

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 22, 1954.

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

QUESTIONS.**CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Mr. **FRANK WALSH**—During the debate on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill on September 8 the Premier said:—

I merely signify that the Government has almost completed the preparation of its Bill to provide for the appointment of a commission that will have the duty of examining the present electoral boundaries and make recommendations to Parliament on alterations that should take place.

Can he say whether organizations and other interested bodies will be able to give evidence before the commission?

The Hon. **T. PLAYFORD**—Yes.

PUBLIC WORKS INQUIRIES.

Mr. **DUNKS**—During the Address in Reply debate I said I thought the cost of public works necessitating an inquiry by the Public Works Committee should be increased from £30,000 to £60,000 to coincide with the change in the value of money. Did the Premier take note of my remarks and is it intended to alter the Act?

The Hon. **T. PLAYFORD**—I did take note of what the honourable member said. It is in connection with schools that the change in the value of money particularly applies. Normally a number of school projects would not require investigation by the committee. The committee regards them as nominal inquiries but they now come within the scope of the Act. The proposed alteration would exclude them. The Acts Interpretation Act says that all legislation should be remedial. The Government has had the utmost co-operation from the committee in connection with matters of the kind mentioned by the honourable member. In a matter of a few days it has presented reports in regard to school projects. So there has been no delay on account of the £30,000 limitation and the Government does not intend to introduce amending legislation this session.

SEWERAGE OF WESTERN DISTRICT.

Mr. **FRED WALSH**—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding the sewerage of the area east of the River Torrens and adjacent to and south of the Henley Beach Road?

The Hon. **M. McINTOSH**—Taking the area as the Fulham Park area, I have given approval for the extension of sewers in Henley Beach Road, Rutland, and Strathmore and Netley Avenues, and it is expected to commence laying sewers in two or three weeks' time. Depending upon the construction difficulty met with in the waterlogged ground where ground water is encountered at shallow depths the work should be completed in about six to seven weeks from commencement.

BAROSSA AND WARREN WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. **TEUSNER**—Yesterday I asked the Minister of Works a question about the position of water supplies in the Barossa Valley and the area reticulated by the Warren Reservoir. The Minister referred to certain proposals that were under consideration by the Government for the enlargement of the Warren trunk main, and for a link up of the Warren system with the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. It was indicated that the estimated cost of the plan was £3,000,000. Today's *Advertiser* says that the establishment of a 10-mile connecting link from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline to the Warren Reservoir would cost more than £3,000,000. Can the Minister say what the actual estimated cost is so that the matter can be clarified?

The Hon. **M. McINTOSH**—I ask the *Advertiser* to rectify an obvious error. I sent up a carbon copy of my statement and I distinctly referred to the proposals for the improvement to the Warren main and said that the cost of £3,000,000 was beyond the resources of the Government, and that a 10-mile link was being considered. Obviously a 10-mile link would not cost £3,000,000. The estimated cost is £138,000. The matter has been before the Public Works Committee and been recommended. In view of the lowness of the level of Warren reservoir Cabinet has agreed that the extension should be made forthwith, but it will take some time to do it. In the meantime the Engineer-in-Chief and the Engineer for Water Supply are considering whether the link can be made early enough to be a safeguard against a water shortage next summer. Calculations are being made and I shall report to the honourable member, for the benefit of his constituents, the steps decided on. The work will go ahead at a cost of £138,000. I hope a correction will be made by the *Advertiser*, because it is damaging to say that a 10-mile link will cost £3,000,000.

ORDNANCE WORKS AT SALISBURY.

Mr. RICHES—In the *Mail* last week-end there was a statement that an army ordnance depot was to be established near Salisbury. The article also said that at least portion of the equipment used at the depot would have relation to work being carried out at the Rocket Range. Can the Premier say whether the last word has been said in the selection of the site for the depot, and has any application been made to the Commonwealth authorities to have the depot situated somewhere in the north of the State, having regard to the fact that some of the equipment will be used at the Rocket Range and the general desirability of decentralizing population as well as installations of this kind?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not aware that the last word has been spoken on this matter because it is possible that the honourable member may ask another question next week. It deals with the defence of the Commonwealth and under the Constitution that is under Commonwealth control. The State has no direct or indirect say in the matter. If the honourable member desires I shall forward his comments to the appropriate military authorities of the Commonwealth, but I presume that they have taken into account the functions that this ordnance has to supply and where its services are necessary, and I know that during the war there was such a depot in the very area concerned. It was established under war conditions and I presume it must have adequately met those requirements, which would of course embrace not only the country areas but a large activity in the metropolitan area. Any ordnance established in the country would obviously be badly placed for meeting the requirements of national training near the city.

LAND AGENTS' ACTIVITIES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Some time ago I drew the Premier's attention to advertisements that appeared in the local press about a land agent who desired to get houses for sale at a substantial figure. The Premier expressed the opinion that the advertisement was a spurious one, and had simply been inserted to attract business to the firm and that there had not been much substance behind it. Last week there was another instance of a land agent getting publicity, this time in the law courts. It seems that he got away with £20,000 of hard-earned money from various people who gave him money for the purpose, I understand,

of building houses. I have the Act concerned before me, and it seems that it was drawn up to give full protection to people who deal with land and estate agents. Parliament set up a board with various powers, and a bond can be required from people operating under the Act. Land agents can be required to operate trust accounts, and the board has power to inquire into misconduct. In spite of all those precautions we still find an unsatisfactory state of affairs. I ask the Premier whether we would not be better off without this type of legislation, for it seems to me that it gives a false sense of security. The ordinary people who are prepared to deal with land agents think that Parliament has passed an Act giving them complete protection. If the Government is not prepared to abolish the legislation will it make the Act more watertight so that more protection will be given to those who deal with land agents?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I agree that the Act has all the weaknesses of Acts of this kind which purport to protect the people but which, of course, in some instances fail to protect them. I obtained from the Crown Solicitor an opinion on the previous case that the honourable member brought forward, and I have it with me if he desires to read it. The Crown Solicitor was of opinion that no offence had been committed and did not consider that any prosecution would be likely to succeed. However, I will refer both the honourable member's questions to the board (I think there is a board controlling these activities), pointing out that unless the legislation is adequately policed Parliament will have to see that other appropriate steps are taken. I will get a report for the honourable member in due course.

WASLEYS TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—During the Address in Reply debate I pointed out the difficulties of working people at Wasleys who were unable to catch a train early in the morning to get to their employment. For that reason they are forced to board away from Wasleys for the whole of the week, to the detriment of that town. At present there is a train from Roseworthy at 6.11 a.m., but unfortunately Roseworthy is six miles from Wasleys. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Railways again bring this matter to the attention of his colleague to see whether anything can be done in this matter? I made further investigations recently and find that

over 50 men and women, some young people, are forced to board away from home for the whole of the week.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I shall be glad to take that matter up with the Minister of Railways.

FERRY AVENUE-WATTLE AVENUE LEVEL CROSSING.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about providing a level crossing at the junction of Ferry Avenue and Wattle Avenue, Plympton Park?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As promised, I directed the honourable member's question to the Tramways Trust, and I have the following reply from the general manager:—

The trust does not contemplate providing a crossing over its reserved track at this location. It would cost approximately £2,250 to construct the roadway, fence, and re-locate the stopping-places now situated a few chains to the west. The provision of a new crossing would increase road hazards and slow down tram traffic. A vehicular crossing is provided at the Cross Road intersection, some 20 chains east of Ferry Avenue, which is a convenient crossing point.

PORT PIRIE TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Railways a reply to the question I asked on September 1 about the Port Pirie to Adelaide section of the East-West express?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have received the following reply from the Railways Commissioner, forwarded through my colleague:—

This train, on Saturdays, is scheduled to arrive in Adelaide at 4.25 p.m. and on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, it is scheduled to arrive at 3.35 p.m., so that it appears Mr. Walsh was under a misapprehension in respect of the scheduled arrival time of the train on Saturdays. Actually, on the day in question the train arrived in Adelaide at 4.24 p.m., or one minute early, although it had departed from Port Pirie Junction two minutes behind schedule. The stops referred to by Mr. Walsh were necessary to effect the change of the electric staff at unattended stations.

I think the following is the more important point:—

It is not feasible to attach the cafeteria car to the up West-East trains from Port Pirie Junction because of difficulties in rostering the cafeteria crew and in providing quarters for the crew at Port Pirie overnight. It is intended, however, to provide, in the new time table which is now being prepared for the running of the East-West train between Melbourne and Perth, for the train to stop at Bowmans for refreshments. It will be appreciated that this time table is a matter for

the four railway systems involved in the movement, and we will not be able to make the necessary adjustments until all the systems have agreed to the new time table.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Mr. Frank Walsh (for Mr. O'HALLORAN), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act relating to long service leave. Read a first time.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 8. Page 633.)

Mr. DUNKS (Mitcham)—In continuing the debate on this important Bill I regret that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) is unavoidably absent this afternoon. While he was explaining the Bill I interjected on a few occasions and, from his replies to those interjections, I gleaned a few of his thoughts that were not disclosed in his second reading explanation. Had he been here this afternoon he might have interjected while I was speaking and we might thereby have arrived at agreement on some matters. I agree with a few of the provisions of the Bill, but there are others with which I disagree. I will not speak at length in this debate, for I spoke at some length on a similar Bill last year. I am delighted to note that Mr. O'Halloran has evidently taken some notice of some of the things that were said by Government members in last year's debate.

Clause 5 provides that the size of this House shall be increased from 39 to 45 members but I consider its present size and composition are both sufficient and sufficiently representative of electors to enable it to do its work. Further the expenses of running the country are so high that we should at all times try to keep down those expenses, and, if the number of members is increased by six, the expenses of running this House will be increased by about £7,000, which I consider unnecessary. One provision of the Bill departs entirely from the single-member electoral system that has operated here for several years and which operates in the Federal, Victorian and New South Wales Parliaments. I also imagine that Western Australia has single electorates. It is desirable that we should stick to that system and not take the retrograde step of returning to the multi-member electorates that operated in South Australia prior to 1938. When Mr. O'Halloran was speaking, I asked him why

he had departed from the single electorate set-up, and some members may have thought that I was accusing him of departing from the principle expressed in his Bill last session; but I was asking him why he had departed from a principle that had operated so successfully since 1938.

Mr. Lawn—Will you amend the Bill to provide for single electorates.

Mr. DUNKS—As the honourable member knows, I have no opportunity to move an amendment, and if such an amendment were moved, I would have only the right of a casting vote. I never promise how I will exercise such a vote, for certain principles govern that matter and I prefer to wait and see what is done in Committee and whether I will be called upon to cast my vote. I do not like the way the Bill divides the State into zones. A division of the State into equal zones might have given some satisfaction to members, but the Bill departs entirely from that principle by dividing the State into two parts—the northern sparsely settled areas, and the rest of the State, including city and country electorates. That division does not appeal to me. Last year I said it was necessary to examine the electorates and find out where population movements had taken place and whether it was necessary to alter the boundaries. Had that been done and the single-member electorates retained, I would have felt more inclined to support this measure.

Although the principle of proportional representation is not expressed in the Bill, I feel certain, after listening to some members speak, that if it is passed, Mr. O'Halloran will introduce another Bill to give effect to that principle.

Mr. John Clark—That is so.

Mr. DUNKS—I hate multiple electorates and I will have nothing to do with proportional representation. I consider that the two-Party system, as we know it today with the chance of Independents being returned, is satisfactory. I do not discredit the efforts of Independents; I consider they are a great help in this House and we hear some able Independent debaters from time to time. The Independents sometimes offer another line of thought, which is valuable, and I give them full marks for the part they play. It does not mean that we must bring in an Independent but if an Independent can prove that his ideals are better than Party ideals then he becomes eligible. In 1938 the Independents could have formed a Government.

Mr. McAlees—What was their policy?

Mr. DUNKS—If they had formed a Government they would have had a Party and a policy. I pay a tribute to the work done by certain Independents. We should not make it possible, however, for enough of them to be here to form a Government.

Mr. Stott—Do you resent Independents being here?

Mr. DUNKS—I thought I made it plain that I did not. I said that I appreciated their work, but that an Independent had to prove himself eligible without having a link with a Party. The position is not a happy one if in a three-member district there is one Liberal, one Labor and one Independent representative. I have represented a multiple electorate. I do not see many here today who were members of the 1933 Parliament. There is a saying "If you want to learn travel the road."

Mr. Stephens—Have you ever travelled to Port Adelaide?

Mr. DUNKS—I was in Port Adelaide in 1927. I had something done to me at Port Adelaide which was most discourteous, and which would not have happened in Mitcham. I was at the Town Hall and I got up to propose a vote of thanks to Mr. S. M. Bruce, who later became Prime Minister of the Commonwealth. For once in my life I was counted out, and I could not make my speech. Later, I held an election meeting at Rosewater when someone called a policeman to preserve order in the hall. When he arrived everybody walked out of the hall. Half the people went to the other side of the road and were addressed by a Labor man. The remainder stayed on my side of the road and I addressed them. I have had experience of three-member districts and I will not support them. This Bill will not pass this session but the day may arrive when the proposals will be adopted and when that is done my remarks of today will be remembered.

Mr. Stephens—The day may arrive when justice will be done?

Mr. DUNKS—It is a matter of opinion. I have my views on electoral justice. The electoral position in this State is to be examined by a Royal Commission, as proposed by the Premier. I do not know what its terms of reference will be, but I should think that they would be along the lines of the reference suggested by the Leader of the Opposition for his distribution committee. He suggests that the committee take into account community or diversity of interests, means of communication, physical features and existing

boundaries of subdivision. When the Premier introduces his Bill for the appointment of the Royal Commission he could take note of these things. Those are the things that have to be considered and I thought they could very well be considered under a system of single electorates.

I now come to the deliberations of the commission proposed to be appointed under the Bill, which states that the commissioners can receive objections and suggestions. For some peculiar reason these must be in writing. I think it could very well have been inserted that persons could appear before the commission and give evidence and be cross-examined. If the Leader of the Opposition gets the Bill past the second reading stage he would be wise to amend it in Committee to provide for people to go of their own volition before the commissioners to give evidence, and that the commissioners may command people to appear before them, for Royal Commissions have that power. Having received the objections the commissioners may then make their decision, and their report is laid before Parliament. I understand that if there is no objection by seven days the report becomes law. If any objection is made the Minister may—and only “may”—refer the report back to the commissioners for further consideration. I think that is a wise provision, but it should be “shall” instead of “may.” If it comes before the House again the House can then come to a decision on whether it is fair to accept an alteration from the distribution committee or whether it wants to refer the question back for further consideration. This is something that must be carefully handled. However, I am quite open to suggestions and I am prepared to debate something in the nature of alteration, for I can see the drift from the country, in some instances into the metropolitan area, and in other instances from one electorate into another. The population in some electorates has been reduced by 2,000 or 3,000 and in others it has increased by even more than that. One would be foolish to suggest that there is no necessity to make any alteration and I am prepared to listen to suggestions, but only if they leave the present number of members at 39, with single electorates. It is a much greater honour to represent a single electorate than a multiple.

Mr. Jennings—Are you bound to the present ratio between country and city?

Mr. DUNKS—I think it should remain as at present. We must remember that when boundaries were last altered this State was a

big primary producing State, and although Parliament has enticed secondary industries to South Australia we must remember that we are not sending many manufactured goods out of Australia. We still rely on our primary industries to bring money back into this country from other parts of the world. I desire to retain the present ratio between country and city because of the great distance that country members have to travel, and the size of their electorates. I do not intend to vote for the second reading because I do not think the Bill can be amended in the way that I think it should be, but if it passes the second reading and it is amended to provide for single electorates, to retain the existing country-city ratio, and retain 39 members in this House I shall examine it to see whether I can support it.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the Bill. I listened with great interest to the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. He spoke, almost with tears in his voice, and an expression of agony on his face for fear of multiple electorates. He raised the bogey of what would happen if we were to have Liberals, Labor members, Independents and Communists representing our people. He nearly brought tears to my eyes, but to check them I looked upwards and thought I saw faces above representing the angels and that I saw a change of expression upon their faces and heard them say “Tell me a story.” The story that was not told by Mr. Dunks was that he feared multiple electorates because he knew that Labor members gave their whole time to their Parliamentary business. They have no earnings apart from their Parliamentary salary and they can outserve the Liberals at every turn.

