the number of aged people there. Some were pioneers and others the grandparents of men who had gone away to fight for us. Those old people are forced to live under shocking conditions, and, in saying that, I have nothing but praise for the staff who are forced to work under those conditions. Some improvement should be made there, and consideration given to those old folk: they should be allowed to end their days in happier circumstances. I trust that this grant to the Medical School will assist in improving the conditions there.

Yesterday, by way of question, I referred to doctors who refused to attend sick patients.

Today's *News* states that a doctor may refuse to attend a patient, but if we are to grant £50,000 toward this medical school to train doctors the least they can do, after graduation, is to attend patients when called upon. We should return to the days of the old family doctor. In some cases today two or three young upstarts set up as doctors, buy a practice, and take it in turns to attend patients. One may say, "It isn't my turn. So-and-so is away fishing and will see you when he gets back." I have been told that there is much of this going on around the city: some doctors called upon to attend patients refuse to do so. The British Medical Association should take a strong stand to stop this practice. I hope the Premier will investigate the matter and ensure that doctors who are trained with the assistance of these grants will give us full value for our money after graduation. I support the Estimates.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norrwood)—Many points have been dealt with by other members, and I do not wish to speak at length on these Estimates, with which I agree wholeheartedly. In speaking about the Tramways Trust, the member for Chaffey regaled the House with a tirade against Socialism, but I do not know why he should use that term in relation to the trust, for it is not—nor has it ever been—a socialist institution. Socialism is a system under which the people control the economic resources of the country, and the people do not control the Tramways Trust. The policy of this Government has never been a socialistic policy: it has been a managerialist policy—a system of establishing a series of trusts, Government institutions and organizations not responsible to Parliament in any way, the details of whose administration could be hidden from public view and the responsibility for which the Government could evade by withholding from members the right of asking the questions which may normally be asked on administration of Government departments. I will refer to one instance in regard to the Tramways Trust. I shall show how the system works to prevent the people from controlling the institution they are supposed to own. In my district a feeder bus runs to Firle. It is an extraordinary system by which a few people are collected from the top of the route near the new housing areas of Hectorville, and the bus runs through the Wellington and Glynde wards of the Payneham council and connects with the Magill tramline at Wellington Road. By the time it gets there it is full; so is the Magill tram. Anyone who tries to fight his

way on to the tram at Wellington Road has the job ahead of him. I have often tried to fight my way on to the tram at a stop nearer the city, but found it better to walk half a mile to the next tramline, and dozens of others have too. The feeder bus system is a hopeless proposition. Last year 1,500 residents of the district signed a petition to the Tramways Trust for a through bus service, which is absolutely necessary. In the company of the mayors of the councils concerned I presented the petition to the trust, which informed us it would consider the position, but nothing happened. Then I directed a question to the Premier, but he was surprised that I should ask him the question because, in his opinion, it would be natural to go to the trust, but he said he would have the question investigated. I heard nothing further, so I asked him another question. He said he had been informed that the trust had the matter under review, but that it would have communicated with me in any case. I received a letter from the trust that it had the matter under review. Then followed a slight improvement in the bus service, but a through service was not run and the position became worse.

We again approached the trust and were again told that the matter was under review and that an expert was coming to Adelaide to report on the matter, so nothing further was done. Some months later I asked the Premier another question. Again the Premier was amazed and said that I should naturally put the question to the trust; that, after all, the Tramways Trust office was open to members to obtain information. I later asked another question in the House, and the reply received from the trust was that it was reviewing the matter and that something would be done. That is where the matter ended. No Minister is responsible for the administration of the Tramways Trust, so we cannot censure any Minister, and it is useless to keep taking the question up with the trust, for the officials merely smile sweetly and say they have plans, but no one knows what they are. The Government has set up organizations such as the Tramways Trust, Housing Trust and Electricity Trust and the administrators can avoid their responsibilities to the public, and Parliament cannot lay the blame on anyone for the mess that occurs.

The member for Chaffey was at fault in saying that the Tramways Trust was a socialistic institution and that Socialism was to blame for its financial difficulties. It is the

managerialistic policy of the Government that has deprived people from being able to bring the trust to book. The Labor Party's policy is to see that the people, through their representatives, control these institutions. Labor does not advocate the establishment of bodies independent of control to run the State's institutions. The people would like to know what is going on in institutions they are supposed to own, and they should be able to get all the information they require as shareholders in them. I support the first line.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to provide some little assistance for old folks' homes in various centres. I join with the member for Gawler in expressing appreciation to religious bodies that have accepted responsibilities that lie with this Government in finding homes for the aged. In Port Pirie an old folks' home is conducted by the Central Methodist Mission. Some time ago I asked the Treasurer whether he would assist this home, but he said that under no circumstances was he prepared to do so. I am pleased that he now proposes £500 for it, but it is a small sum considering the work it is doing. That home is prepared to accept people not only from the district around Port Pirie but from outlying areas, too. Recently a man from the metropolitan area applied for admittance and was accepted, showing there was insufficient accommodation for the aged in the city. Opposition members have been prepared for some time to help the aged, but members opposite were not concerned about them, although this section has given yeomen service to the State.

Mr. Lawn—Government members got a shock at the last elections.

Mr. DAVIS—I think they will get a bigger shock at the next elections. The people will realize that the Government is not discharging its obligations to the aged. It is distressing to see old people living in hovels not fit to house a dog. The Government is prepared to let many of them linger in ill-health without assistance. Many that were not able to obtain admission to an old folks' home have had to depend on neighbours to look after them. The home at Port Pirie is not large enough; it accommodates only about 20. They contribute towards their keep, but the grant for this home is not nearly adequate. The Government should build suitable houses for people still fit to live in them.