Mr. Dunks—Is that a fact?

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, because Liberal members have to divide their interests. The honourable member surely objected to Independents in this House and said that we should, in effect, frame a Constitution that would debar them from Parliament. The Australian Labor Party desires only one thing under this Bill, namely, that the people shall have the right to elect the type of representative that they want and the type of Government that they want. Mr. Dunks opposed that principle this afternoon. If, under a just electoral system, the people show that they want a majority of Independents in this House, they are entitled to that, and if, under such a system, they show they want a Liberal Government, they should get

it. I was pleased to hear Mr. Dunks say that the Leader of the Opposition had noted the remarks made by Government members last year. Mr. O'Halloran has framed this Bill to meet the principal objections made then, but Government members are voicing unfounded objections to it.

Mr. Quirke—He that is not with me is against me.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. The Bill provides for the appointment of a committee comprising the State Electoral Officer, the Surveyor-General and another person to be appointed by the Government. Its job will be to create two zones: one covering the northern part of the State and divided into two districts, the other comprising the remainder of the State and containing thirteen districts. Mr. Dunks said that clause 8 should be amended to provide that Parliament "shall" refer a scheme back to the committee if any objection is made, but that would mean that this House would have no discretionary power, and the Labor Party does not desire to take away any of Parliament's discretionary power. The arguments of members opposite have no foundation. The Premier has made it clear that he believes in the retention of the ratio of two country members to one metropolitan member.

Mr. John Clark—You know why.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, but the Premier said it was necessary if the country were to obtain amenities equal to those enjoyed by people in the metropolitan area. I point out, however, that the present electoral system has operated for almost 20 years, and the disparity between the standard of city and country amenities has never been greater. Recently the member for Chaffey (Mr. Macgillivray) said that the Government was spending money on amenities in the metropolitan area in order to attract people from country areas, and charged it with pursuing a deliberate policy in this regard. Earlier in this debate the Premier said:—

I believe it is impossible to separate country districts. Many members ask question in the House, but if someone were to ask me which member had the most problems in his district I would say a member representing one of the small districts, such as Wallaroo. It is a district with a substantial population in a relatively small area, but it has lost its means of livelihood and the industries that supported it.

Mr. Shannon then interjected that Wallaroo was one of the underprivileged districts. That is true, and we often hear the member for

the district (Mr. McAlees) say that the only advantages ever obtained by it have been given by Labor Governments. The Wallaroo jetty was built by the Gunn Government, and the Cresco fertilizer works and the grain distillery were established through the efforts of Labor Governments. Mr. McAlees would give much to see a change of Government so that more amenities might be secured for Wallaroo.

Mr. McAlees—It's the only chance we have.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. All this talk about retaining the present ratio of 2 to 1 in favour of the country is so much eye-wash. Mr. Shannon told us that we should examine the political situation in Queensland and New South Wales, and, as I believed that I had not heard aright, I asked him, "Did you say New South Wales?" He replied:—

Yes. The honourable members seems to imagine that the Labor Party in New South Wales has not a policy of keeping in office.

Evidently Government members opposing this Bill are concerned only with retaining office irrespective of the cost to the State and the retarding of the State's progress caused by the Playford Government. In 1952 a new electoral distribution was effected in New South Wales, and of a total of 94 seats 48 are in the metropolitan area and 46 in the country; but it is interesting to note that 58.5 per cent of New South Wales electors receive 51 per cent of the representation in the New South Wales Lower House. The country areas, with 41.5 per cent of the total electors, receive 49 per cent of the representation. Mr. Shannon would have us believe that that is a gerrymander and that the Liberals received most of the votes cast, but in the 1953 election the Labor Party had an overall majority of 155,684 votes. Only those steeped in hypocrisy would suggest a gerrymander in New South Wales. Mr. Shannon also said that there was a gerrymander in Queensland. Under the Electoral Act of 1950 that State was divided into four zones, metropolitan, south-east, north and west. The number of members was increased from 62 to 75. South Australia is the only State that keeps its members of Parliament below the proper number. In Queensland the number of seats allotted were:—Metropolitan area 24, south-east 28, north 13, and west 10. In the 1953 elections the Labor Party had an overall majority of 39,058 votes. In the South Australian 1953 elections Labor candidates received 166,526 votes and Liberal candidates 119,003. That indicates a gerrymander. This

Bill proposes a just electoral system. I spoke on this matter last session. It is becoming a hardy annual but we believe that the constant dripping of water wears away the hardest stone. That is why the Bill has been introduced again.

Not even young Liberals are convinced that there has not been a gerrymander in this State. In the 1953 elections the number of electors in Gumeracha was 6,430, in Albert 6,125, in Yorke Peninsula 6,395, in Newcastle 3,989, and in Young 4,218. For the five seats the total number of electors was 27,157, exactly 3,222 less than the number in the Port Adelaide district, 30,379. Onkaparinga had 7,995 electors, Rocky River 4,719, Angas 6,391, and Gouger 6,640. For the four seats there was a total number of electors of 25,745, or 45 less than the number in Goodwood, 25,790. Stirling had 7,004 electors, Light 5,430, Burra 4,336, and Eyre 5,084. In these four districts there were 21,854 electors, or 2,390 less than the number in Semaphore, 24,244. I understand that the position has become worse. Thirteen Liberal and Country League members represent 74,756 electors, or 5,657 less than three members of the Labor Party, who represent 80,413 electors. Yet we say we live in a democracy.

The Government proposes to introduce amending electoral legislation. I understand that the 1938 ratio is to be maintained, but the position was bad then and most undemocratic. It deserves the greatest condemnation. Then for every 100 people represented by a country member 276 were represented by a metropolitan member. In 1941 the ratio was 100 to 285. It was 100 to 307 in 1944, 100 to 320 in 1947, 100 to 320 in 1950, and 100 to 327 in 1953. The ratio is now three to one and with the trend of the times the position must worsen. Mr. Dunks said that the Bill will not pass this session. I believe it will because justice must prevail. When people stop to think of the price paid to retain our democracy, and the sacrifices made by the women of this country in the fight against dictatorship, this necessary reform cannot be long delayed. I trust that the second reading will be carried and if amendments are necessary they can be made in Committee. I ask members to remember the things cherished throughout the British Commonwealth and the things that give importance to individuals. They should not think only of bricks and mortar, pounds, shillings and pence, dusty acres of land and waste lands, but that humanity deserves the right to have the Government it desires, and

to dismiss the Government it does not want. If this happens we shall then have government of the people by the people for the people.

Mr. JENNINGS (Prospect)—I support the Bill. I do not retreat one scrap from the principle of one vote one value. I believe in that principle without any qualification or equivocation. It is typical of those bereft of argument to criticize Labor members when they introduce a Bill that makes some attempt to meet the more plausible arguments raised against the measure introduced last session. On this side we do not do what the Premier frequently does and say, "This is an important Bill. Take it or leave it." In order to make progress we genuinely attempt to meet the more reasonable of the views held by Government members. In this Bill we have not compromised our principles.

Mr. Brookman—Do you mean that in this Bill you are going half-way towards that?

Mr. JENNINGS—We are still committed to the principle of one vote one value, but we were obliged to temper idealism with realism to the extent of recognizing that if this Bill were successful it would be a big step towards achieving the principle of one vote one value. We realize that a Bill for the immediate attainment of that principle would be far too just and democratic to be accepted by members opposite who oppose it because they fear it.

Mr. Brookman—Do you believe in State Parliaments?

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes. I remind members that to break principles one first must have principles. No-one could accuse the Liberal Party of breaking its principles, for it has not got any. The Premier said that the proposal to establish a separate zone for sparsely settled areas in the north of the State was unrealistic because it was already an area receiving considerable favours from the Government. He particularly mentioned the district of Stuart represented by Mr. Riches. However, this district provides a perfect answer to the Premier's own argument that we have heard so often, namely, that large electorates suffer because of the difficulty of contact between elector and representative. We all know that Stuart is the largest and most populous country electorate. The same story that the Premier told about Stuart applies, in reverse, to the district of Wallaroo. He said that this district has tremendous problems, yet it is of small area and comparatively thickly populated. On that basis it should be one of the most flourishing

districts in the State, according to the Premier's argument. That shows clearly that the Premier's argument that if we divide country areas into districts of somewhat equal population it would react to the detriment of the country has no validity at all. The only reason why the Labor Party has provided for two zones under this Bill is to meet what we thought was legitimate argument put forward sincerely last year by the Government that in the sparsely settled country areas there would, if the electorates were changed to multiple electorates, be districts so large that the members would have great difficulty in covering the territory.

Mr. Brookman—Do you really think you have messed up a good Bill in order to meet our objections?

Mr. JENNINGS—The Bill is not as good as it would have been had we stuck firmly to the principle of one vote one value; nevertheless we believe we shall be achieving something if we get it through. I think that the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) in speaking on this Bill entered for the first time into the debate on such a measure. He spent much time in talking about what happened during a debate between him and the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) at the University. As Mr. Shannon got a father of a thrashing there he waited until Mr. Dunstan had spoken on this Bill and then followed him up. Mr. Shannon claimed that Mr. Dunstan had some prior knowledge of what would happen at the University, but that that knowledge was not shared by him. I share the same office as Mr. Dunstan, and I know that he was invited to debate electoral reform at the University, but he knew no more about the arrangements than Mr. Shannon. However, as he was to debate such an important topic he naturally took it seriously. Mr. Shannon apparently considered that he was being invited as a guest of honour to teach University students how to debate. I commend him for his courage in debating against the member for Norwood, for I have great respect for the courage of anyone challenging Mr. Dunstan in debate. I also offer him my sympathy. Mr. Shannon claimed that Mr. Dunstan stacked the audience, but I think the boot was on the other foot. I have been informed that certain Liberals even voted for Mr. Dunstan, and I know that 40 per cent of those who voted against him were Liberal members of Parliament and their wives. I am sure there were no Labor members of Parliament there.

Mr. Shannon did his best to retaliate in this debate. He referred to the political position in Queensland and endeavoured to mislead the House by saying that whereas the Liberal Party holds 13 of the 18 Queensland Federal seats the Labor Party governs Queensland, but he did not say that people are at liberty to vote different ways at different elections.

At the last State elections in Queensland the Labor Party gained a majority of the total votes cast, which justified its retention of office, but at the last few Federal elections Labor has not received a majority. I cannot understand that, but the point is that at the last State election in Queensland the majority of people voted Labor. During this debate, as on previous occasions, we have been told what happened in South Australia in 1938 after the gerrymander was perpetrated. We were told that a host of Independents were returned, but the significant thing is that most of them were returned from seats that were conservative by inclination. Since the absorption of some Independents into the Liberal Party and the defeat of others by Liberal candidates, those seats have been consistently held by Liberal members. Obviously, in 1938, after the Butler Government had increased its own life in this House by two years, it became unpopular in the electorates. Further, because of internal dissension at that time, the Labor Party was not confidently regarded by electors. As a result of these trends many Independents were elected, but most of them were independent in name only. The only Independents who have remained are the genuine Independents.

Mr. Shannon—Plus one you shoved on to the Independent benches!

Mr. JENNINGS—One member chose to enter the Independent ranks, and no-one objects to that, least of all Labor members. We have been told that the purpose of retaining the present ratio between country and city representation is that the country needs amenities, industries and population; but we have often heard that argument. It was exploded by the member for Norwood earlier in this debate and ably dealt with by the member for Hindmarsh this afternoon. Despite the existence of the present electoral system for almost 20 years, it has had just the opposite effect: instead of population being attracted to the country, it has drifted to the city until 62 per cent of the population is now in the metropolitan area. The system has worked not the way we have been told it was designed to work, but in the

opposite direction, and it always will, because, if industries are established in small pocket borough country electorates having only 3,000 or 4,000 electors, an influx of only a few hundred workers into each electorate will be necessary to convert it to a Labor seat. The present electoral system must inevitably continue to work towards centralization rather than decentralization.

The only other argument ever used to justify the present system is that it would be expecting far too much of members to keep in contact with electorates larger than the existing country electorates, but that is not a valid argument because the Commonwealth Constitution provides that all electorates, both country and city, must have about an equal number of electors, and I have heard no Federal member—either Liberal or Labor—accused of not satisfactorily representing his electorate even though it is larger than any State electorate. In order to refute the argument that an increase in the size of the country electorates may mean that country members will not be able to satisfactorily perform their duties as members I will read a list of members who are doing other jobs. There is nothing personal in this and I am not blaming any member for doing what he chooses to do.

Mr. Shannon—Did you ever hear the saying, "If you want to get a job done, go to a busy man?"

Mr. JENNINGS—I have heard of someone waiting a long time for a report from the Public Works Committee, and he has not got it yet. I do not want any member to think I am criticizing his activities, whether business, civic or any other, but I feel obliged to go through this list and ask members whether they can continue to hold to the outmoded argument that country members, having large country electorates, are so busy that they cannot look after more electors. Mr. Brookman (Alexandra) has extensive grazing interests. Mr. Christian not only represents Eyre but also has time to be Minister of Agriculture, and, prior to taking that office, he was chairman of the Public Works Committee, which, we are told, is almost a full-time job in itself. Nobody has ever suggested that the Port Pirie electorate is not adequately represented, yet the member for Port Pirie (Mr. Davis) is also the mayor of that town. Burra is represented by Mr. Hawker, who has extensive grazing interests, and Mr. Heaslip (Rocky River) has similar interests.

The Hon. T. Playford—The honourable member would be wise to keep off personalities.

Mr. JENNINGS—The Premier may not have been here when I made it perfectly clear that—

The Hon. T. Playford—Other members can indulge in personalities, too.

Mr. JENNINGS—I did not mean these remarks to be personal.

The Hon. T. Playford—Then what are they?

Mr. JENNINGS—I come to the honourable member for—

The Hon. T. Playford—We will come to the honourable member himself presently.

Mr. JENNINGS—Mr. Hincks does an admirable job in representing Yorke Peninsula, and he also has time to be Minister of Lands and Irrigation. The huge electorate of Newcastle, which we were told last year by the member for Torrens comprised 300,000 sq. miles, is represented by Sir George Jenkins who, until recently, was Minister of Agriculture. Stirling is represented by a member who is also mayor of Victor Harbour. The member for Albert (Mr. McIntosh) is also a Minister, holding some of the most important offices in the Government. The member for Young has time to be Speaker, with all the official engagements that go with that office, and I have no doubt that he does both jobs extremely efficiently. The member for Frome (Mr. O'Halloran), as well as representing his far-flung electorate, has time to be Leader of the Opposition, the alternative Premier of the State. The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Playford), besides being Premier and Treasurer, also holds certain other portfolios. The member for Stanley (Mr. Quirke) is also a member of the Clare Corporation, and I do not think he would deny that he has certain business interests. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), who represents the largest electorate in the State, is also the mayor of Port Augusta. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) is also chairman of the Public Works Committee, and evidently finds time to fulfill the duties of that important public office. He also has business interests. The member for Ridley (Mr. Stott) has so far, as an Independent, successfully maintained his position in this House, despite attempts by both political machines to unseat him. He is also the Federal secretary of the Wheat and Woolgrowers Federation, yet has time to satisfy both his electors and the members of his organization. The member for Angas (Mr. Teusner), as well as being a

country member and the Government Whip with its attendant duties, practices as a solicitor in his town.

Mr. Teusner—And also acts for the benefit of his constituents.

Mr. JENNINGS—I have not denied that in any instance.

The Hon. T. Playford—Will the honourable member tell us about some of his own activities?

Mr. JENNINGS—I have been talking about country members. The member for Murray (Mr. White), as well as giving satisfaction to his electors, is mayor of Murray Bridge. Are any of the members I have enumerated prepared to admit that they are not giving proper services to their electors? I do not think any of them will. I have not said in any instance that any one of them is not doing all that is required of him, yet every one of them apparently has sufficient time to attend to other important tasks. I believe that must surely put an end to the argument that we have heard so much about for so long that country members, because of their large electorates, are so busy that it would be most unfair to them to cut up the electorates of the State in such a way that they would have anything like the same number of electors as members in the metropolitan area. When debating this Bill the Premier said he intended to bring in an Electoral Bill. I do not think he will deny that he intends in that Bill to maintain the ratio of two country members to one metropolitan member in spite of the fact that 62 per cent of the population lives in the metropolitan area compared with 38 per cent in the country. This cannot be justified, of course, from the point of view of decency and equality. We heard the former gerrymander described as "save our seats" legislation, but the Premier's proposal cannot be described as such; it can be described only as "save Glenelg" legislation. I do not mind if the member for Glenelg is back with us after the next election so long as a lot of Labor members are also returned. It will not remedy the glaring inequalities apparent in the original gerrymander legislation of 1938 that have become worse since then.

Mr. Dunks—Is the honourable member debating this Bill or some Bill of the future?

Mr. JENNINGS—Being Chairman of Committees the honourable member should realize that as he had time during his speech to give us his own autobiography and mention the incident in which someone threw an egg at

him in Port Adelaide, then I should be permitted to mention something the Premier said in this debate, and that is what I am doing. Under the Premier's legislation we will still have the fantastic position that 3,000 people in the country have as much say in this Parliament as 30,000 in the metropolitan area, and the ludicrous position of 38 per cent of the total population electing two-thirds of the members of this House while 62 per cent of the people elect only one third. We will still have pocket boroughs in the country with voting strength equal to metropolitan districts. We will have a system designed to have no other effect than to keep the Liberal Party in office. I support the Bill.

Mr. CORCORAN (Victoria)—This Bill has my whole-hearted support. It is high time that the present legislation was amended because under the present set-up 62 per cent of the people elect one-third of the members of this House and 38 per cent elect the remaining two-thirds, creating the position that the country vote is worth approximately $3\frac{1}{4}$ times the value of the metropolitan vote. This does not appear to me to embody the principles of democracy, and it is time that it was altered. I agree with Mr. Jennings and every member on this side of the House that it is unfair to accuse us of having changed our attitude on one vote one value. We know that we have to introduce a Bill that will have a certain appeal to some members on the other side and, although we have not lost sight of the principle of one vote one value, which is a basic principle of democracy, we believe that this Bill will go a fair distance in that direction.

Mr. Shannon—Is this the first step?

Mr. CORCORAN—Yes. As a democrat I extend to everyone in the House the right to an opinion, but I cannot see how anyone has any appreciation of the principles of democracy unless he agrees with the principle of one vote one value. We know that legislation introduced by Sir Richard Butler in 1936 was not intended to build up the discrepancies that have ultimately crept into it, but they have occurred over the years because of the large number of people coming to the city. The Labor Party has tried in the past to introduce this type of legislation and I do not like the inference of members of the Government that that has been done for our political gain. Such statements indicate to me that political gain must be foremost in their minds. As Mr. Jennings pointed out,

any system that permits representation on the basis of the present set-up is not democratic.

Much has been said for and against multiple districts but I believe there should be proportional representation and to give effect to it there must be at least three representing each district. We hope by this measure the anomaly I have referred to will be eliminated. Unless anyone can justify the Government's attitude towards the present set-up I cannot accept it. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Dunks) said that if we amend this Bill to bring it back to the state of affairs existing today he will support it. He wants the same ratio between city and country as exists today but we desire to ensure that the voice of the majority will prevail. It has not done so in the past, and it will not do so under the Premier's suggestions. We are prompted, whether rightly or wrongly, to suggest that he clings to a system of this kind to hold the reins of office. All members should support this Bill if they appreciate the principles of democracy. I can remember when the Premier took a trip around the world and on his return told us what was going on in France, in other places on the Continent and in other parts of the Commonwealth, but we are not concerned about that; we are only concerned with local affairs. We will not allow our minds to be distracted, because we believe that the principles embodied in this Bill will stand analysis and all the criticisms that can be brought forward. If we fall by the wayside in an effort to embody the basic principle of one vote one value, we are quite prepared to do so.

The Premier intimated that he intends to introduce a Bill this session to alter the electoral set-up. Is that not an acknowledgment that the electors will not stand for the present position any longer? The Premier is a psychologist. He can sense the atmosphere, and he knows that something has to be done. He intends to appoint a Commission to investigate this matter, and that would be all very well if he gave it an open hand, but he will give it an instruction.

Mr. Geoffrey Clark—Is there not an instruction in your Bill?

Mr. CORCORAN—If we had seen the measure proposed to be introduced by the Premier and it had agreed somewhat with our ideas we would not have introduced the Bill. The Premier said that he intended to introduce a measure, that the same ratio between city and country was to be retained, and that he did not acknowledge the principle of one

vote one value. That is why we decided to act on our own. The people will stand some things some of the time, but not all of the time. We have reached the stage where an alteration must be made, but the people should realize that what the Premier proposes will not improve the position. The principles of the Bill are true to democracy. We fought to maintain the principles dear to our hearts and I hope that members opposite will give this matter serious consideration and support the Bill.

Mr. HAWKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 8. Page 636.)

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I oppose the Bill. For as long as I can remember a section of the community has been opposed to some form of sport. As the population has increased so has the outcry. The Bill prevents trap shooting of pigeons. I am opposed to it and I suggest that 90 per cent of those who signed the petition for the abolition of the sport have never been on a shooting ground or witnessed a wing shooting competition. I have attended many matches and have seen some of the best gun shots in action. The member who introduced the Bill knows very little about the sport or the strict rules under which it is carried out. The South-Eastern Gun Clubs' Association has been in operation for many years. Members of the association are mostly men of the highest integrity and sportsmen of the truest type. They are men who can be relied on, because their word is their bond. I wonder whether members know much about the rules under which they compete. Rule No. 4 deals with the charge of shot and states:—

The maximum charge of shot shall be 1½oz. avoirdupois. No wire cartridges to be used and no concentrators or other substance to be mixed with the shot. Any shooter infringing this rule shall be at once disqualified and shall remain disqualified for any term the committee may decide. No shot of a larger size than No. 4 Newcastle shall be used in any match whatsoever.

Regarding the size of guns, rule No. 5 says:—

No guns except breech loaders of a bore not larger than No. 12 shall be used. No gun shall be used which in the opinion of the referee is defective. If, in the referee's opinion, a gun is defective or dangerous and

will not explode the cartridge the referee shall have power to order the shooter to use another gun.

It was said that the shooting distance was 10yds., but rule No. 6 provides:—

Each visiting competitor who is a registered member of a recognized gun club association and who produces membership and handicap cards shall pay no further fee and shoot from his handicap mark. Any shooter unknown to association officials shall not shoot closer than 26yds. on live birds and 16yds. on clays.

In connection with birds on the wing, rule No. 9 states:—

Should the shooter, after calling "pull," fire before the bird is liberated from the trap the bird if killed with the second barrel is a "no bird." If missed it is a "lost bird." The bird must be on the wing before the shooter fires his first barrel.

That is strictly adhered to. Rule No. 10 states:—

Should a bird not rise or rise and not continue its flight, the referee shall declare it "no bird" if he considers it has not had its wings. That gives the bird every opportunity to be on the wing before there is any shooting, and it is at a distance of 26yds. Rule No. 22 says:—

Should a bird show no mark of having been hit it shall be scored a lost bird. The referee shall order all wounded birds, whether pigeons, starlings or sparrows, to be gathered and killed immediately.

There is no such thing as allowing a wounded bird to linger before death. Regarding boundary, the rule provides:—

The boundary for live bird shooting is 25yds. to 30yds. from the traps, enclosed by a fence 24in. to 36in. high in the form of an oval.

The rule dealing with wounded birds states:—

The committee or referee shall specially see that all wounded birds, whether pigeons, starlings or sparrows that fall in or near the shooting ground are immediately gathered and killed. Members are requested to report to the committee if they observe any case where this is not done.

In the constitution there is power to fine or suspend a member, and the clause states:—

The council shall have power of its own motive to fine, suspend or disqualify any registered (or unregistered) shooter proved to its satisfaction to have been guilty of fraud, malpractice, abusive language or of conduct, including any infringement of the game laws in or out of any registered club's premises, prejudicial in the opinion of the council to the interests of the association.

Members have always been definite against shooting in the close season.

Mr. Davis—There is no close season for pigeons.

Mr. FLETCHER—No, but there is for ducks. Much damage can be done by unscrupulous persons shooting old birds and leaving the young ones to die in the nest.

Mr. Davis—That applies to all shooters, registered or otherwise.

Mr. FLETCHER—Yes. It is the policy of registered gun club members to prevent this sort of thing. They look upon that, with disfavour.

Mr. Davis—What would happen to a registered shooter who did that?

Mr. FLETCHER—He would be disqualified. To a lover of the sport nothing could be more severe than his being black-balled from his own gun club. No gun man worthy of the name would shoot game during the close season, or fire at a bird not on the wing. Such actions are frowned upon as poor sportsmanship. On October 17, 1953, the *Adelaide Truth* had a front page article relating to a shoot which took place at Murray Bridge. The article vividly described the event in blood curdling terms. To bolster its case the *Truth* used photographs but they were years old and taken in Victoria. One photograph, revealing a man in the act of shooting, was of Mr. Tom Power of Melbourne. Another photograph portrays a man demonstrating the methods by which wounded birds were killed at Murray Bridge. That photograph was of Mr. Power's son. Neither of those men was at Murray Bridge on the occasion in question. Does any member claim that the use of such illustrations is indicative of true sportsmanship? How many of those who have signed petitions would favour the use of deceit to achieve their objective? I have attended many wing shoots but never have I witnessed any of the scenes described by *Truth* as taking place at Murray Bridge. As that paper used photographs taken years previously in another State and alleged they were taken at Murray Bridge can its report of what happened in October, 1953, be regarded as reliable? Another photograph was of a pigeon's head which it claimed had been pulled from the body of a wounded bird after it had been brought in. I have never seen birds destroyed by that method. They are normally killed by the ringing of their necks as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Davis—What happens to the wounded birds which get away?

Mr. FLETCHER—They are like those who fight and run away and live to fight another day. They are likely to re-appear at a later shoot.

Mr. Davis—They could linger for days before dying.

Mr. FLETCHER—I have never known that to happen. It was also suggested in that article that the sportsmen walked along a concrete path until they were within their handicap distance of 23 to 30 feet and then the birds were released. Can any member imagine a sportsman shooting at a bird from a distance of 10 yards? What chance would the bird have? Why has there been this sudden outburst against the sport? It is a very good political move and will no doubt provide election fodder on some future occasion. If trap shooting is as cruel as the mover claims why have not the R.S.P.C.A. and the police complained about the conduct of these shoots? Officials of both these bodies have attended the fixtures and have not, to my knowledge, reported any case of undue cruelty and no prosecutions have taken place. The Premier called for a report from the Fisheries and Games Department on the conduct of these sporting meetings and I have been informed that an official from that department was at Murray Bridge on the occasion in question. Will the Premier make that report available so that members may peruse it before voting on this measure? The sponsor of the Bill proved in his opening remarks that he knows little about this sport.

There are many sports more cruel than trap shooting. There is nothing more cruel than line fishing. A fish is hooked and played for a long time before it is landed. I claim that the racing of animals is cruel if the animals are not in condition. Some people have suggested that we should stop hurdle and steeplechase racing, but if that were done we should also debar Show jumping. I doubt if any member has had as much experience of animals and birds as I have. I have been responsible for trapping many thousands of rabbits and, goodness knows, that is cruel enough. I can remember the days when phosphorus was used for the destruction of rabbits. The rabbit ate the phosphorus which gradually burned its "innards" out. There was nothing more cruel than that.

Mr. John Clark—There is nothing much crueller than the use of myxomatosis.

Mr. FLETCHER—That is one of the most damnable things I have seen. Trap shooting has been carried on for centuries and it operates under very strict rules. The bird is given every opportunity of escaping. I have received a letter from the Secretary of the

South-Eastern Gun Clubs Association in which he states:—

The Remington Cartridge Company of America approximately three years ago conducted a series of tests on cartridges and sporting guns. They came to these conclusions: to consistently kill game cleanly, and so reduce the wounding or crippling of game (i.e., birds), using a good quality gun loaded with standard factory loads, the shot size as recommended for the type of game shot at, the extreme range should rarely exceed 50yds. and never more than 55yds. The average pigeon handicap is 25yds. from shooter to trap and from trap to boundary, 30yds. The trap used nowadays is a spring ejector, so the bird is in the air and flying strongly before the shooter can shoot. The average time taken for a bird to reach the boundary is two seconds unless, of course, the bird circles, which occurrence is rare. This time has been carefully checked by our officials and from personal observation I would say it is correct. It also agrees with most authorities on birds in flight, who estimate a pigeon covers 75ft. a second. You can see that a shooter does not have much time to make a successful shot. In fact, the average field shot is not good enough to compete successfully. He finds the birds too fast for him.

It does not always happen that because a man is a good field shot he is a good trap shot. It has been suggested that clay pigeons should be used. They were first introduced into South Australia in 1925 and have been used intermittently since. However, that has possibly proved uninteresting, and it is not economical. A pigeon can later be used for food but a person cannot eat the remains of a clay pigeon!

Mr. Corcoran—What disadvantage would sportsmen suffer by using clay pigeons.

Mr. FLETCHER—From an article I will quote, the honourable member will readily appreciate that there is a big difference between shooting a bird on the wing and shooting at clay pigeons. In Melbourne the shooting of clay pigeons is highly commercialized, with paid officials fostered by the cartridge manufacturers and gunsmiths and assisted by a big population. Here there are no paid officials. I shall give some of the costs of clay shooting for the I.C.I. trophy held on May 1. The winner shot 67 clays at a cost of £1 7s. It cost him £3 for cartridges, or £4 7s. in all. The cost to the competitor who came second was the same, and he also shot 67 clays. The third prize winner shot 30 clays at a cost of 12s. and his cartridges cost him 1 10s., or £2 2s. in all. The total cost for the first, second and third prize winners was £10 16s. On May 15 the competition for the Pigeon Cup was held. This was for live

birds. The winner shot seven pigeons, costing him £1 1s. and 10s. for cartridges, a total of £1 11s. The second man also shot seven birds and his cost was also £1 11s. The third man shot six pigeons, which cost him 18s., and 9s. for cartridges, a total of £1 7s. The total cost for the three place getters was £4 9s. compared with £10 16s. for clays.

Mr. John Clark—Has cost got anything to do with the rights and wrongs of the Bill?

Mr. FLETCHER—It shows that clay shooting is not what it is cracked up to be. There is nothing cruel about shooting live pigeons if it is carried out in accordance with the rules I have mentioned. The Live Bird Championship of Australasia is held on 21 birds, which come from five traps set wide apart and the birds choose their own direction, high angle, low, swerving, rainbow, towards, away, or across, and is the cream of shooting that has stood the test of time. I think that Victoria and South Australia are the only two remaining States where live pigeon shooting is still carried on, but if it is carried out according to the rules it is not as cruel as open shooting. When shooting quail and duck some wounded birds always get away, but they cannot be put out of their misery as wounded pigeons can be under trap shooting. It is wrong to call people who indulge in this sport bloodthirsty and inhuman. Some of the finest men in South Australia love the guns and love the sport. I hope the House will reject the measure.