I agree with most of the remarks of other speakers about the Tramways Trust. I realize

that anything that this Government is connected with is doomed to failure, but I do not agree with the member for Chaffey that the tramways should be run by private enterprise. He would be prepared to let private enterprise run the tramways and railways and other transport services so as to exploit the public. He is not concerned with the interests of the people. Further, he is not prepared to condemn the irrigation schemes along the river, an area that has produced wealth for him, yet he is prepared to condemn anything that provides a useful service to the **general public**. He is only concerned about getting perquisites or gains and is not concerned about the welfare of the people. The tramways are not paying because they are not giving an adequate service. The member for Chaffey said the tramways were a failure, but he did not say that the trust allows private enterprise to pick the eyes out of public transport. Private operators have all the profitable routes in the metropolitan area, but if the trust ran all services it would not be losing money today. Without the profitable routes how can it pay? The same applies to the railways. Once I said in the House that Port Pirie had an excellent railway service, but through maladministration and neglect by the Minister the services were reduced, so people do not patronize the Port Pirie line like they did. Years ago it was hard to get a seat on the train, but today one often sees only 20 or 30 passengers on it. It is a service which cannot be depended on. At one time it was possible to leave Port Pirie early Saturday morning and return the same night, but for some unknown reason the evening train has been cancelled. That train was of great service to the people in Port Pirie.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—You should all have your own motor cars.

Mr. DAVIS—If all people in Port Pirie were as wealthy as the Minister we would probably all have motor cars and would not need a rail service. People are using motor cars and are being driven into breaking the law by carrying passengers to the city. I have frequently asked that the railway line in the main street of Port Pirie be removed and placed near the wharf but have been told that the Harbors Board will not permit the Railways Department to have lines on its property. It is ridiculous that one Government department will not permit another to use its property. Ores going to the smelters and plant necessary for the development of uranium are carried by rail down the main street. The people at Port Pirie should receive more consideration. An amount is to be spent on the

construction of roads and I hope that some of it will be spent in Housing Trust areas. I appreciate what the trust has done in Port Pirie but there are no roads in the area which has been developed and the local council is finding it impossible to provide them. The Education Department is to spend £30,000 on the purchase of buses. I assume they will be used in transporting children from nearby districts to the metropolitan area because I could not imagine the Government showing consideration for people in country areas. At present persons are contracting to convey children to schools in our northern areas but most of the buses provided are not suitable. At Port Pirie the two schools which must cater for a population of almost 14,000 are becoming overcrowded. We have been told that a new school will be erected in Risdon Park and I hope that a start will soon be made on it. It will relieve the congestion in existing schools. I support the first line.

Mr. CORCORAN (Victoria)—I support the payment of £229,900 as subsidies to institutions for aged persons. It is gratifying that the Government has at last acknowledged its obligations to the various religious organizations and institutions which have shouldered the responsibilities bound up in attending to the needs of aged people. In view of the way this responsibility has been handled in the past we can confidently entrust this money to those institutions. I am pleased that the Government is assisting the Old Folks Home at Mount Gambier because elderly people in that area will be able to live in peace and comfort without severing their association with the locality in which they have lived all their lives. It is hard for old people, who are unable to care for themselves, if they are taken away and placed in new surroundings. It is good that they should be housed in an institution where they can have their friends and relations near them in their declining years. That is the least we can do for those pioneers who have paved the way and built the foundations on which we stand today. I shall not discuss why this matter has been neglected in the past but be happy in the knowledge that it will be attended to in the future. We must congratulate the institutions on the splendid work they have done. The Government is making some move to provide homes for aged people. If a man and his wife can care for themselves they should not be separated in what is the sundown of their existence. They should be permitted to live the remainder of their lives together, enjoying all that each other's company means to them.

I do not profess to know anything about the problems bound up in the administration of the Tramways Trust but the first thing people look for from this undertaking is service. If that cannot be provided without running into debt then in a young State like ours we should meet that debt. It seems to me that if the trust is to function effectively it should control all bus services and if private services are taken over by the trust the owners of those services should be adequately compensated. I do not blame the trust for the difficulties it has encountered. I would not have the audacity to criticize it. So long as it is being managed honestly and is doing its utmost to put the undertaking on a proper basis I am satisfied. Some services may not carry many passengers but they are available for the public. Whether it would be possible to make them pay I do not know. The railways do not pay directly but the services must be maintained because they pay indirectly. The member for Chaffey is opposed to taxpayers at Renmark contributing towards the cost of running the trust but they have as much obligation to contribute as anyone because they enjoy the benefits of the services when they visit Adelaide. If the people in the metropolitan area did not contribute towards the cost of services in the Murray areas the people there would suffer. I sympathize with those who have the responsibility of managing the trust. It is easy to criticize and condemn as some members have done, but I believe they are doing all they can to satisfy all concerned.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 p.m. to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I am sure all members are pleased to notice that the Government intends to assist in the care of aged people. However, there is one feature I do not like. By being admitted to any charitable institution these people are separated from their spouses. I would much sooner that the Government spent a larger amount so that these old married couples, who have done so much for the State, could be provided with homes and so spend their last few years together. Many of the good things we enjoy are the result of their labours. I know of many elderly people who have practically nowhere to live. Only a fortnight ago I was endeavouring to get a home for an elderly gentleman receiving a pension and unable to look after himself. I sent a letter to the Premier's secretary asking if anything could be done. I regret that the man died a few days afterwards before the case could be dealt with.

There should be no need for these institutions, but our elderly people should be provided with their own homes.

Parliament has rejected a suggestion for a State lottery to raise funds to help charitable institutions. Had this proposal been supported there would be no need to place money on the Estimates to help these organizations, and old people could be provided with their own homes. Many do not support the establishment of a lottery because they consider it is tantamount to gambling, but that is all bunkum. All people gamble in some way or other; life itself is a gamble. A person has to gamble in order to enter Parliament by laying odds of £25 to nothing that he will receive a certain number of votes. Everyone who has laid those odds is actually gambling, yet we do not allow others to gamble to help our old people. Gambling is done on the stock exchange. I hope that someone will introduce a Bill at an early date to provide for the establishment of a lottery to assist charities.

An amount of £8,500 is set aside for municipal authorities to develop tourist resorts. I do not know whether councils will do any better in this activity than they have done in some of their other operations. I do not approve of the way in which members of the Municipal Tramways Trust used to be selected. It did not necessarily mean that the most able persons were elected, but those who were the most successful in canvassing votes. If a man were a popular footballer or a prominent jockey he would possibly get more votes than a more able man. Often a man was elected because of his popularity and not because of his ability. I register a protest against the manner in which the trust has carried out its duties. I know of one man who was elected a member of the trust and before he attended his first meeting left for an overseas trip and was absent for seven months, but during that time he drew his salary. Yet, we wonder why the trust has not operated successfully. No man should be elected to the trust who has not the necessary qualifications. Canvassing for votes applied not only to the trust, but in one instance I know in the selection of a member of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. It is wrong that a man should be appointed under those circumstances.