Mr. WHITE (Murray)—I oppose the Bill. It seems from the remarks of the member who introduced it that it is the element of cruelty in the trap shooting of pigeons that he deplures, but other speakers have pointed out that cruelty is associated with other sports. The member for Mount Gambier referred to duck shooting, fishing, and live hare coursing. Considerable interest is taken in racing pigeons, and I am sure that this is cruel to some extent. An article in today's *News* states:—

Murray Bridge: Only one pigeon reached home in the 285-mile Ararat Derby run by Murray Bridge Homing Club for young birds. Heavy head winds were encountered.

Only one bird reached home. I take it that some of the others succumbed to exhaustion or were too weak to escape from hawks and other birds of prey. No mention was made by any member of interfering with these other types of sport, and I do not know that any good purpose would be served if we interfered with them. Some cruelty enters into many sports.

Those who attend pigeon shooting need costly equipment. A good gun costs about £150, and they have to pay for pigeons and ammunition. If they follow the sport regularly they must have a motor car. I believe that this legislation is aimed at a certain section of the community. Members opposite are more concerned about having a crack at the people who can afford this sport than about cruelty to birds. If the Bill becomes law there will be certain repercussions. The member for Stirling stated that in South Australia 30,000 pigeons were used every year in this sport. The clubs pay up to 3s. a head for the birds, and if the sport is banned there will be no inducement for people to catch wild pigeons. The price paid for them acts like scalp money does in the destruction of wild dogs. Most birds have a nesting season, but the pigeon is nesting all the year.

I have a property at Monarto South. It has a stone barn and some years ago the people living there had a child who was given a pair of pigeons. They found their way into the barn and after eight years, despite the fact that there were cats and birds of prey there, it was found necessary to destroy them. We got 72 birds. If we pass the Bill and the incentive to catch pigeons is removed they will increase rapidly and become a serious pest. The member for Stirling told us that it was impossible to successfully grow pea crops if many pigeons followed the drill and took the seed. Pigeons rest on roofs and foul water that is required for domestic purposes. In the States where trap shooting has been abolished pigeons have become a real menace. It is necessary for the police to organize shoots there to keep them down. However, many wounded birds get away, so there is cruelty even in organized shoots, perhaps more than with trap shooting. I have tried to study this subject from every angle with an open mind and I find that there is nothing in the Bill to commend it to me. This is the type of legislation which panders to the sentiments of certain people and could get us into much trouble. Because I feel that the Bill contains certain pitfalls and serves no useful purpose I have pleasure in opposing it.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support the Bill and would like to refer to some of the opinions expressed by other members. It seems to me that the member for Murray, Mr. White, was perfectly correct in saying that this Bill panders to sentiment. So it does; it panders to a sentiment that is sound, sane and decent and in consequence deserves the

wholehearted support of every member of this House. I have been amazed at the arguments that have been adduced by certain members. Member after member has opposed the Bill on the ground that, although this particular activity may be sadist in its nature, other things are similarly sadist and therefore we should not do anything about it. It is most extraordinary to urge that a Bill which enacts a partial reform should be rejected for the simple reason that it does not enact other reforms as well. Many measures come before this House which do not pretend to be a complete code of any particular series of matters, but deal with one particular matter. Are we then to vote against every partial reform on the ground that it does not go the whole way that it might? That is an extraordinary argument to put before the House and it has not the slightest merit in logic. Mr. White said that many gentlemen have invested large sums of money in equipping themselves for this sport, but I see no excuse for voting against the Bill on that ground; I see no merit whatever in supporting people who have a vested interest in cruelty—in pandering to people with money in their pockets because they happen to have paid £150 for a gun with which to go out and be cruel. If they are particularly interested in sport and skill they will find a use for their equipment, but to say that we should pander to whatever they wish to do with their guns is quite extraordinary. It is also suggested that this sport is not cruel because a chance is given to the pigeon. I admit freely that there has to be a certain amount of shooting; we kill for food and we kill to exterminate pests, but I cannot see any sport in deliberately going out to trap a bird and then killing it for fun.

Mr. Corcoran—Like a cat with a mouse.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, or a small boy pulling the wings off a fly. That is the sort of sentiment these gentlemen are suggesting this House should subscribe to. The arguments against the Bill have contained no merit whatever. Obviously, there must be a certain amount of shooting for food but to kill for the sake of killing is wrong, and it should not be suggested that it should be perpetuated in our community. I believe that this measure is something that has to be enacted to bring this State into line with the enlightened view of other States and other countries. It may be, as some members have said, that there are other forms of sport that are cruel and against which action may have to be taken in

due course, but that is not the slightest excuse for voting against this Bill. I believe that if the House did not pass this measure it would place a very great slur indeed upon Parliament, and it is necessary for every member who has humane sentiments at heart to support it.

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—At the outset I indicate that I propose to support the second reading. There may be amendments in the Committee stage which I will consider on their merits, but generally speaking I support the principle contained in the Bill. I have never been favourably disposed towards unnecessary slaughter. I do not think I am a sentimentalist, but I feel that there are reasons why this Bill should be supported. It would be a mistake to assume that because I do so I am indicating that I would support a whole lot of measures that may or many not be introduced which in my view do not have the merit this one possesses. In other words, I am not establishing for myself a precedent in this matter, but reserve the right to consider upon their merits such matters as may come forward. There are, of course, many so-called cruel things that happen in this world. I think it has been written that there is nothing so cruel in this world as "Man's inhumanity to man," and there are on record many cases of the most dastardly cruelty meted out by one human being to another. However, it must be admitted that it is sometimes necessary to be cruel, using the term in the broad sense and assuming that it means destruction or death, or the imposition of pain in some form. I think it was Oliver Cromwell who was instrumental in, or at least connived at, the execution of Charles I, and it is recorded that on the night following the execution Cromwell appeared on the scene and, recalling the events of the day, was heard to utter the words, "A cruel necessity." I do not think it necessary to develop that line of thought, but merely to indicate that there are times when obviously sloppy sentimentality does not meet the case and that we have to be realists, gearing ourselves up to do certain things which, from some angles, may appear to be somewhat cruel. Country people, particularly, are confronted by the breeding up of certain animals to the proportion of pests.

Reference has been made in this debate to the eradication of rabbits, foxes, and other vermin, and I recall my own experiences when I first went to Eyre Peninsula nearly 20 years ago. My property was surrounded by scrub,

and I had on my own farm some thousand to 1,500 acres of scrub in which emus and kangaroos abounded. It was necessary to take measures to deal with these pests which did serious damage to crops, pastures and fencing and we were forced to destroy the surplus. As the country became cleared they disappeared from our immediate surroundings, but on odd occasions there would come in, perhaps, a family of kangaroos, or an emu with a brood of chickens and some of my employees and neighbours, being accustomed over the years to destroying these things, naturally thought that they could wipe them out to the last kangaroo or emu. I took exception to that and gave instructions that those few animals that persisted on the property should remain and were to be regarded as pets, and over the years since occasionally there comes in near to the house some of the few remaining remnants of Australia's native fauna. I use that as an illustration of my attitude on this matter. I have never had any hesitation in destroying something which I felt must be destroyed in the interests of industry or of my own survival as a farmer-producer, and that is my attitude today. The methods used to destroy pests have come under criticism and reference has been made to myxomatosis, rabbit trapping, etc. Be that as it may, if one is faced with a pest which does serious damage one's attitude towards its destruction is somewhat different from what it may be in other circumstances.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—You get back to the creed—self-preservation is the first law of Nature.

Mr. PEARSON—That is true. Let us remember that Nature herself is particularly cruel. Frequently we hear the terms "jungle law" and "the law of tooth and claw," and it is said that "big fleas have bigger fleas upon their backs to bite them." Nature lives on itself; indeed, we are told in the Bible that animals are provided for the use of man. Man is a hunter by instinct. In our younger days we often committed a destructive act or inflicted a degree of pain on animals, which we would not do in our more mature years. There seems to be good reason why we should support the banning of the trap shooting of pigeons. There is in this practice a degree of unnecessary slaughter to which I have already referred and to which I object. There are alternatives such as the shooting of clay pigeons. I realize that the shooting of live pigeons is a better sport, because a live bird coming out of a trap at an unpredictable

angle, speed and line of flight must be a much more difficult target than is any mechanical device.

Mr. Shannon—The figures quoted prove that.

Mr. PEARSON—Yes, and from the point of view of sport and the skill required, the sportsman will lose something by the substitution of clay pigeons, but for the sake of public opinion and to prevent unnecessary destruction, we should support the banning of trap shooting of live pigeons. The people concerned in this sport should be willing to use a substitute, which, although not quite so good as a live bird, would serve as a satisfactory target. As to the survival of gun clubs, I listened with interest to the comments of some members in this debate. Although there are only two States in which trap shooting has not been banned, nobody has suggested that gun clubs have gone out of existence in other States merely because their members must shoot at clay pigeons. Gun clubs can continue to function using clay birds, and, by passing this Bill, although it may perhaps reduce the skill required for a good score, Parliament will not be preventing members of gun clubs from indulging in their sport. Much evidence has been produced to show that pigeons breed rapidly and that they have become pests in certain areas, but, if they become a pest, let us deal with them as a pest. To use them as targets in trap shooting seems to me unnecessary. I support the Bill.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I, too, support the Bill. I did not intend to speak on it until I heard the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Fletcher) advance one of the most foolish arguments possible against the Bill. He read from the rules of gun clubs and pointed out that members of those clubs were not allowed to use the wire cartridge, but I believe that it would be in the interests of the birds to use such a cartridge as, once a bird was struck by it, death would be instantaneous and no suffering would be caused. I have seen much pigeon shooting and have an idea of the number of birds that escape after being wounded. Mr. Fletcher also said that wounded birds were immediately captured and their heads screwed off, but that is not always so, for a wounded bird may fly for a distance of half a mile before falling to the ground, and then may flutter about for a time. As a child I went to pigeon shooting matches and tried to catch the birds after they were wounded, and it was quite common to find birds that have been wounded some days before lingering at some little distance from the site of the shooting.

Myxomatosis has been mentioned in this debate and I agree that that is a cruel way of eradicating a pest; indeed, if I had the opportunity to vote for the abolition of its use, I would do so. Some members seem to think that, if this Bill is passed, people will not be allowed to shoot live pigeons; but anybody could still shoot them if they became a pest. In that case, however, they would be shot not for sport but for food. I do not desire to be a killer of sport, but I object to the trap shooting of live pigeons and believe clay pigeons could be used. I hope the Bill is passed so that the interests of these live birds may be protected.

Often it is necessary to act in order to destroy vermin. Recently I read a press report stating that the water in a certain area had been poisoned and that hundreds of dead kangaroos had been found about the waterhole; but surely nobody desires to get rid of animals or birds in such numbers unless they have become a pest. We have been told that, when a party goes duck shooting, some of the ducks that get away are wounded, but that is only because of bad shooting. There is a vast difference, however, between duck shooting and pigeon shooting, because there is only one pigeon to shoot at whereas there are a dozen or more ducks.

Mr. William Jenkins—Probably six get away wounded.

Mr. DAVIS—All might get away if I shoot at them. Many of the pigeons that escape at pigeon shoots are wounded, and although wounded pigeons that are recaptured are destroyed, some are never recaptured.

Mr. HEASLIP secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR SPIRITS DISTRIBUTION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 559.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I did not have the opportunity of hearing the explanation of this Bill by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), but I have studied it at some length and, because three weeks has elapsed since he spoke, I have been able to obtain information on this subject, and have also received representations on it. Mr. Dunstan said:—

It is necessary to meet a situation that has arisen in the South Australian petrol retail trade, and this Parliament has a duty to ensure equality of opportunity and protection of the public against monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade. This House must

ensure that people have the opportunity to engage in retail trade under conditions of fair competition and that the avenues of that trade are not tied up by monopolies and combines to the detriment of persons engaged in the trade and the public generally.

That sets out fairly clearly his reasons for introducing the Bill, but I cannot find any connection between the reasons advanced and the actual circumstances of the trade. I have received a number of deputations from persons interested in this trade, and the general complaint is not that monopolies exist, but that the oil companies are encouraging and promoting the establishment of an unusually large number of petrol stations. Representations made to me have not been directed against the wholesalers as such, but merely against the establishment of additional petrol stations. I point out, however, that the expansion of competition does not promote the existence of a monopoly. It is not correct to say that this Bill will rectify anomalies. What it will do, if it will do anything, will be to restrict competition amongst retailers, and nothing more. I have been in this House for a considerable number of years and on many occasions attempts have been made to establish privileged classes by legislation, usually by a system of registration. I have learned to look upon any of these Bills that provide for a licensing system with a good deal of hesitation because in our economy today consistent attempts are being made to hold back or cut off competition. This applies to professions as well as to individuals. Sometimes in marketing legislation attempts have been made to restrict acreages being planted; sometimes requests are made to create a professional status, and these attempts are seen in other things. There is no justification for curtailing initiative or enterprise by anyone unless they are doing something that creates a public nuisance or is undesirable for the welfare of the community.

Mr. Riches—This is designed to let the garage man conduct his own business.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If this Bill does anything, it creates a magnificent department that will send officers around the country inquiring into the pros and cons of whether persons shall be allowed to have petrol stations or not; for instance, whether Harry Brown or John Smith is entitled to have a petrol station at Mallala.

Mr. Riches—Now the petrol companies decide that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They do not. Mr. Dunstan gave some information that he

believed to be the circumstances of the trade, made statements and gave figures that on examination, either on an Australian or a South Australian basis, have been found to be purely figments of imagination; they are not in accordance with the facts. I do not know who sells petrol at Mallala, but assuming there is a petrol seller there and that somebody else considers he could give a better service to the public by starting business in competition, what concern is it of the Government, the honourable member for Norwood or anyone else? Why should we restrict him? We do not say that there shall be only a certain number of tailors, haberdashery stores or chemists in Rundle Street. Petrol selling will be a monopoly if it is restricted as proposed and not because the avenues of competition are expanded. The basis upon which this legislation is designed is completely foreign to a free country and should not be accepted by this House. As far as I know the only licensing legislation that has been introduced before has been when things have got out of hand and obviously have been detrimental to the community, but the competitive selling of petrol is not detrimental to the community. Why then should we set up a magnificent department that will obviously be a costly one? I cannot grasp the means by which it would be financed. It has been claimed in this House that there has been an increase in the number of petrol stations that exceeds the logical requirements of the community, that the competition between the oil companies to sell their products has led them to introduce, particularly in the metropolitan area, an excessive number of stations and as a consequence building materials have been used. If that is so and we are concerned about the amount of materials being used, the simple thing is to say that for a period of years no building materials shall be used for the construction of any petrol stations. This Bill sets a lion to catch a mouse. The control that it provides will not go out of existence if the emergency requiring control ceases; it will continue forever, and for what purpose? Mr. Dunstan gave some information about these things, and set out the facts on which he sought support for this Bill. He said:—

Before the second World War 277 shop licences to sell petrol were issued for the metropolitan area, and they were adequate to provide the public's requirements. Further, there was ample opportunity for newcomers to enter the business. Today there are at least 450—probably about 500—petrol resellers in the metropolitan area. It is extraordinary

that during the last few days the Royal Automobile Association in its publication *The South Australian Motor* stated:—

From 1939 to the end of June, 1954, the number of petrol resellers in the State increased by 17 per cent while the number of motor vehicles increased 142 per cent. . . . Since 1939 the number of resellers, including stores has risen from 1,325 to 1,551 in the State, and in the metropolitan area only, from 455 to 550, an increase of 21 per cent.

I cannot imagine how the association arrived at the figure of 455 for 1939, because according to the Factories and Steam Boilers Department, the number of shop licences to sell petrol issued in 1939 was 277; therefore, the association's statement is completely misleading. There has been an enormous increase in the number of petrol stations serving the community, and it is not necessary for me to quote further figures, for everyone is aware of that increase.

Quite obviously there is an argument as to the disparity in the figures and the honourable member accused the Royal Automobile Association of giving misleading figures, quoting one Government department as his authority. That, of course, is something that could be examined, and I immediately obtained a report which reads:—

Mr. Dunstan, in introducing the Motor Spirits Distribution Bill, stated that before World War II there were 277 licences to sell petrol in the metropolitan area whereas today there are at least 450—probably 500—petrol resellers in the metropolitan area. These figures are approximately correct, but as they represent two different things they are not comparable. The report of the Chief Inspector shows that the actual number of licences in operation in 1939 would be approximately 264, whereas on 31/8/54 the number was 326 plus 10 new applications not then dealt with—this is an increase of 27 per cent. Mr. Dunstan stated that the figures published by the Royal Automobile Association in *The South Australian Motor* of 455 resellers in the metropolitan area in 1939 compared with 550 now were completely misleading and wrong. The Chief Inspector's report, however, shows that these figures are probably substantially correct. "The metropolitan area" referred to by the Royal Automobile Association is the metropolitan area as understood by the petrol companies. This area is greater than the metropolitan area as defined by the Early Closing Act. Mr. Dunstan apparently did not realize that a number of resellers do not take out licences to sell petrol after the normal closing time for shops, and therefore the number of licences issued is always less than the actual number of resellers.

Many resellers do not ask for licences to remain open after normal trading hours. They were in operation in 1939 as they are today, so it is misleading to quote the number of licence holders as being the number of

resellers, as that is to compare two different things. The report continues:—

In 1939 there were 98,691 motor vehicles registered in the State, whereas the number in June, 1954, was 243,639—an increase of 147 per cent.

In one instance the increase is 147 per cent, and in the other 27 per cent. The report further states:—

Later in his speech Mr. Dunstan stated that there were only about five wholesale companies in existence. The following six companies operate in the metropolitan area:—Shell, Vacuum, Ampol, C.O.R., Caltex, H. C. Sleigh (Golden Fleece), and in addition Neptune Oil, which, however, is a subsidiary of Shell. I understand that in the South-East the Atlantic and Pacific Companies also operate. Mr. Dunstan also stated that he knew of no independent station which was getting either Vacuum (Plume) or Shell. Actually there are petrol stations and motor dealers in the city as well as the suburbs where Plume and/or Shell as well as other brands of petrol can be obtained. Two of these places are Motors Ltd., of Flinders Street, and Bolton's, of Greenhill Road. Mr. Dunstan's statement that only about one-third of the total gallonage of motor spirit sold in South Australia is sold through the petrol resellers cannot be verified except by contacting the oil companies.

I suggest that if that information were obtained it would not support the statement made by Mr. Dunstan. The figures for Australia do not support the statement. Mr. Dunstan said that most of the oil companies were American, but the Registrar of Companies has some information on that matter. I do not know why Mr. Dunstan brought it up because it really does not matter. We could say that General Motors-Holdens is an American company but that does not alter the fact that many people have gained a benefit from the company's activities. The premises on which this Bill was introduced cannot be supported. The records of the Registrar of Companies show that the nationalities of the directors of the six main oil companies are:—

Shell—three English and one Dutch (all residing in England).

Vacuum—three Americans and five Australians (all residing in Victoria).

Caltex—six Americans, five of whom reside in America, and three Australians residing in Australia.

Ampol, C.O.R., H. C. Sleigh—all Australians residing in Australia.

We are asked to consider legislation to control a wicked thing.

Mr. Dunstan—I did not say that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member said that the Bill was introduced to control a monopoly, but we are not up against a monopoly but a position arising from intense competition. Oil is now becoming available from various parts of the world. British Shell interests have installed huge refineries in many places. Some are in Australia. There is intense competition in the industry, as we find when we call for tenders. If it is said that the legislation is necessary to curb the operations of a monopoly the whole thing is put on a wrong basis. I do not believe it is necessary for additional petrol stations to be established at present. I have expressed concern about labour and materials being used for unnecessary stations. I have visited many parts of South Australia. During the war when there was a limited number of persons selling petrol I found the greatest difficulty in getting a reasonable service, as did most of the travelling public. The hours of petrol selling are fixed by the Government. Over a period of years there has been intense pressure to curtail the facilities for the sale of petrol. When it was decided that petrol stations could stay open longer it was found that many did not avail themselves of the opportunity. Today the travelling public is getting a more reasonable service. When the pool arrangement operated there were times when in certain parts of the State it was necessary to have spare petrol in your vehicle because it could not be purchased there. I have much information on all aspects of this question before us. The Prices Ministers considered whether one-brand petrol stations should be allowed because of increased costs, although the companies said there were substantial savings from such stations.

Mr. John Clark—Are the savings being passed on to the consumers?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The oil companies have no say in that matter. Continually auditors go into the accounts of the oil companies and the Prices Ministers decide what is a fair price to be paid by the consumers. From time to time when the companies have asked for a price increase there has been a decrease. There is no need for this legislation in the matter of price-fixing.

Mr. Fletcher—There has not been a price increase for resellers for some time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—We have gone closely into the accounts of resellers. Because of the large increase in the number of motor vehicles and the consequent gallonage increase, the resellers have been able to absorb most of

the increased costs. Regarding the Bill the Parliamentary Draftsman says:—

Under Mr. Dunstan's Bill no person may carry on the business of selling petrol unless he holds a retailer's or wholesaler's licence. A person is prohibited from holding both a retailer's and a wholesaler's licence, and a wholesaler is prevented from doing three things. He is prevented firstly from restricting the right of any retailer to purchase petrol from another wholesaler, secondly from monopolizing the supply of petrol or establishing any restrictive trade association, and thirdly from owning any interest in a retailer's business.

We are considering whether we should pass the most iniquitous piece of legislation ever introduced in this House. It prohibits a person from engaging in a lawful occupation unless he gets permission from a bureaucratic body.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It is done in connection with the sale of liquor.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, because experience has shown that unrestricted legislation in that respect would create a public nuisance. It was adopted after the people had looked into the matter and voted on it. The position can be altered at any time by a vote of the people. Under this legislation three dictators will be appointed who may go around the country saying, "Yes, Mr. Brown, you may sell petrol. You cannot sell it wholesale and retail, but you can sell it wholesale," or "Mr. Smith, you can sell petrol retail, but not in bulk." Has any member heard of a more iniquitous type of legislation? Some member will, no doubt, suggest that similar legislation has been enacted in New Zealand by a Liberal Government. I have never had the Party tag tacked upon me. If a proposal is wrong when brought up, no matter who suggests it, it is still wrong as far as I am concerned. The case presented by Mr. Dunstan in support of this legislation was ill-prepared and not in accordance with fact, and revealed an elementary understanding of the problem involved. The Government would be concerned if large quantities of material were being diverted from house building to the erection of petrol stations. I publicly expressed my concern in this House, and immediately the oil companies approached me and gave a written undertaking that the number of retailers and resellers would not be increased in the metropolitan area for two years and that no premises not in operation at the time of the undertaking would be started in the metropolitan area for that period, unless other wholesalers who would not be bound by the undertaking entered the business. If other wholesalers came in

from outside and increased the number of stations it would obviously be grossly unfair for one group of wholesalers to be tied by an undertaking while the other group was not. That was one qualification of the undertaking. The second was that if a wholesaler closed a station which was not serving a community need in one area he could open another station elsewhere where it might be more necessary. That is not an unreasonable undertaking and it was given long before Mr. Dunstan rushed into the breach with this legislation.

Mr. Dunstan—What was the date from which they were not to erect any new stations?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—July 1.

Mr. Dunstan—I can point to many stations which have been brought into operation since then.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I hope the honourable member's information is more accurate than the figures he presented in his second reading speech. If the honourable member or any other honourable member can give me particulars of such cases I will have them examined immediately and appropriate action will be taken. There are seven companies operating in South Australia and all of them have intimated their preparedness to enter into this agreement with the Government without all this business of creating for all time a magnificent bureaucratic organization of three people who would go around the country deciding the fates of petrol stations and with power to revoke licences and remove a man's means of livelihood.

Mr. Lawn—You have taken away the right of the people of South Australia to elect a Government of their own choice.

The SPEAKER—Order!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not take away the rights of anyone. The laws of the land are made in this Parliament.

Mr. Lawn—By a Liberal Party Government.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They are made by all members of Parliament. The constitution has been drawn up over a long period by members of Parliament. This petrol topic is extremely interesting. The guarantee of the companies does not prevent a private individual from building a service station if he wants to. The purpose of this legislation is to restrict these wicked companies, but if I decided that I could make an honest living from selling petrol and could provide a service to the community, what earthly reason would this Parliament have for saying I

should not do so? Why should I have to go before a licensing authority and plead with three persons appointed by the Government? We do not know the type of persons to be appointed to that body, but if I have the job of advising His Excellency upon this matter I will suggest he appoint three people who believe in there being plenty of petrol stations, because I do not believe in artificial restrictions.

Mr. Macgillivray—What about the Transport Control Board?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot debate that legislation now, but I have already stated that the need for any legislation of this nature should be proven to the hilt before this Parliament accepts it and I do not reserve transport legislation from that view. I ask the House not to accept this legislation. I assure members that the Government will closely supervise the undertaking given and if it is not honoured—although I do not doubt that it will be—the Government will view the position with concern. I have every sympathy for a person selling petrol who does not want unbridled competition to put him out of business. I would be the last to support putting people out of business by any merciless trade practice. I have already assured representatives of the resellers that the Government will see that the undertaking is properly carried out. I do not believe that this legislation is warranted. In the first place it would set up a long-term authority to deal with what is, at the most, a short-term problem. I do not agree with this type of approach to the problem. If it were merely a question of the use of building materials Parliament could deal with it. We did deal with that problem for many years until this Parliament unanimously decided it was no longer necessary to control building materials.

Mr. Riches—What about the right of a reseller to sell more than one brand of petrol?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If members go into a hotel they will find that the hotel sells certain brands of liquor.

Mr. Riches—That is wrong, too.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know that it is. The honourable member sells a certain brand of politics but he does not put the Liberal brand of politics up. He is not game to put our placards up alongside his. If one goes into a chemist shop he does not find that the chemist stocks all brands of drugs. He is usually an agent of a wholesale house and stocks Fauldings or Bickfords but

not all brands. A chocolate shop does not necessarily sell all brands of chocolates. Some fruit shops sell Jonathan apples and others Rome Beauties, but not necessarily all varieties. If a person requires Shell petrol there are plenty of avenues open for him to get it. Does the honourable member believe it would be reasonable for an oil company to finance the establishment of a reseller's organization to sell his competitors' products?

Mr. Riches—No.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Then that is the answer. I believe that this legislation is unnecessary and I ask the House not to accept it.

Mr. RICHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

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

LOAN ESTIMATES.

Grand total, £27,295,000.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 21. Page 682.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—Last year the Treasurer promised that he would recommend the building by the Housing Trust of rental homes in Clare. The negotiations were rather prolonged, but his promise has been honoured and probably the land required has now been purchased. My district will receive, in the Clare area, homes built for rental purposes, which is a departure from the usual policy of the trust. Now an extension of this programme is necessary. There are towns such as Riverton in which small industries are being started. They are extremely valuable for country towns, but there are not sufficient houses available for employees. It would be almost impossible for the young people to be engaged in these industries to build their own homes, but under a rental programme by the Housing Trust they could be housed and the industries adequately staffed. This would be one way to promote decentralization. I think every member, especially those representing country districts, would appreciate an extension of the programme to build rental homes in the country.

The Advances for Homes Act is quite unrealistic, for the maximum amount that can be

advanced is £1,750. That means that a person desiring to build his own home must have about £1,250, because it is almost impossible to build a home for under £2,800. We have recognized this in our amendment to the Succession Duties Act which exempts a widow from paying death duties on property up to £2,800. The Government should seriously consider increasing the maximum advance of £1,750. I do not see how it would harm anyone or jeopardise the Government's finances, but it would be a great help to young people and enable many of them to build their own homes in country towns, thus easing the burden on the Housing Trust to some extent.

The Minister of Works has repeatedly told us that on a *per capita* basis we have more miles of water main in South Australia than any other country. We accept that, but there are still many country areas that are without water, except for supplies from dams. One corner of my district, comprising Black Springs, Waterloo and Manoora, has no reticulated supply, and in dry seasons, such as this, the shortage of water is a major problem. The district is adjacent to a main, and the people there have petitioned for a supply. The department is drawing up estimates, but if the Government can spend about £20,000,000 on building a satellite town, surely it can find enough money to take water to these country areas. When people move into the satellite town they will have a water supply and deep drainage. I applaud those responsible for bringing water from the Murray to the city, but that will cost up to £10,000,000, and it is not asking much, by comparison, to request the Government to carry out a few projects for country people. Highly productive districts would greatly benefit. The Government has an obligation to these people, especially considering the mammoth schemes being carried out to benefit directly the metropolitan area. With those remarks and observations, I support the first line.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—The Government's proposal to build a satellite town near Smithfield is an ambitious project, but if smaller similar projects were undertaken in various country districts we should have more decentralization. It is obvious that the Government is determined to go ahead with the satellite town, so it would be only beating the air to protest against it. Parliament has not been asked to consider the problem of transport for the new town, which will be built on the Main North Road. Practically all the traffic will come to Adelaide on that

road and thus create a bottleneck. I also want to refer to the traffic island at the West Terrace-Anzac Highway intersection. Recently an important football match was held on the Adelaide Oval, which attracted large crowds, and there were also large crowds at the Royal Show. After the football match was over I travelled along West Terrace and intended to turn down the Anzac Highway. When I reached the island the police officer on duty would not allow motorists to turn right down the Anzac Highway, but made them go further south down the Goodwood Road and into the traffic from the Show. However, there was practically no traffic on the down side of the Anzac Highway, and it was therefore stupid to create a bottleneck by directing the traffic to continue south. The problem of Adelaide's road traffic should be tackled in real earnest by the State Traffic Committee and other authorities. From 4 p.m. onwards each day Gilbert Street should be made a one-way street. Further, the construction of an underground tunnel under West Terrace, diverting it at angle and lifting it into the left-hand traffic lane on Anzac Highway would ensure a clear stream of traffic. By diverting another tunnel through the corner of the parklands at South Terrace to go under the Goodwood Road and lead back on to Anzac Highway, a greater economy in traffic movement would be achieved. Traffic could not enter Anzac Highway from West Terrace, and all traffic coming up Anzac Highway would come straight down West Terrace. This would eliminate all the dangers of a level traffic intersection, the present bottleneck and interference from tram traffic, and would result in the maximum safety for the public.

The Government should consider widening the Morphett Street Bridge and extending it across the Torrens so that diesel buses could use it. This would provide another north-south highway and allow motorists to by-pass Montefiore Hill. It would enable traffic coming from the northern suburbs to cross the Torrens, come through Light Square, and use Brown and Gilbert Streets or South Terrace on their way to southern and eastern suburbs. Provision could also be made for buses to use these routes. Such arrangements are necessary because of the Government's decision to build a satellite town north of Adelaide. Further, the extension of the Morphett Street Bridge would result in the widening of the Adelaide Railway Station yards which would be necessary in the event of the proposed electrification of the suburban system. At

present those yards are choked. My suggestion would result in the improvement of railway transport, north-south traffic facilities, and northern and eastern bus services.