The Government has announced that it is preparing legislation for the establishment of a Metropolitan Public Transport Council whose duty it will be to deal with the problem of co-ordinating the various forms of transport services in the metropolitan area with the

object of preventing unnecessary duplication and to secure efficiency and economy. I would favour action being taken to co-ordinate the services not only of the metropolitan area, but of the whole State. I hope something will be done in relation to those people who today are destroying our roads by excessive loading of their vehicles and who are not paying their fair share towards the upkeep of these roads. Some time ago I warned the House there would be a serious accident on the hills roads and that notice would not be taken of me until someone had been killed. Only this week the load on a trailer slipped off on the Mount Barker Road. One can imagine what would have happened had a passenger bus or private car been passing at the moment. Because of the way in which some vehicles are loaded it is a wonder there have not been many more accidents. It should be the duty of a policeman when he sees a vehicle loaded in a dangerous manner to order that the goods shall be made safe, even if it involves unloading and reloading. It will not be long before there will be a serious accident on the road and then something will be done. When the Premier was referring to earthquake damage I asked him whether the State Bank carried its own insurance, and whether it was a separate body from that known as the Government Insurance Department. The Premier said:—

I am not quite sure in what way the honourable member is trying to trick me. The position is that the State Bank carries the insurance on these houses as an agent of the Government. Advances are made on home building by the State Bank on behalf of the Government and if there are any losses the State Bank does not stand them, but the Government must meet them.

Fancy me trying to trick the Premier! As if I would dare to do it. I am always out to help him. He also said:—

In future the board will issue an insurance policy to each of the home owners so that they will know what they are insured against and what cover they are receiving for the premiums paid. Another reason why the Government hastened to come into the matter was that insurance had previously been part of the agreement in connection with the loan and a separate insurance policy was not issued. Under such circumstances it was easy for a person getting a loan to assume that he was covered. In future it is proposed to deal with the matter more on the insurance side, which is getting a little closer to what Mr. Stephens desires.

It was the Labor Party which first established the Government Insurance Department. I and the girl in my office were insured with the

Government. One day I was informed by letter that the Government had decided to discontinue the insurance and that I would have to insure with a private company. Almost in the same mail I received a communication from a private company offering me insurance. The following figures show the profits from the Government Insurance Office which were paid into general revenue:—

	£
1924-25	9,825
1925-26	14,018
1926-27	15,108
1927-28	14,224
1928-29	13,923

Mr. Brookman—What happened then?

Mr. STEPHENS—It was then that the department was closed and most of the business went to private enterprise. Some governmental insurance was retained. In 1929-30 there was a profit of £1,442, a loss of £153 in 1930-1, and a loss of £161 in 1931-2.

Mr. Travers—What happened to the insurance of the girl in the office?

Mr. STEPHENS—At that time I was proud to be the secretary of the Drivers' Union and the honourable member knows the wonderful work that the girl did for him and me when fighting cases in the court. In all the years that we fought cases together never once did we lose. In 1932-3 the Government Insurance Department returned a profit of £790, £67 in 1933-4, and £208 in 1934-5. I have been told by an insurance man that he would like to have taken over the control of the Government Insurance Department because he believed that enough profit could be made in a year to pay for all the hospital treatment required in South Australia.

There is a line dealing with the purchase of motor buses for the Education Department. I do not know whether they have already been purchased, and I wonder whether they will be used solely for the carriage of children to and from school or for the cartage of milk to schools. When I moved for free milk to be issued to school children there was a general objection from members opposite but there was not the same objection when Mr. Menzies put forward his plan to give milk to school children. I should like to see the Government establish an insurance department which would be of great help to the people of the State.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I appreciate the fact that there is acknowledgment of the work done by institutions in caring for aged people. I do not think it would be possible to have people in their declining years given greater

care than is given to them now by religious bodies. The principle behind their activity is not one of gain, but a service prompted by charity. When these factors operate the very best type of service results and today there is a recognition of that service in the subsidies paid to the religious organizations. We often hear it said that in our big public hospitals elderly people occupy many beds that are urgently needed for surgical and other medical cases. These people probably have no particular disease but are in a generally run down state because of their age and need to be in hospital, so I suggest that we look to the organizations that we are now subsidizing for some form of hospital care for these people. At present when people are not able to care for themselves, often they are forced because of their circumstances to go into hospital. By continuation of the subsidy system much could be done at these institutions, and if they are prepared to undertake the care of the aged they would relieve congestion in the big public hospitals.

I appreciate the gift of £10,000 to the victims of floods in the eastern States. We in South Australia will probably never suffer a like calamity because of the topography of our country and our low rainfall. The rivers on the eastern coast of New South Wales were once a blessing, but the recent floods were due not to natural but to artificial causes, brought about by man's destruction of the out country. Investigation of the flood rivers on the eastern coast of New South Wales would show that they are now much shallower than before we removed the top cover from the hills and allowed the country to be scoured off by the heavy monsoonal rains which washed the soil into the rivers. At one time most of those rivers would take big ships for a considerable distance, but today even the mouth of the Hunter has to be continually dredged to allow the entrance of ships into one of the principal harbours of the eastern States. We have contributed towards the flooding of the areas and it would mean a mammoth operation to correct the damage done, although ultimately we shall have to set about doing it.