Members have no doubt read recent press reports about an application to the Commonwealth Government for a subsidy for the dried fruits industry, which is in a precarious position. This Committee is asked to make money available by means of these Loan Estimates to the State Bank so that industries, including the dried fruits industry, may be assisted. The overseas competition facing this industry is terrific. Californian growers are subsidized up to £20 a ton on their raisins, which sell in competition with ours. Turkish growers have been granted a subsidy of £25 a ton on sultanas and £4 a ton on freight rates. Greek growers, whose product competes with Australian sultanas, now have a distinct advantage since the depreciation of the drachma against sterling; the exchange rate has changed from 42,000 drachma to the pound sterling to over 84,000 to the pound. These factors must be considered in assessing the competition that must be faced by Australian producers selling in the United Kingdom market. It is often said that the United Kingdom will naturally buy its foodstuffs in the cheapest market, and she cannot be blamed for doing so. I am concerned that we are voting thousands of pounds to the State Bank to make advances to growers and to enable the construction of such projects as the proposed Loxton distillery, while on the other hand we are not providing additional channels for the sale of the product. When completed, the Loxton distillery will be the biggest in this State, and within a few years the output of wine and spirits from this district will have increased considerably. Parliament should urgently consider the provision of better facilities for the marketing of the products from our soldier settlement areas.

Every member must be proud of the achievement of the Government in the Loxton soldier settlement scheme. Anyone who has not visited Loxton recently would be agreeably surprised at the great growth of the trees since they were planted. Many of

the younger settlers get a little bit perturbed because they have a hard struggle during the first year or two, but they receive a tonic when they are shown the trees that have grown so well since they were planted in 1948 and 1949. If we vote hundreds of thousands of pounds to be used for advances to these settlers, but do nothing about giving them an outlet for their products, we will find ourselves later faced with a position similar to that which we have experienced with regard to the Tramways Trust, and we will be called upon to pay out millions of pounds merely because these settlers cannot find a market for their products. The South Australian Parliament has not been kind in its treatment of the wine industry, and I support the remarks of the member for Angas (Mr. Teusner) and the member for Stanley (Mr. Quirke) that Parliament should do something this season for the wine industry.

One or two members have referred to production costs, and Mr. Quirke spoke on this matter. Indeed, he made some points I intended to make. The Treasurer, the Minister of Agriculture, certain Commonwealth Ministers, and some officers of the Agriculture Department have said in effect that the primary producer should reduce his costs of production. I point out, however, that it is difficult for him to do so, for there are few factors of production on which he can reduce his costs. He has no control over the wage component that goes into the costs of the machinery, superphosphate, fuel and rail freights. No doubt the authorities made those statements to encourage greater primary production and to maintain the balance of Australian trade. To compete on world markets we must sell our goods on an equivalent basis, but how is the farmer to reduce his costs of production? There has been much talk about the cost of production formula applied in the wheat industry, and it has been said that the grower is adequately covered in respect of land values. In order that honourable members may be informed on this question I purpose to set out, as briefly as possible, the items that make up the cost index in assessing the wheat price.

The following table shows comparisons of costs of production of wheat per bushel:—

Item.	1947/48. d.	1952/53. d.	1953/54. d.
1. Labour—			
(i) Farmers	22.80	48.37	—
(ii) Harvest	4.62	10.35	—
2. Maintenance of—			
(i) Machinery	5.23	—	17.01
(ii) Structures	2.81	8.32	6.43
3. Depreciation	7.58	10.12	20.73
4. Fuel	12.48	21.88	18.03

Item.	1947/48. d.	1952/53. d.	1953/54. d.
5. Interest on—			
(a) Borrowed capital	5.28	1.65 }	
(b) Farmers' equity	13.08	19.18 }	33.20
6. Fertilizer	4.32	11.76	15.04
7. Cornsacks	1.50	3.74	3.37
8. Seed	5.16	8.54	—
9. (a) Rates and taxes	2.19	4.30	3.56
(b) Insurance	1.53	—	3.77
10. Cartage	1.80	—	3.56
11. Rent	1.80	—	1.13
12. Miscellaneous	2.16	—	12.20
Total gross farm costs at sidings . .	98.96	—	221.48
Net costs at sidings	—	—	124.83
Rail freight and handling	10	24.36	25.83
Total net costs, bulk basis, f.o.r. ports	75	—	150.66

There has been a great deal of justifiable criticism about the terrifically high prices paid for farming land, and I agree with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition that these prices are ridiculous. However, I point out that in this index the costing is carried out on the basis of a land value of £6 10s. an acre. From this it will be seen that anybody who criticizes the 12s. 7d. or 14s. a bushel allowed in the costing index because of the high price of land is not correct. Members will realize the careful way in which these indices are prepared, a survey being made every year from farm to farm. A questionnaire is distributed and by such means a good cross section of the farmers who make up these costs is obtained.

Recently I have been approached to make representations to the Housing Trust for the erection of six to eight homes in Karoonda because young business men, teachers, and others have nowhere to live. People in this income range are unable to find sufficient deposit to purchase a trust home, so the trust should be encouraged to build homes for rental in small country towns. This would greatly encourage teachers particularly and other young fellows anxious to get on, and if they are subsequently transferred the home would be readily available to someone else. I trust that the Government will consider this matter. I hope also that it will give some consideration to the points I have raised relating to transport problems, the satellite town, the future suburban railways electrification, the wheat costing system, dried fruits industry, and marketing of wine. I think that is sufficient food for thought to give the Government a headache for a long time. I support the Loan Estimates.

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—In the last few days we have heard some very admirable speeches on the Estimates in such terms

that one would think members were in banking institutions rather than in an assembly such as this. Nevertheless, I do not desire to criticize unduly the remarks expressed by those members who have confined themselves in the main to certain financial theories on what can be done in the administration of this State. I notice a provision in the Estimates of £100,000 for roads and bridges. In these days of high costs that will not go very far, something that I as a member of the Public Works Standing Committee, a body that deals with various public works, realize because of the cost of some very minor matters coming before the Committee. I do not know how the amount will be allotted, but a considerable amount should be spent on the Hilton Bridge. The member for Burra (Mr. Hawker) tried to give the Railways Commissioner of 30 years ago credit for foresight, and said that perhaps it would have been good if we had followed his advice. It must be remembered that when Mr. Webb was in office considerably more was spent on the railways than ever before or since. He had an unlimited purse given to him by the Labor Government. I think the Hilton Bridge was his brainwave, because he is the one who was responsible for transferring the goods and cleaning sheds from North Terrace to Mile End. It was a very commendable thought because it eliminated a considerable amount of congestion. However, he did not take into consideration the necessity to provide a proper overhead bridge at Mile End. The filling for this bridge consists of earth and ever since its construction there has been a gradual subsidence of the soil, making it necessary for the road and footpath to be built up. The last Minister of Railways was very generous in response to some requests I made to him, particularly in regard to lighting, which has been considerably improved. Anyone using the bridge knows that

it is necessary to climb a gradient of about one in 10 to get on to the second overhead portion yet it is only a year or so since it was built up almost level. This will continue until something is done to prevent the subsidence. I also suggest that the bridge should be widened. Perhaps the railways or highways authorities have given some thought to the matter. Yesterday morning when I was driving over the bridge a vehicle coming from a side road forced me on to the footpath. I did not know whether or not he had the right of way, but I gave it to him. The ramps should be regraded, a stop sign erected at the top, and traffic should not be permitted to come on to the bridge until the roadway is clear. Although I feel that the Government has planned for the far distant future in relation to that bridge by proposing to construct a steel structure over the old property, that would mean encroaching on the Electricity Trust's land. In the meantime the Highways and Railways Departments should co-ordinate to remedy the present position, which is becoming more dangerous every day. It is not in the interests of commercial people in its present condition. I do not agree with Mr. Stott's suggestion for a tunnel at the South Terrace and Anzac Highway intersection. Apart from the enormous expense that would be involved, there would be difficulty after the traffic emerged from the tunnel. The City Council and some suburban councils favour the installation of traffic islands. The roundabouts we have installed have created more congestion instead of alleviating it. Traffic has gone on to the top of the roundabout at the corner of Portrush and Greenhill Roads. If drivers of vehicles run into that roundabout and get on top of it they will run into anything. The one at the South Terrace-Anzac Highway intersection has caused more congestion rather than ease the position. Mr. Stott mentioned the position there during Show week, but that was something special, although between 4.45 and 5.45 each day almost the same position applies. Attempts should have been made to ascertain the best form of structure, in view of all the conditions.

Mr. Stott referred to his pet subject of the Morphet Street bridge, but there would be much trouble in eliminating the danger and congestion because of the very nature of the terrain. A mistake was made in building Bonython Hall where it is because it has prevented the construction of a road through to the Frome Road Bridge. I know we are not experts on these matters, but we have a right to criticize the decision of the experts, especially

when public money is concerned. Mr. Pearson was very critical about the money the Government spends on public hospitals. He said the State was responsible for maintaining them without getting any return. He will not deny that the State is responsible for the health of the community, and if that is so the State must be responsible for the erection of the hospitals. A number of community hospitals have been established in recent years and all people associated with them are appreciative of the great work being done, but they cannot carry on at the present high cost of administration without further Government support, which must be forthcoming. It is impossible to measure in pounds, shillings and pence the return to the State for the hospital and medical service rendered to the public. Most people are unable to meet the high costs of hospital accommodation. There is a guaranteed return to the hospital under the Commonwealth benefits scheme and payments by friendly societies. People unable to pay should not be expected to pay for public hospital accommodation, and when they go to private hospitals some time elapses before they can meet the charges. We must commend the Government for the establishment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which will provide much relief in the western districts when completed and in full operation. More hospitals must be built. The Government must soon consider establishing one on land available at Oaklands. The inadequacy of country hospitals is well-known to country members. Conditions at some of them are appalling. I have noticed it myself when I have visited country hospitals as a member of the Public Works Committee. I soon appreciated the need to improve them, if not to completely reconstruct them. It is pleasing to note that the Government is proceeding with work at the Mount Gambier and Port Pirie hospitals.

Like Mr. Stott I commend Mr. Teusner for his very fine contribution to this debate. Although I do not agree with all he said, there is much with which I have sympathy. Those people associated with the wine industry will not deny that much public money has been spent on its development. We all know the original reason for its establishment. It was not only to start an industry but to find an outlet for the production of the ex-servicemen settled on the land. Many of the established wine making firms made considerable sacrifices in the industry's development, and so did the employees. I know a great deal about this matter. I remember the fight we had to get

decent wages and conditions for the employees. It was not until 1919 that an agreement was reached with the employers in regard to wages and conditions. It provided for a wage 3s. a week less than the basic wage and some years elapsed before it reached that level. Because of the union's activities and the co-operation to a large extent of the employers the conditions are now reasonably good when compared with conditions in other industries. During the depression years in the Barossa district many of the wine firms took grapes from growers without having any hope of getting rid of them. Some growers were not paid for their grapes at the time but rather than allow them to rot the wine firms took them into their cellars. I remember one grower begging the manager of a wine firm to take in his grapes but the manager said his cellars were full. The grower said that if they were not taken in the grapes would have to go back and be turned into the soil. The manager then agreed to the grower taking the grapes to the crushing shed, and he pointed out that he did not know when payment would be made. Three years elapsed before some growers were paid for the grapes they delivered at that time. The manufacturers did something to protect the growers then. However, it was unfortunate that shortly before the depression years, because of the bounty paid by the Commonwealth Government to the industry, a number of small wine-producing establishments grew up overnight with the object of receiving the benefit of it. They swamped the overseas market with inferior wine and ultimately affected that market. Immediately the depression set in they flooded the metropolitan areas of Australia, particularly Adelaide, with their accumulated stocks. One firm hawked its products at 3s. 6d. a gallon to hotelkeepers. They did considerable harm to the industry. It took some time to rehabilitate itself after the depression, but brandy firms built up a considerable market in India—particularly Pakistan—and South-East Asia. Unfortunately, the outbreak of war cut off those markets. The loss of overseas markets was accentuated by the war and since then by the imposition of excessive duty on imported wines by the United Kingdom. It is impossible to buy a bottle of Australian wine under 12s. sterling in England. On my visits to England since the war I have not noticed any advertising by the Australian wine industry. If we desire to rehabilitate our wine trade in England we must indulge in a programme of advertising. If we don't, we will have no hope of competing with South Africa. Some

people have suggested that to assist the industry we should licence storekeepers and others to sell wine in single bottles. I do not subscribe to that. I will probably have an opportunity later of expressing my views more fully, but I am convinced that if that suggestion were adopted it would not result in the sale of sufficient wine to affect the industry to any appreciable extent.

Yesterday, by way of question, I mentioned that the Commonwealth Minister for Customs was to attend meetings of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff and suggested that a South Australian representative should attend those talks. I was wrongly reported in the press as having suggested that a member of this Parliament should attend. Nothing was further from my mind. I believe that if it were not possible for the dried fruits or wine industries to be directly represented, then an adviser to the official delegate could attend on their behalf. I thought that the Agent General for South Australia would be competent to act in that capacity and it would not involve the State in any great expenditure. He could go to Geneva afterwards. I was informed by the Minister, on the advice of the Premier, that Mr. Powell was to represent this State. I do not know whether he is a State Government appointee or whether he was appointed offhand by the Commonwealth Government, but it must be borne in mind that he represents the Chamber of Commerce. He is president in this State, and, I believe, is Federal President of the Chamber. My impression in 1947, in association with other members of the Australian Delegation, was that the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures were generally uninterested in the dried fruits, canning and wine industries. It is not too late to send a person to represent South Australia direct and not the Chamber of Commerce. That organization is concerned more with imports than with exports. When the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff was established the Chifley Government sent advisers from all industries affected to the meetings.

Mr. Brookman—How many representatives would you send?

Mr. FRED WALSH—That would not matter. In 1947, Mr. Newcomen represented the wool and wheat industries, Peter Malloch the dried fruits industry, Mr. Evatt—not the doctor—the canning industry, and there were other men also acting as advisers. Surely Mr. Brookman appreciates that it is not competent for any individual to understand

the requirements of all sections of industry.

Mr. Brookman—Mr. Powell has a particularly wide experience of almost all industries.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Don't you bet on it. I do not suggest he should not be there, but I would like to see representatives from the wine and dried fruits industries at those meetings. I am not in accord with some of the remarks of my colleagues about the proposed new satellite town. I favour decentralization, but it must be done economically. It is no use trying to establish an industry inland where power, water, and raw materials do not exist. It must be established where some, if not all, of those features exist.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—And a labour pool.

Mr. FRED WALSH—That will follow. Amenities must be provided. If an industry were to be established at Radium Hill there would be difficulty in getting manpower unless amenities were provided. At least at Radium Hill there are raw materials. Mr. McAlees has a greater claim for industries to be established at Wallaroo than most members have in respect of their pleas for the establishment of industries inland. Mr. Quirke said yesterday that it was ridiculous to house workers near the Salisbury munition works. It must be borne in mind that an incalculable amount has been spent on establishing those works and at a time when we had no conception of atomic warfare. It would be almost impossible and of no advantage to remove workers from their homes in the vicinity. While these works may represent a danger in time of war it cannot be suggested that the workers and their homes should be moved miles away. Men do not want to spend hours daily travelling to and from their places of employment. Many people who work in the centre of London spend two to three hours daily in travelling and I will guarantee that the average Londoner who does not live in the heart of London knows less about that city than a person who spends two or three weeks there.

Mr. Pearson—In Sydney workers travel from Katoomba.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, but that is not a good thing. It does not matter particularly to persons employed in offices and not engaged on heavy work, but a labourer does not want to spend his leisure time travelling to and from work. He does not want to get home in time to have supper and go to bed, and rise next morning and immediately after breakfast travel to work. Like everyone else, I believe that Adelaide will develop greatly.

The city cannot expand east or west, nor very much to the south. It must go north, and I think the Government erred in proposing to establish this satellite town at Smithfield. It should have started from Gawler and gone north and south from there. Forests could be grown between there and Adelaide so there would not be any linking up of settled areas. The number of parks and gardens in and around London would astound most people. One could get lost in Epping Forest. Those reserved areas will never be built upon, and we should do something along those lines in Adelaide. I see by today's *News* that the Government has bought more land in the Adelaide hills, but it should buy much of the land in the foothills so as to keep it as reserves in perpetuity.

State Bank, £2,340,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I note that £1,350,000 is proposed for loans for new homes and for purchase and additions to existing homes, pursuant to the Advances for Homes Act. I understand that the Housing Trust is getting advances from the State Bank of up to £1,750 on its new homes. From what other institutions does the trust get financial assistance? I also understand that the State Bank has discontinued building brick houses.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—For many years the State Bank did not undertake group building, but immediately after the war, in an attempt to ease the housing shortage, it built a number of group houses of its own volition. At present the bank is not undertaking any group building, but it is assisting people to build who have bought blocks of land. Most of these blocks are scattered throughout the suburbs, though some are in country districts. I cannot state the number of houses that the trust will build this year, but I will get that information from the trust. Of course, it is one thing to let contracts for houses, but we never know what progress the contractors will make. Further, the Housing Trust gets an amount under the Commonwealth-State housing agreement. Negotiations are now taking place to have the agreement amended with a view to getting great benefits for this State. The terms of the alteration have not yet been worked out, but if they can be finalized in time they will be brought before the House for ratification this year. The terms are much more liberal than anything previously available.

Mr. Frank Walsh—What will the interest rate be?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Four and a half per cent, which is slightly lower than the current market rate on Commonwealth loans, but the rate charged to the State will be lower than that, thereby enabling us to cover working expenses. Adequate advances are proposed under this scheme, but I am not sure whether the Commonwealth wants the details released yet.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Does the Treasurer expect that the maximum advance of £1,750 under the Advances for Homes Act will be increased?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. The State Bank will not be involved in any new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The money to be provided to the State Bank will come out of normal Loan funds which we receive through the Loan Council.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I think that there may be some complications arising out of any new agreement. It seems that some people will get a better deal as a result of money made available by the Commonwealth under new conditions. Will the Housing Trust's activities come under two categories—one under assistance from the State Bank, and the other (the major) under advances made by the Commonwealth Bank? Will some of the Commonwealth advances be used for building purchase homes, or will most of them be rental homes? Will it be possible, under the new proposals, to obtain a greater first mortgage under the Advances for Homes Act?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—We are now discussing the £1,350,000 proposed for the State Bank pursuant to the Advances for Homes Act. That has nothing to do with the Housing Trust, though I referred to the trust when replying to the honourable member's questions. When explaining the Loan Estimates I stated:—

This year the bank estimates that it will expend approximately £20,000 on the completion of the group scheme houses; will advance a further £580,000 to persons who are constructing their own homes, and will require £750,000 for new advances.

The line we are now discussing does not involve the Housing Trust at all.

Mr. Frank Walsh—The State Bank has made advances to the trust.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—To my knowledge, never. Any person who purchases a house from anybody may go to the State Bank for an advance to enable him to complete the purchase. The bank makes the advance to a person and not to the Housing

Trust. There is no tie-up between the State Bank housing and the trust housing. The State Bank has a number of functions under the Advances for Homes Act: to render architectural assistance to intending home builders, to arrange contracts, to supervise construction and to assist the purchaser by an advance repayable over a long period on a credit foncier basis. It will also advance money to people desiring to purchase homes. An intending purchaser is asked whether he has previously had an advance from the bank, for its function is to enable people to build and purchase homes for their occupation and not for speculation. The State Bank and the Housing Trust conduct their business under different Acts, and there is no borrowing between them. Each institution is responsible for its own functions. The bank is authorized under its legislation to advance £1,750 or 90 per cent of the valuation of the property, whichever is the lower, but the State Bank Board may advance a greater amount if it considers that circumstances justify it. Under its legislation it is relieved of any responsibility for losses up to £1,750 or 90 per cent of the valuation, whichever is the lower, but, if it lends more, it must make sure, as a banking institution, that it has adequate security for the loan and that it is not lending money that will not be ultimately repaid.

Line passed.

Highways and Local Government, £100,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has this sum been allocated to its various uses for the current year? Is the new plant being used on the site of the satellite town near Salisbury the property of the Housing Trust or the Salisbury Council?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Often the road-making requirements in the Housing Trust areas are too great for local councils to handle, and for some time the Housing Trust has assisted councils by constructing such roads. The plant referred to by the honourable member is probably Housing Trust plant. The £100,000 on the Estimates is additional to about £500,000 that has already been made available to councils. The terms on which loans are made to councils by the Highways Department are five years free of interest. Previously many councils were trying to do road work without adequate plant, a rather hopeless task in times of labour shortages.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—The council in my district recently applied to the Highways Department for £12,000 worth of machinery,

but I understood that this fund had been exhausted. Could such a loan be made from this £100,000?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Highways Department has known for two months that this sum would be made available to it, but I do not know how much of it is committed. The department would probably start to allot amounts to councils so that the machinery could be ordered, and I would fancy that this total is fairly fully committed.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I accept the Treasurer's explanation. Is the equipment to be purchased with this £100,000 capable of doing the work envisaged or would it be more economic to the councils and the ratepayers for the Highways Department to build up and modernize its plant, which could then be hired out to local councils?

Line passed.

Lands, £81,000; Irrigation and Drainage, £726,000—passed.

Woods and Forests, £1,300,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Premier inform the House why it is necessary to publish practically all the names of the employees of this department? I appreciate that loan works, such as the planting of forests and purchasing of further areas for afforestation, should be financed from loan money. When it comes to production from the forests there should be another approach because I see no reason why we should make available loan funds. Two years ago there was a curtailment in the amount for the Engineering and Water Supply Department because funds had been exceeded. This has happened in the Woods and Forests Department. In view of the large amount of timber used for home building and case making, is it necessary to finance it from loan funds considering that the department will return more than the loan provides?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The reason why the names are printed is that it is required by Statute that loan money spent on salaries shall be enumerated. I agree that there is not much point in cluttering up the documents with a long list of employees because I think that the total of £130,000 would give Parliament all the information it needs. I will consider whether an amendment should be introduced to alter this position. On the second point, the honourable member is not correct in his assumption, because the Government would not be entitled to spend money earned by the Woods and Forests Department without obtaining a vote from Parliament. In a department such

as this in which the payments to loan are nearly as much, if not as much, as payments from loan, if we did not have a provision such as this Parliament would have no control over expenditure.

If these departments could automatically use moneys without authority they would go blithely ahead, estimates would never be presented to Parliament and there would be no oversight of the money being spent. Under the Public Purposes Loan Act any moneys earned and any repayments to loan can only be used for future financing of works after Parliament has approved of that. That is an important provision and I am not in favour of altering it because it is the very basis of the control of finance by this House.

Mr. JENNINGS—I am at a loss to appreciate how this department, in which there is expenditure of revenue, is not dealt with in the State Budget instead of in the Loan Estimates. I understand that once there was an excess of revenue over expenditure in the Harbors Board, the Engineering and Water Supply or some other department it was regarded as a revenue item. Why is this department so dissimilar from other departments? It seems to be a satisfactory business venture.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In the first place, this was a long-term activity and for many years there were no repayments to the department. It was a matter of planting trees and having no milling operations. Even today we have not satisfactorily worked out a method of assessing yearly the value of the growing forests. For instance, a wasp attacks forests in other countries and if it were established here our forest undertakings would soon be reduced in value. It is difficult to assess the profit the department actually makes each year. Whatever the profit, it is used to extend the operations of the department. It is an investment valuable to the State and I think it would be unwise at this stage to take some of the earnings and use them purely for revenue purposes. Without being definite about it, I think the total commitment on our forests today is not more than £3,000,000. We have a wonderful asset and something with which we can meet future competition.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Can the Treasurer say how much of the £1,300,000 will be devoted to developing and planting pines in the Second Valley forest?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In explaining the Loan Estimates I said that about £78,000 would be spent on the preparation of land and

plantings, and that the maintenance of existing forests would cost £112,000. I cannot give figures for the individual forests.

Line passed.

Railways, £2,176,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Money is to be spent on providing additional four-wheel vans but there is a doubt as to the advisability of using them. Does the Treasurer know whether a decision has been made to abandon their use and concentrate on the bogie type under-carriage?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot give much information on the matter. I understand that some of the four-wheel vans did not have enough flexibility and were rather stiff in operation, which made them prone to leave the rails. They have been returned to the Islington workshops to be made more flexible. I have heard no suggestion to abandon the use of four-wheel vans, which are used generally throughout the world.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I notice that 14 diesel mechanical railcars and 12 suburban diesel railcars are to be purchased. Is one organization supplying the gear boxes and two other organizations supplying other parts of the mechanism of these rail cars? In reply to a question I was told that on a trial run the engine of one of these rail cars collapsed but that the suppliers in America were prepared to reinstate the whole of the machine without cost. When competitive tenders were called for the supply of diesel engines for these rail cars was one organization prepared to supply all component parts and to send an expert here to rectify any mistakes that might occur? Is it not a fact that that tender was rejected and tenders accepted from three firms which, between them, supply the components of the engine?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The 14 diesel mechanical rail cars are components. The pancake engines were supplied from America and the transmission, which was recommended as the best and cheapest, was supplied from France. These tenders are not of recent origin. In most instances tenders provide for a long period before delivery and as far as I know the pancake engines were the only engines available for speedy delivery. The transmission gear was recommended by Mr. Harrison after he had been overseas and inspected the various alternatives offering from other organizations. The French tender was ultimately accepted.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Has not the company gone insolvent?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is supplying the equipment and if it has gone insolvent someone evidently is carrying on the business of supplying equipment according to specification and in accordance with the terms of the contract. At the time the contract was let there were no tenders for the complete cars.

Mr. STEPHENS—For many years I have asked questions relating to engines operating on the Port line about which many residents have complained. The Minister of Railways said that he was expecting to utilize new engines on that line and so obviate further damage to homes. An amount of £173,000 is provided for 10 diesel-electric shunt locomotives. I believe some of those engines will be used on the wharves at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour. Will any of the proposed new engines mentioned under the heading "Rollingstock" be used on the Port line?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the Railways Department purchases new locomotives it does not identify them as being available for any particular line. One day a locomotive may be used on the Port Adelaide line and the next day on the Murray Bridge, Marino or other lines. It is the intention of the department to supersede obsolete stock at present in use with modern fast transport. To that extent the answer to the honourable member's question is in the affirmative.

Line passed.

Harbors Board, £800,000.

Mr. STEPHENS—Can the Treasurer say where the proposed seamen's pick-up centre is to be situated? Will it be built near the offices of the Harbors Board?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know the precise locality, but I presume it will be situated in the most convenient place. It is one of the amenities we are providing at Port Adelaide.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, £5,575,000.

Mr. WHITE—Under the heading "Country Water Districts" an amount of £17,900 is provided for the electrification of the pumping station at Murray Bridge. Can the Treasurer indicate when that work will be carried out?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot say when the work will be completed but as an amount is provided in this year's Estimates it is anticipated that it will be spent before June 30 next.

Mr. WHITE—I am often asked by my constituents when the various pumping stations will be electrified. At one time I understood

this would be the first big job undertaken and that is my reason for asking the question. I was hoping to get some reply in order to answer the queries I receive from time to time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The expenditure has not even been authorized yet. When it is the contracts will be let, but even then it will be impossible to say precisely when these jobs will be finished. Let us consider the Mannum-Adelaide main. The pumps that were delivered were found to be faulty. They had to be discarded and the contractor had to make new pumps. That explains why some works are delayed. It is impossible to say when the £17,900 mentioned by the honourable member will be spent.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—An amount of £200,000 is proposed for South Australia's quota of expenditure for work to be carried out by the River Murray Commission. I am surprised that the amount is not larger. I believe that a conference of Ministers was held in Melbourne on the question of raising the capacity of the Hume Dam, and that will cost a great deal. Some time ago the Minister of Works received a deputation organized by the citrus industry, which asked that No. 4 lock at Berri be raised by four feet. The Minister said that plans were being drawn up for this work, which would cost about £20,000. Have they been placed before the River Murray Commissioners yet?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Minister of Works informs me that the plans have been prepared and will be submitted to the commission. My Government believes that there will be no difficulty in getting the proposal approved, for it is not a large one. The question about the Hume Dam involves expenditure outside this State by an authority in which we are only jointly interested. The contribution that we shall make will be determined outside this State, and we are providing for one-quarter of the total estimated expenditure for this year.

Mr. Macgillivray—Is the item I referred to only a progress payment?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS—An amount of £220,500 is listed for reticulation sewers in the metropolitan area. The Minister of Works promised me that the Croydon Park sewerage project would be included in this year's Estimates. Has it been included?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Minister informs me that it has been.

Line passed.

Architect-in-Chief, £2,570,000.

Mr. HUTCHENS—On behalf of my constituents, and also on behalf of the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping), I express appreciation at the considerable progress that has been made at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and I hope that the remainder of the hospital will be open in the near future, for it will meet a great need.

Mr. WHITE—Under the heading "School buildings—primary and infant schools" Mon-teith and Murray Bridge are mentioned. Can the Minister say what amount will be expended on these schools? What amount will be spent at Urrbrae high school and on the woodwork centres at Murray Bridge high and the Mannum higher primary school? How much will be spent on the Mannum, Tailem Bend and Murray Bridge police stations?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is impossible to give the honourable member the information he desires at the moment, for it depends on the progress made in the letting of contracts and to get a report on how much will be spent on each school would involve heavy administrative expense. The sums in the Estimates represent intelligent estimates by the Architect-in-Chief of what he will require for the various works. Sometimes, however, more work is done in a year on one project than on another, and the Public Finance Act gives the Treasurer a certain flexible power over expenditure. In some instances mentioned tenders have been called, and the figures represent departmental estimates.

Mr. PEARSON—I assume that the £26,490 provided for additional accommodation and sewage disposal at the Port Lincoln hospital is a further instalment in the provision of increased accommodation for nurses, patients and ancillary services. Recently certain men who were to undertake the second phase of the contract there were unable to proceed because the plans and specifications for the electrical work had not been received. Does the Architect-in-Chief, as a matter of practice, try to get a contract price for the complete job, or does he call for separate tenders for the various parts of the work? If the latter is the case, I suggest the policy be reviewed, because, even though it may work well in the metropolitan area, it is difficult to co-ordinate the work of sub-contractors in remote districts. It may be more advantageous to call for tenders for the complete job from contractors who may if they wish, sublet contracts for parts of the work

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The practice of the department is to call for tenders for the complete contract, but sometimes these cannot be obtained, and the department must do some of the work so that the job may proceed.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The sum of £17,000 is provided for new courthouses at Barmera, Berri, Murray Bridge and Salisbury. Last year £6,000 was provided for new courthouses at Barmera, Berri and Murray Bridge, but nothing has been done at Berri or Barmera. The need at Berri is probably greater than that at Barmera, because it is a bigger district and more policemen are employed in the town. When the court is in session at Berri, the local policemen cannot carry out their work properly, and a justice who officiates there has told me that, when the court is sitting and the 'phone rings, the 'phone must be passed through the window so that the policeman may use it in the street. I have placed this question on the Notice Paper, but have received no satisfaction. If there is any difficulty in getting tradesmen to do the work the district council is willing to help the department.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government approves of certain works and the Estimates are drawn up by the various departments for the work that can be undertaken in any year, but progress may be greater on some works than on others. With the exception of the hospitals programme, all last year's estimates for public buildings were achieved. I will try to get details of the current year's programme in respect of courthouses. To save time in this debate, if members will indicate on paper the information they require, I will get it for them.