We have listened today to a long criticism of the tramways, and to me it seemed like kicking a man when he is down. If an archangel came from heaven he could not make the tramways pay; that is impossible today because of the growth of this city, which has gone far beyond the termini of the tramways. Another reason is that today many people own motorcars and most of them, even

those living right on the tram tracks, drive to work. The position the trust is in today is consequential on the growth of the city and also the increased incomes of the people which enable them to provide their own transport. Putting up fares will not solve the problem; if they were to be doubled, at the end of the year we would find the same losses as the previous year. The tram tracks will not last much longer, as anyone can see when driving along them. Their edges, particularly on the inside, are worn to razor thinness and it is dangerous on many lines to drive a car with the wheels on the rails. If we are to keep trams in the metropolitan area, a colossal expenditure will be necessary to replace those tracks, and I do not think the system is worth it. Great cities like London have removed them. I do not deny that trams can shift a lot of people, but if we are to maintain them we must meet their losses as we do with the railways. The other alternative is to take tram tracks out of Adelaide lock, stock and barrel and replace them with another method of transport, because the renewal of rails would cost such a colossal sum today that we could practically buy the buses necessary to replace them with the same amount. It is inevitable that they must be relaid if it is intended to continue the tramways system because it would break a snake's back to wriggle along some of them today, as anyone driving along them will agree.

Mr. Davis asked why we should hand the tramways over to private enterprise so that it can make an exorbitant profit. That is one of the strangest contradictions I have heard. His inference was that instead of having an effective transport system providing someone with a profit it is far better that we should have a State-owned system making colossal losses. I cannot understand that form of reasoning, if it is reasoning. It would be possible to zone the metropolitan area with bus routes and give a number of people the opportunity to make them pay, and I think that should be done. I would never consent to the tremendous cost of relaying tram tracks knowing full well that after that were done we would still have something running at a colossal loss to the taxpayers. If that is the position the sooner we get rid of the whole system the better it will be for this State. Then private enterprise should be given the opportunity to run it.

Mr. Macgillivray—But it might make a profit.

Mr. QUIRKE—I hope it would. I would not expect it to run if it could not because it is only a State or Socialistic enterprise that can be kept going at a loss. We must make up our minds, and I think this House has done so, realizing that if we continue the tramways we must keep granting these huge subsidies to bolster up their losses. There is no other way out, because they cannot be run at a profit. The blame is not attachable to the people who run the trust. I have the greatest sympathy for them, and would not have their jobs for anything. I do not think it is fair to criticize them, because last year the Premier admitted that it would be necessary to spend £1,300,000 over a period of five years to entirely resuscitate the system. It is going to be a dead loss, so it should be written off entirely and an alternative system put into operation, giving someone an opportunity to make it pay. Private enterprise would run it at less cost to the people who use the present transport system. It is proposed through the Tourist Bureau to pay subsidies for providing amenities in public pleasure resorts. Councils throughout the country are experiencing a great deal of difficulty in finding money to finance these resorts. This is all very well for the districts close to the metropolitan area because there are more people to use the amenities, but there are areas in the country where the local people are the ones who use them the least.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why not leave it to private enterprise?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am going to suggest that but in this way: Today a 50 per cent subsidy is paid and the resorts are run by councils who have difficulty in finding the other 50 per cent, because the provision of amenities is costly both in the first cost and in upkeep for the caravan parks and so on that are in great demand. Recently gifts have been made to councils to enable them to seal roads provided the work can be completed before the end of June. That was very acceptable to the councils, and the corporation of which I am a member was extremely grateful for the £1,200 it received and will spend it. However, the cost of bitumen sealing today is terrific. Our practice, assuming that a macadam road is in a fit condition, is to fill in the potholes with a pre-mix, put a primer coat on, and the next day a sealer coat topped with a fine gravel or Moonta skimps. That requires two drums of primer coat and two drums of sealer to the chain, and it costs £24 for bitumen alone. The least cost for sealing a

road as we do it in Clare is the labour cost; it is the colossal price of bitumen that is killing the whole process. After meeting road construction costs, little money is left to councils for providing other amenities. The Government wants these resorts throughout the country as does everyone else. It already provides 50 per cent of the cost and I suggest that it should let the councils have the other 50 per cent on a long term loan basis as it does in respect of plant and equipment. That is not asking for anything more than a spread of the expenditure over a period of years.

Mr. O'Halloran—But it is not private enterprise.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is not necessary to have it. It is Democracy; councils looking after their own business.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is pure undiluted Socialism.

Mr. QUIRKE—One might just as well say that this whole Parliament is a Socialistic process.

Mr. O'Halloran—So it is.

Mr. QUIRKE—A fair percentage, perhaps, but not all yet. I offer the suggestion in order to make it easier for councils. The people will have to find the money through their rates, but spread over a term it would be comparatively easy and in this way they could achieve something worthwhile.

I now wish to offer some comments on school buses. Years ago, in the days of horse-drawn vehicles, road conditions in relation to traffic did not matter much; children rode their own ponies or drove horse-drawn vehicles long distances to school quite cheerfully. It is a different matter today when the route is along a main highway, but the conditions for providing school buses remain the same as they were in the horse and buggy days, so I think that where the route to a school is along a main highway carrying heavy traffic the provisions should be different from those that exist today. The main road for a child is very dangerous and parents are unwilling for children to have bicycles. Consequently the only way is to walk, and under winter conditions a main highway is a dangerous place for children. I suggest that these factors be taken into consideration when considering school bus routes on main highways as compared with routes on ordinary country roads not carrying heavy vehicular traffic. I support the first line.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I wish to comment at the outset on the speeches from the Conservative section of the House, the chief spokesman of which has just resumed his seat. Mr. Quirke took Mr. Davis, the member for Port Pirie, to task because he had expressed the opinion that it would be unwise to allow private enterprise to make a profit out of public transport by picking the eyes out of it and thereby requiring the public to carry the burden of services that could not be expected to pay under existing circumstances. I was amazed to hear the member for Stanley denounce what he called Socialism on the one hand and then proceed to the next line on the Estimates—the development of pleasure resorts—and complain that they cannot be developed with a half Socialistic policy, under which the local people, through their councils, pay half the cost and the State the other half. He is asking that they should be completely socialized.

Mr. Quirke—I did not say anything of the sort. I asked for an advance for half of it. Stick to the mark.

Mr. RICHES—So we have those who rant about what they call Socialistic enterprise making the charge that everything that does not suit them in its entirety is wrong because it is Socialistic, but hardly completing their complaint before they are crying out for further doses of Socialism. The truth is that Socialism is a way of life that is inevitable and which the people, whether they know it or not, ask for and appreciate. It is the policy that has been responsible for the development of South Australia. There is scarcely an undertaking of any magnitude in this State that has not been developed as a Socialistic enterprise. The Government has laid down that all uranium, whether above the ground or beneath, is the property of the Crown. Our coal deposits and all our country services have been developed on Socialistic lines and the people endorse that policy. They are quite satisfied with it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Try to take some of the country services away and see what the people will say.

Mr. RICHES—In 1906, when the tramways were first electrified, the Parliament of those days insisted that they should belong to the people, and I believe that that is the position today. The people want the tramways and if they depend on monopoly for success they should be under a Minister responsible to Parliament which is controlled by the people and until we

have that we will never get satisfaction in the administration of our tramways. It is wrong for this Government continually to set up trusts and hand over to them responsibilities that rightly devolve upon this Parliament. All trusts that have been set up should be answerable directly to this House through a Minister. The Labor Party has advocated that upon numerous occasions and the Government will gradually be forced to adopt that policy by the march of events and by public opinion. The Premier has resisted throughout, in debate and by his vote, motions specifically moved to co-ordinate all our public transport under one Minister. We have been told that it is wrong in principle, that it is not a policy acceptable to the Government, and on Party lines such motions have been voted out. I noticed in the Governor's Speech, however, that the Government is trying to achieve the same thing in another way by setting up a council, the details of which are not yet known to us, to control and co-ordinate all forms of public transport. This policy, which was wrong a couple of years ago, the Government will now find itself adopting because public opinion will demand it because there is no other satisfactory solution.

I join with others in expressing gratitude at the conversion of the Premier to the situation in which he is now prepared to subsidize religious organizations conducting homes for the aged. That is a notable conversion almost as startling as the one that happened on the road to Damascus, for we know that the Premier has not always been of the opinion that this is the right procedure to follow. He was able to announce to these organizations that this subsidy would be granted; he has already assured them in conference, before consulting Parliament, that the money will be paid to them and he was able to tell them this with confidence because he knows the attitude of members of the Opposition on this question and, I believe, the similar attitude of members generally. He has every reason to know that this would be supported by the House, for members have asked for it each session since 1949. When it was asked for in 1949, the Treasurer said that there was no need for it, that the Government had spare room at Northfield, and that, until Northfield was full, it would be wrong for the State to subsidize any organization conducting homes for the aged. In 1952, when the members for Port Pirie and Wallaroo and I questioned the Treasurer on this matter, he said that the old-age pension should cover the cost of accommodation which was not

primarily the responsibility of this Government. Members on this side are pleased to note the conversion of the Treasurer on this question, and they believe it is for the good of the State that the work of these bodies is to be recognized and encouraged.

The provision of these grants is only right, for those working in these organizations show a devotion to duty and a missionary outlook that cannot be recompensed by any amount of money. There is a service to the community and I am more than pleased that the Government has seen fit to provide this money. I assume that this will not be the last list of grants that we are asked to approve and that other funds and institutions that have been established to care for the aged will be subsidized. I have in mind particularly the fund established by the Bishop of Willochra for the building of a home for the aged in the country; if that cause could be subsidized the same as those organizations mentioned in these Estimates, a start could be made on the building of that home. More of such homes should be established in the country, especially in the warmer parts of the State, from which older people will not come south, particularly during the colder seasons of the year. Many old people are living in our northern areas and not receiving the care that would be available to them in any of the homes mentioned in the Estimates.

A grant of £7,600 is to be made for the care of aboriginal children at institutions, and I take it that this is in accordance with the announcement of the Minister of Works towards the end of last session that the Government is now prepared to recognize that aboriginal children kept in institutions must be fed and clothed, and that it is related to the statement that the Government will pay 25s. a week for each aboriginal child so maintained. This is a new departure and, on behalf of all recipients, I express gratitude to the Government, particularly to the Minister of Works, who took a personal interest in the introduction of this grant. Efforts are being made to bring up the generation of aboriginal children in our missions to a stage where they can take their place in society, and they need as much care and attention as white children. It takes more than 25s. a week to give them that care, and the people engaged in this work are working not for a salary but in a cause that they are prepared to serve. I have in mind a matron in charge of such a home, who was interviewed concerning her work of caring for 30 aboriginal children. A visitor

to the home saw 30 heaps of clothing being sorted out after the weekly wash and said to the matron, "I wouldn't do your job for £700 a year!" to which the matron replied, "I know this work, and I wouldn't do it for £1,000 a year; but I'm happy to do it because I believe I have been called to do it." Those aboriginal children receive a mothering that money cannot buy, and it is a great thing when the State steps in to assist in rendering that service and makes its continuation possible.

The grant toward the improvement of Tourist Bureau reserves will meet with the approval of all members. Further action should be taken, this year, to make available to the public the beautiful resorts in the lower Flinders Ranges—Alligator Gorge and Mambray Creek. I hope that members may be able to see these places for themselves, if a Parliamentary trip is arranged to Port Augusta for the opening of the regional power station, for I believe the scenery in the lower Flinders Ranges is second to none. People who at this time of the year are looking for sunshine, can find it without a great deal of expense in these ranges. However, although the Tourist Bureau has done excellent work and obtained rights over the reserves, it is still not possible, with safety, to take buses into these areas, and, until buses can go into them, the maximum benefit cannot be derived from these beauty spots, for they will be accessible only to private cars.

Further, provision should be made for the preservation of the native fauna and flora in these areas. Members of organizations such as the Field Naturalists Society and the Bushwalkers Club, as well as other people who have gone into the lower Flinders Ranges, are unanimous that the native flora, some of which is peculiar to Australia, should be preserved, but although representations to this effect have received wide support, they seem to have fallen on deaf ears, for nothing seems to have been done in this matter. The Government should consider, this session, declaring these reserves protected areas. With the reservation to which I referred, I have pleasure in supporting the first line of the Estimates.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I wish to congratulate the Government on the way it has budgeted for the current financial year. It has done well, in a total of about £50,000,000, to Budget within one per cent, and criticism of a Government accounting system that can arrive at this result can be nothing more than carping. If that is all the Opposition has to offer as criticism, it is not very damaging. At the

beginning of the financial year the Government must try to anticipate its expenditure and revenue and must consider all contingencies, including wage increases. If such wage increases were not necessary, owing to the sound policy of the Federal Government—a policy recently endorsed by Australians—it merely means that the economy of the country has been stabilized to an even greater extent than was expected. When the Government can come to the House and announce that its financial position is within one per cent of the original estimate it has something to be proud of. I congratulate the Government on proposing grants totalling £229,900 to assist the accommodation of aged persons. Of greater importance than the sum proposed is the manner in which the Government has gone about helping this section of the community. It does not propose to establish new Government institutions, but to subsidize the existing ones that are catering for aged people now and doing a good job. I thoroughly endorse the principle of assisting existing institutions rather than establishing further Government homes.

An amount of £70,400 is provided for the extension of tourist facilities in this State. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to grant this amount, but facilities provided for overseas tourists fall far short of international standards. Perhaps we can satisfy South Australians seeking a short and enjoyable holiday by extending our facilities as proposed, but we must not delude ourselves that these additional facilities will attract people from overseas. We must go much further. However, this is not entirely the Government's responsibility. When people from overseas are asked what they think of South Australia they usually say they have been pleased with private hospitality, but they are often too tactful to say what they think of tourist facilities in this State. We only get their opinions when they write books or when they get back to the other side of the world.

The Tramways Trust has come in for much criticism, but I endorse the Government's proposal to grant another £100,000 for this organization. The Leader of the Opposition recommended the establishment of a public accounts committee, but I cannot too strongly criticize his proposal. I can think of no organization that would more greatly stultify the enterprise and initiative of public servants than the appointment of a committee to take evidence from all departments and criticize every decision, if it desired. We have some

knowledge of the Congressional investigational committees appointed in the United States of America, and we know that they cramp the initiative of public servants.

Mr. Stephens—Didn't Mr. Menzies appoint a public accounts committee?

Mr. BROOKMAN—Yes, but I do not agree that it does any good. After all, there is a Minister in charge of every department and he is responsible to Parliament. A public accounts committee could call evidence from any officer below a Minister, even below heads of departments, and that would intimidate people who are trying to do an honest job. This would prevent the most energetic administration of the State's affairs. Many Opposition members levelled bitter criticism at the Tramways Trust.

Mr. Stephens—It is not responsible to a Minister.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Opposition members all agree that a Government organization should be in charge of city transport. The member for Hindmarsh criticized the trust in his usual extravagant way, and said:—

No body in the history of the world has proved its incompetency in such a short time. A year or two ago I heard him uncover a scandal that was worse than the Stavisky scandal in France before the war, but it was not mentioned subsequently by him; consequently it can be assumed that he realized later that it was not such a terrible scandal as he at first thought. Therefore, we can take with a grain of salt his assertion that the Tramways Trust is the most incompetent body in the history of the world. This Parliament may be held up to ridicule by the public when such stupid and exaggerated statements are made. The Tramways Trust board was reconstituted recently. Obviously, the Government wanted only efficient persons on the board, but these men have only had a few months in which to work. They now ask Parliament for another £100,000, which is a small sum compared with the original amount required. Simply because we are asked to vote another £100,000 we get a tirade of abuse about the Tramways Trust. I do not know the board members very well, but I believe the Government picked them carefully. If anyone can they will run the tramways successfully. The attacks that have been made on them have been stupid, ignorant and irresponsible.

Mr. Davis—That is only your opinion.

Mr. BROOKMAN—That is all I claim to give in this place. One or two members said that the tramways should be handed over to

private enterprise. I believe that private enterprise is unrivalled for efficiency in its own field, but I do not think it alone can solve our city transport problems satisfactorily. Those people who say that private enterprise should take over the city's transport entirely should tell us where it is doing so in cities comparable in size to Adelaide. I do not know of any. The Government should give us more information about the progress made at and the success or otherwise of Yalata Station. Even outside the House I have heard considerable criticism of that station from people who are by no means irresponsible. They say that it is not achieving the objects for which it was acquired. The sum of £11,000 is proposed for expenditure at the station, which is a not inconsiderable amount for one station only. We should be supplied with more information on that subject.

I am gratified to know that the Education Department is purchasing more buses. I sympathize with the Minister of Education who has to face the problem of providing school transport. It is a subject on which a decision is rarely acceptable to all people. Each parent desires his child to be collected at his home a few minutes before school opens and returned a few minutes after it closes. I know of one centre where the department has valiantly tried to cope with the problem of transporting secondary school children to a high school 20 miles distant and other children to a primary school on the same run 10 miles away. That is particularly hard on those children who are collected first. They have to be at the pick-up centre at a quarter to eight in the morning and are frequently not returned home until after 6 p.m. In the winter when it is getting dark between 5.30 and 5.45 p.m. it is a particularly difficult problem and I sympathize with the parents. The cost of running two buses on that run would not be justified at the moment.

An amount of £50,000 is to be provided for the medical school at the University of Adelaide. The necessity for this vote arises partly because the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science has expanded and is using a floor in its building which previously was utilized for the study of medical science. The Institute is performing valuable work of a quality that cannot be faulted in its scientific accuracy. Its contribution to the welfare of this State is rarely understood by the general public but much quiet work is proceeding in efforts to ascertain cures for veterinary diseases and its discoveries are only

gradually being brought to the notice of the public. The medical faculty of the University of Adelaide is held in high esteem in universities in other parts of the world and a degree at our university can scarcely be excelled in universities elsewhere. I support the first line.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I do not propose to delay the House but it is my intention to refer to the Tramways Trust. Members will recall that during the debate relating to the original allocation of a grant to the trust I said that the amount then provided would be nowhere near sufficient notwithstanding the Premier's statement to the contrary. My prediction has proved only too true. I said then that the Government was putting the cart before the horse and that it should appoint a Minister of Transport to co-ordinate the control of railways, tramways, country buses and taxicabs in order to plan an overall policy of transport for the entire State. The Transport Control Board today is taking a bite here and a bite there in its efforts to solve the country transport problem and under this measure we are to pour more money into the Tramways Trust while there is no overall co-ordinated policy on transport. The Government has announced that it proposes to co-ordinate transport and I congratulate it although I think the move is a little late. It would have been better had the Government appointed a Minister of Transport 18 months ago when he could have had time to co-ordinate the policy of the trust with the suburban railways system and taxi cabs. At present there is the unfortunate spectacle of the railways competing with the trust. Mr. Brookman suggested that many stupid things had been said during this debate. I think that a lot of time has been wasted in suggesting that private enterprise should take over the trust. No private enterprise could take over the trust with its present state of losses.

Mr. John Clark—It would not want to.

Mr. STOTT—That is so. The trust is in a mess and must be helped out of it. Private enterprise would not entertain the thought of taking it over. Only a company with an enormous capital as, for example, the B.H.P., would be capable or competent financially to run the trust as a private enterprise. I have previously referred to tramways services in other countries. Members of the Opposition will probably denounce me when I say that in many cities silent trams are used with only one operator which obviously

reduces operating costs of the system. At Washington, U.S.A., a passenger places a dollar in a box and the driver turns a wheel and this provides a certain number of chits with which to pay for trips. By this method the tram is not held up. The Government should consider the introduction of the system of having one operator on trams to save costs. The time has come when the trust must contemplate taking trams out of King William Street. The prosperity of the State is such that the number of motor vehicles has greatly increased and many people living in the suburbs are now using their cars to travel to the city instead of the trams. This is aggravating the general transport problem in the city, particularly in King William Street and other main roadways. I have in mind the Main North Road. At 5 p.m. it is almost impossible to pass a tram. Obviously, the most efficient service could be provided by buses because they could pull to the kerb to put down and pick up passengers. This would allow motor traffic an opportunity to proceed uninterrupted.

In other cities the object is to get traffic moving and to obviate bottlenecks, and that is what our trust has to consider. The Government is a little late in meeting the position and should have appointed a Minister of Transport some time ago to co-ordinate the various transport services. The Minister could then have approached Parliament for funds to carry out an overall policy. We are still voting money on the Estimates for the Tramways Trust, but there is no co-ordinated transport policy. We have reached the stage where transport is the major problem facing Parliament and the State. We are not aware of how the trust is handling its transport problem. Trams have been dispensed with in some of the outlying suburbs and buses have taken their place, but this is only a stab in the dark, there being no overall policy. The Housing Trust is establishing large numbers of homes in new areas without any consideration to the question of transport. If we had a Minister of Transport he could confer with the Minister of Housing as to what should be done in such circumstances. We do not know where we are going with our present policy.

Mr. Jennings—And we do not know where the money is going.

Mr. STOTT—I am afraid that the £100,000 proposed will not be enough for the trust, and we shall be called upon to provide still further sums.

Mr. Quirke—You can be certain it will not be enough.

Mr. STOTT—It is a pity that the trust has not a definite policy. Then Parliament could, with greater confidence, vote it money knowing that there would be a long-term policy which would eventually result in the position being righted. I congratulate the Government on its foresight in providing money for the housing of the aged. They are deserving of all the help the Government and Parliament can give.

I am pleased that the Government has placed a sum on the Estimates to provide additional school buses. I commend its policy of establishing area schools. This provides the students with the advantage of instruction from teachers of a high standard. Unfortunately in some outlying districts the Department of Education has been a little niggardly in providing subsidies to parents to enable their children to get to school. Sometimes a bus would have to travel a considerable distance to pick up only two or three children. The department says that a bus is not warranted in such circumstances and the children have to get to school the best way they can. In some instances the parents club together to provide a conveyance and the Government pays a subsidy. In districts where there are not sufficient children it is impossible to get a bus operator to run, and the present Government subsidy is insufficient to provide an adequate service. It means that the parents have to pay something out of their own pockets to get the children transported to school. The cost of running buses has increased and the Government must realize that the grants should be increased accordingly. Children are entitled to be educated and every possible assistance should be given. Generally, I congratulate the Government in getting so close to its estimates. An overall policy is desired in connection with our transport systems. If we had one we would know where we were going and we would not have a repetition of voting moneys.

First line passed.

TREASURER AND MINISTER OF IMMIGRATION.

Publicity and Tourist Bureau and Immigration Department, £70,400.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I am pleased that land is to be purchased for the establishment of a recreation reserve at West Beach. The Government proposes to spend £60,100. I believe that £20,000 is to be voted in each of the first five years, and that the three local councils will contribute towards the cost of the

scheme. It is asking a lot of a council to give up land to the Government and lose revenue thereby, yet still have to pay towards the cost of the scheme. For years the beach councils particularly have provided playgrounds for people in the metropolitan area. People who buy land in these coastal areas pay higher prices for it and have to meet higher rates. Can the Premier say what provision has been made, if any, to relieve the councils concerned of what seems to be an unjust call upon them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This matter has been the subject of a discussion with the councils concerned. In the first place they requested that land should be acquired. The first request came from the Henley and Grange Corporation for the Government to purchase land which it would develop.

Mr. O'Halloran—And stand all the costs?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. It was a project that I could not approve. It was to buy land which had been cut up for building blocks at excessively high prices, and it would have only given a limited area to the corporation. If we are to buy building blocks for recreation purposes the Treasury will need a very large sum of money. I told the deputation and the two adjoining corporations that the Housing Trust had land which it proposed to use for building purposes, but which I would consider as a suitable site for a recreation area if the councils themselves approved the proposal and in effect constituted a trust to manage the activity. I further told the councils that to give them a start in the matter I would recommend that Parliament vote £20,000 outright, and that the agreement would include the councils collectively covering that £20,000 over five years. In other words, their collective obligation over the five years would be £4,000 a year. That was considered reasonable by the councils, and it still is, and a request has been made for money to enable the scheme to proceed. It is not a proposition which has been forced on the councils. Since the Government purchased the land there have been a number of eager buyers at increased prices so that the land can be used for other purposes, particularly housing. It is true that the area will constitute something valuable to a large number of people because it will mean development of tremendous advantage to that part of the State. I do not think it is an unreasonable proposition when the Government contributes £60,000 against £20,000 by the councils. When the matter was discussed with them they expressed their appreciation of what they

termed an act of generosity by the Government. The majority of them still think that way.

Mr. O'Halloran—When you say the majority, do you mean that somebody has retracted?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—To the extent that one of the councils at a meeting decided to request the others to re-open the question of their payments. A conference was held and the other councils were requested to support the application for a review of the payments, but two councils said they would not under any circumstances support the move because they had made an agreement they believed to be satisfactory. No approach has been made to the Government to vary in any way the original agreement submitted. I believe that the proposals put forward have the strong support of the districts concerned and that they are very much in their interests, but if honourable members have other views they will have ample opportunity to discuss the matter, because before it can become effective supplementary legislation will be necessary to set up the proposed trust. If members disapprove of the proposals I can assure them that the Housing Trust will be pleased to take back its land and everyone will be the best of friends. The supplementary legislation is now being worked out by the Parliamentary Draftsman and will be submitted to the local authorities before being introduced in this House.

Mr. STOTT—Some time ago the electrification of the suburban railway system was mentioned in Parliament. I do not know whether the proposal of the Railways Department was tabled in Parliament, but I know that a plan was prepared for the electrification of the suburban system to Glenelg, from there to West Beach, Henley Beach, Woodville and then to the city on a circuit. There was also some talk at that time of having an underground system of electrified railways through the city. If the land purchased at West Beach is diverted for recreation purposes does that mean that the Government has dropped its electrification scheme? Has the Government a new policy with regard to electrifying the suburban system, or what is proposed to be done?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—One of the conditions under which the land will be handed over to councils in trust is that if at any subsequent time any of the land is required for public utility purposes it will be made available, the Government undertaking not to capriciously

acquire land on which expensive improvements have been made. The proposal to electrify the suburban railways was announced in connection with an agreement entered into with the Commonwealth for the standardization of all our main rail gauges, which required us not only to standardize the gauges on the mainland but to provide different equipment for operating them. The opportunity was being taken at that time to electrify systems in the metropolitan area, because this could be undertaken under those circumstances relatively cheaply for the State as part of the standardization proposals. Since the agreement was entered into the amount of funds available under the agreement have not been sufficient to carry out a very large programme. The work in the South-East has not been completed, and as Mr. Corcoran mentioned the other day, it is being slowed down because of the small amount available—about £1,000,000 a year on what was a £27,000,000 programme. The Government has not abandoned the scheme for electrification of suburban railways. There is no occasion at the moment to make a decision, nor do I think it desirable to do so. From the land acquired at West Beach a certain portion will be available for the Government at any time.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £147,161—passed.

MINISTER OF LANDS AND MINISTER OF
REPATRIATION.

Miscellaneous, £15,400—passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS.

Aborigines Department, £18,669—passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Education Department, £30,000; miscellaneous, £50,000—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1.)

The Supplementary Estimates having been adopted by the House, an Appropriation Bill for £561,530 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. T. Playford and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time. It is based on the Supplementary Estimates which have been dealt with by this House. Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of moneys totalling £561,530, which is the total

amount provided for in the Estimates. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall only have available to him, for payments, such amounts as are first authorized by His Excellency the Governor by warrant, and that the receipts of the payees shall be evidence of the payments made and the Treasurer shall be allowed credit accordingly.

Clause 5 provides for Parliamentary authority for payments which have been made to two persons as rewards for the finding of uranium. The sum of £5,000 was paid to Mr. W. Wenham in January last in connection with the finding of a uranium deposit at Myponga, and £50 was paid to Mr. J. Spooner in April for the finding of uranium in the Adelaide Hills. A variation of the Mining Regulations under the Mining Act is being made to provide for the payment of rewards, but at the date these payments were made the regulations had not been approved by His Excellency in Executive Council. To keep faith with the finders of the uranium deposits the Government made the payments from funds in hand. Clause 5 is not an appropriation of money but a validation of payments already made. Under the Mining Act a general provision is made for the payment of rewards for the finding of minerals, but at the time that provision was drawn up uranium was not included in the schedule. That has since been done and it is proposed as a general policy to pay rewards much on the same scale as apply in Commonwealth Territories for the finding of uranium deposits. The awards will be based on the economic value of the finds and the overall amount provided by the regulation now before the House, not exceeding a total of £25,000.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I agree entirely with most of what the Treasurer said, but I am concerned that rewards for the finding of uranium should be restricted to £25,000. There should be some cognizance of the value of the find. We are encouraging people to search for this valuable mineral and that is a wise course to follow, but circumstances may arise when £25,000 would not be sufficient, and that is a matter which might be further considered by the Government. In other words, if, after we have granted rewards of various sums, someone finds a very valuable deposit there might not be enough remaining in the fund to compensate him adequately and proportionately to rewards paid to others. I believe these rewards are mainly paid to prospectors and this may be designed to induce other prospectors to search

for something different, so we might well consider whether we should be able to provide for an adequate reward for something real worthwhile. After all, one does not know how valuable the finds will turn out to be. The Treasurer should give the House more information on the Government's policy of rewarding people according to the value of their finds.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This Government has accepted, as a matter of policy, the procedure followed by the Commonwealth Government in its territories. The payment of a reward with a maximum of £25,000 has been followed as a matter of principle in the Northern Territory for some years. Under Commonwealth procedure the reward is tax-free, and the Commonwealth Government has agreed that any reward made for any South Australian find will also be exempt from taxation. If a person finds a uranium deposit and reports it to the Mines Department, it is investigated by the geologists in the department, its value assessed and a recommendation made by the department for the payment of an initial reward. In some instances that will be the total amount paid, for the deposit

may be only on the surface, but in other instances the deposit may prove to be valuable.

Mr. O'Halloran—Is the initial reward the final reward?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Not if economic circumstances justify a further reward. The original discoverer of the Rum Jungle field has secured from the Commonwealth Government the maximum reward of £25,000. At some time after a deposit has been found, consideration is given as to whether a further reward is justified by its value. My Government desires to give every encouragement to prospectors to look for this valuable mineral, and it realizes that it is only by keeping faith with prospectors that it shall have them keen on their job. If circumstances justified it, I would not hesitate to approach Parliament for an additional amount. Every attempt will be made to deal fairly with prospectors.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 10, at 2 p.m.