Mr. DAVIS—Provision is made on the Estimates for primary and infant school accommodation at Port Pirie. Does this include the new school at Risdon Park?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think it does, but I will check it for the honourable member.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Can the Treasurer inform the House whether the Tooperang and Middleton schools are included in the £46,994 provided for grading and paving school yards?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. LAWN—An amount of £2,750 is provided for alterations and additions to Magill Wards. That is not a very large amount, and I ask what additional accommodation will be provided?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is obviously some minor job; perhaps some minor alterations to kitchen accommodation or something

of that nature. I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—An amount of £244,000 is provided for portable buildings as required. For many years the Gawler High school has required these buildings, and attempts have been made to obtain additional land. Provision is made for septic tank installations, and I ask whether the Wasleys school is included, because for many years efforts have been made to obtain installations there. Land is required for the Angle Vale school. Is that provided for in the line relating to purchase of land for school purposes? Repairs are sadly needed at the Lyndoch school. At the Gawler primary school the land around portable buildings badly needs paving, and I understand tenders have been called. Is part of the amount allotted for grading and paving school yards for the Gawler school?

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £11,427,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I move—

That the line—Municipal Tramways Trust, loan to . . . £500,000—be struck out.

We have not been informed how this money is to be spent.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! Would the honourable member resume his seat for a few moments to enable me to find out whether anyone wishes to speak on the line.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move that progress be reported.

The CHAIRMAN—I asked the honourable member to resume his seat while he was making his speech, so I do not think I can prohibit him from resuming.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am most insistent about this now and am prepared to continue with this debate tonight. We have not been told how this money is to be spent or of the intentions of the trust on its policy. We have not been informed how long it will be before the Tramways conversion policy will be completed although it has been indicated that it may be 10 years. We certainly have not been informed how much it will cost. It is proposed to add a loan of £500,000 to the £600,000 already voted to the trust and not yet spent, and this will increase the total indebtedness of the trust to the Government from £5,717,000 to £6,817,000. In 1952 the Premier estimated that the trust would require £1,180,000 spread over a period of five years, to be allotted as follows:—

	£
1952-53	450,000
1953-54	350,000
1954-55	250,000
1955-56	100,000
1956-57	30,000

It will be noted that the amounts were to be gradually reduced over the period of five years, yet in the first two years the trust's revenue has been supplemented by the Government to the extent of £1,400,000. In other words, in two successive years the Government has made available £700,000. Greater losses are being incurred by the trust each year. In 1953-54 there was a deficit of £796,000, before allowing for the Government subsidy of £700,000. The trust does not seem to know where it is going. We have been told that no final decision has been made regarding the abandonment of tram tracks. Some tramlines recently laid down have been torn up. This has happened in Erin-dale and now it is impossible for trams to run from Hutt Street in an easterly direction to serve that area. Why was money spent on laying a track in Franklin Street? We do not know the cost of that work. I understand that the track was laid to provide a turn round for trams going to and from the Showgrounds. Earlier I referred to the roundabout at the corner of South Terrace and Anzac Highway. When speaking to a city council representative about it I asked what was to happen to the tram tracks on the roadway and he told me that the trust intended to remove them. If that is so, why did the trust spend money in putting a track down in Franklin Street? Huge losses are being incurred in the scrapping of tramlines. According to information given by the Minister of Railways to a member of another place it costs between £62 and £65 to remove a chain of single track and sleepers, and to reinstate the roadway. Second-hand rails unfit for further use are being sold, according to the Minister, at 5s. a foot and less. Scrap sleepers unfit for further service are sold from 1s. 6d. to 6s. each. In the trust balance sheet the gross value of the permanent way is given as £1,090,000, but what is its real value? Has any consideration been given to the number of miles of tram tracks already taken up? Several items appearing in the trust's balance sheet are set out at inflated gross values. For instance, the value of trams is set down at £672,000, power station and plant £525,000 and electrical equipment £209,000. In view of the policy of tearing up tracks, how can a value be placed on the trams? A tram cannot be an asset if it is not used. I do not know what is covered by the reference to the power station and plant. There was a power plant at Port Adelaide used for the purpose of generating electricity, but the trust considered it uneconomic to continue to use it and purchased its requirements from the Electricity Trust.

At June 30 this year the trust's indebtedness to the Government was £5,717,000. Against that were assets with a net value of £2,448,000. Less than half of the trust's liabilities are balanced by real assets. Accumulated losses to June, 1954, were £3,174,000. The accounts for 1953-54 do not include a contingent liability of £330,000 for the cost of restoring roadways after tram tracks had been pulled up. It seems that some of the £500,000 will be used to meet the reduction in the value of assets. On page 53 of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on State Transport in 1951, under the chairmanship of Sir Kingsley Paine, it was suggested that to achieve greater efficiency in the operation of the trust's services and thereby ease the problem of increased fares, the trust should immediately institute inquiries to ascertain whether it would be economically practicable to replace trams by buses in one form or another on the more lightly patronized lines. It was not an unqualified recommendation that trams should be entirely replaced by buses. In fact, it could be said that the report recommended that buses should only replace trams in a limited way and then only if they could be shown to be more economical. In 1952 the Anderson committee recommended:—

That trolley buses or one-man operated fuel buses replace obsolete trams operating on light traffic lines as soon as practicable, particular attention being given to those lines where renewals of the tramline would otherwise be necessary. That on heavy traffic lines where the trams being used are not obsolete, the trams be maintained for the time being, but they be not replaced by new trams without a detailed investigation into the economics of alternative forms of transport at the appropriate time.

Here again there was no absolute recommendation for the scrapping of trams as an accepted policy. It would be unwise to scrap trams at this time, particularly in view of the experiences of other States where bus services are being replaced by trams which it is believed will be more economical. We should not be asked to approve of the loan of £500,000 to the trust, particularly as we do not know the intentions of the management of the trust. The trust must depend entirely upon the passengers it can carry. Committees have inquired into the service and experts have come from overseas to advise on the management of the trust, but has the management endeavoured to meet the situation? This item should be struck out because the Government has failed to supply the necessary information relating to the proposed expenditure of this money.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—One or two matters should be discussed before we decide this question. If the proposed amendment were successful the trust would be forced out of business because it could not continue operations without this money. Unless this amount and another amount in the Revenue Estimates is approved the trust will go out of business. Whether members want that to happen is a matter for them to decide. The Government, quite obviously, would like to be relieved of this drain upon its resources. If this motion is carried it would not only strike out the provision of a loan of £500,000 to the trust, but would also be a vote of no confidence in the Government. The Government has supported the tramways because it has been assured that they provide transport necessary to take workers to their jobs at a reasonable cost. We have been told that private enterprise does not give a service as good as the tramways and that if we do not support them people who are not in the privileged class will be in difficulties. Therefore, the Government has generously supported the trust, despite criticism from the member for Chaffey and others. I understood that the Government's policy on this matter was supported by most members, but I now find that members opposite have come to the conclusion that the tramways should not be supported.

Mr. Lawn—The Government should resign.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If that is what members opposite want they should move a vote of non-confidence in the Government, and that could be done without involving the tramways. I have been informed that the attitude of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was a premeditated vote of no-confidence in the tramways system by the Opposition.

Mr. Pearson—And a vote of no transport for people in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and this would affect the less fortunate section of our community, those who could not afford a motor car. The stand taken by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is a vote of no-confidence in the tramways primarily, but it becomes a vote of no-confidence in the Government. I have even had some criticism from members behind me because we have spent money, lavishly as they say, on this undertaking, but I have carefully examined the trust's requirements. The amounts I have recommended to Parliament have not proved excessive. Even with these amounts it has been difficult for the trust to pay its way. Last year the trust's accounts showed a deficit.

If this line is not carried the trust will go out of business. The question of trams *versus* buses has been raised. I am not an authority on transport, but we have had inquiries in which the advice of most competent people was obtained. They showed that for a number of years the tramways in South Australia were not properly maintained. Many of the tracks are out of repair. We have had several questions lately about the Findon line. I inspected the rails myself and found that most of them were badly rusted. If the trust is to carry on it must be rehabilitated. We had a similar position many years ago in the railways. The Government engaged an expert from overseas, Mr. Webb. There was much criticism about the large sums that he spent and because the railways did not pay immediately, but during the war many members who had criticised Mr. Webb were generous enough to say that if it had not been for the rehabilitation of the railways we should have been in a hopeless position. Facts and figures about the Tramways Trust's operations have been made available, and they have been substantiated by overseas experts, people who do not handle the transportation of a few thousand people, but who are in charge of systems that carry millions. The trust is acting on the advice of those experts.

Mr. Quirke—Is it intended to rehabilitate all the tram tracks?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is intended to rehabilitate the entire transportation services of the metropolitan area. We have already authorised a series of rehabilitation works for the railways. Last year the railways made a loss of £3,000,000, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not move to strike out the vote for the Railways Commissioner. What has happened to our tramways system is not peculiar to South Australia. Only yesterday the Treasurer of New South Wales brought down his Budget. Even with the great density of population and the greater number of passengers per mile in Sydney and Newcastle the tramways there will lose not £600,000, but £3,000,000.

Mr. Pearson—And for years they have spent nothing on maintenance!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is so. At present our tramways are providing the highest amount possible for depreciation; indeed, in one case the Auditor-General queried the amount. The trust is presenting the worst picture possible in that regard, and that is of some advantage for it is on the worst picture that we can build up and get somewhere. If honourable members opposite do not wish to

support the tramways, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has given them the opportunity to express their wishes. In providing a sum for this purpose on the Estimates the Government will take into account any vote taken this evening—and I am not bluffing. If members say they do not want money provided for the tramways, the Government will give a receptive ear to their desire.

Mr. LAWN—I support the motion, and I make no apology for doing so, for I shall not be bluffed by the Treasurer.

The Hon. T. Playford—I am not bluffing.

Mr. LAWN—This motion is not merely a vote of no-confidence in the tramways: it is a vote of no-confidence in the Government and cannot be construed in any other way. If it is carried it can be interpreted only as a vote of no-confidence in the political dictatorship existing in this State. The Playford Government occupies the Treasury benches and can do what it likes in this House. It can appropriate money for any purpose it likes, irrespective of the wishes of the people. Labor members supported the Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment Bill two years ago even though it did not provide for the State Government's control of the trams, which they desired. The Treasurer said that the Deputy Leader had not mentioned railway deficits, but the railways are owned by the people and administered by a Minister who is answerable in Parliament for railway policy. The tramways are not owned by the people: they are owned by the municipal councils. It is true that this Government is a debenture holder of the trust, but the board is not answerable to a Minister or to Parliament. Despite this, the Treasurer wants members to vote money to the Tramways Trust the same as it is voted to the Railways Department in the management of which we have some say.

Members may voice their disapproval of railway policy and may ask questions of either the Minister or his colleague about railways administration. Such questions bring results, but no member may ask questions regarding policy or any other matter concerning the Tramways Trust. The board may increase fares, shorten sections, or abolish workers' monthly passes, but no opportunity is given to members to protest against such acts, for there is no Minister responsible for the activities of the trust. How often have members heard the Treasurer say that the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust and the Tramways Trust are not answerable to Parliament, and that

questions regarding their administration cannot be answered. The Government is responsible for the activities of these bodies, and, if this vote is carried, it will be a censure motion.

If the Government is willing to do the right thing, it will give the people a fair electoral system so that they may change the Government if they desire. This motion may put the Government and not the tramways out of business. I am one who cannot afford a motor car and I have had many opportunities to compare the services provided by the trust and by private bus lines. I am one who must patronize both types of service, and I will not have my vote in this House influenced by any bluff on the part of the Treasurer. From my observations I have no doubt that there is a large and growing discontent among the travelling public in the metropolitan area about the financial position of the Tramways Trust. I hear it from day to day, not only from people who own motor vehicles, but from passengers in buses and trams who probably do not know who I am. I do not hear such criticism only from people I meet in this House or in the trade union movement.

The Playford Government cannot be shifted under the present gerrymandered electoral system; because of that system it is in a position to squander money by voting it to a board over which Parliament has no control. I do not subscribe to the trust's policy, which includes tearing up our tram lines and replacing trams by diesel buses. Before such action is taken an investigation should be made by the Government and not merely by some board that is not responsible to Parliament. Such a body should not be able to make a decision off its own bat and then come to Parliament for a hand out. Atomic power will soon be available in this State and it is wrong to substitute, for trams, diesel buses, the fuel for which may be difficult to obtain from overseas. I do not subscribe to the policy of substituting diesel buses for trams and I will not do so until the Government has satisfied me that it is the right one. It is throwing money down the drain. I ask members opposite to consider all these things because they will have to answer for them at some time. It should be the responsibility of the Government to determine whether or not tram tracks will be torn up and what will be substituted for trams; no outside body should be entitled to decide. Money voted for the tramways has been used also for obtaining

advice, firstly, from a committee and then from American experts, and now it is proposed to introduce a time study system. We have no control over the way the trust spends the money that we vote, and the Government should take the trams over and put them in a position similar to the railways. The Premier said that the tramway system needs rehabilitation but a system that is operated by a trust over which we have no control cannot be rehabilitated by Parliament. I reiterate that this is a vote of no-confidence against the Municipal Tramways Trust and also against the Government and I suggest that the Treasurer, on reflection, might indicate that the further gerrymander he has promised will be reviewed so that the people will have a fair electoral system to enable them to elect a Government of their choice.

Mr. RICHES—As usual, when the Premier is hard pushed to answer criticism from the Opposition, he steps around it by charging the Opposition with desiring to do the very things he desires to do himself. I am not in favour of any action that will put the tramways out of business.

The Hon. T. Playford—If the honourable member votes in favour of this motion he will put them out of business.

Mr. RICHES—The trust wants to take trams off the road and to substitute diesel buses. According to the Premier £350,000 is required to purchase diesel buses and the remaining £150,000 is partly for restoration of roadways and partly for reconstruction and re-equipment of workshops. If we reject this line the Government will be asked, before any further money is allotted, whether it is intended to put trams out of business.

The Hon. T. Playford—Didn't the honourable member say he would not vote money for an undertaking that was losing money? The very ground of this motion was that the trust was losing money annually.

Mr. RICHES—I did not hear everything that was said, but I am giving my reason for supporting the motion.

The Hon. T. Playford—I thought you were giving an apology.

Mr. RICHES—The Premier is concerned that the motion might be carried, and his willingness to listen to members on this side is rather belated. He complained that this matter was brought on without notice, but I remind him that at least three members on this side said earlier in the session that they would not be parties to voting a single penny

towards the tramways to substitute buses for trams until they were satisfied that the service could not be provided by trams. Before members expressed themselves on this matter previously, it was shown that modern trams could capture business as easily as the trust hopes to do with diesel buses. According to the Premier an order has already been placed for buses and most of the amount under discussion is for their purchase. As Parliament has to provide the money it should have been consulted before the order was placed because we are becoming tired of accepting decisions made by outside bodies. We are now placed in the position of having to move what is tantamount to a vote of no-confidence, but there is no other way out. I am not too sure that we are not already committed because the order has been placed. The Opposition has taken the first chance of expressing its feelings on the matter. I do not know that there is any more call on Parliament to provide money for bus services in the metropolitan area than there is to provide them in the district I represent. If the trams are to be scrapped and buses instituted in their stead, Parliament should have the opportunity to consider the matter. The Opposition protests against trams being replaced by buses. The Treasurer tried to draw an analogy between the trams and the railways. He said that the railways make losses and that to be consistent the Opposition should have moved to delete the line granting money to that undertaking. If there were any move to replace the railways with road transport by the expenditure of public money without Parliament being consulted, there would be Opposition protests. If the money is not made available to the trust the undertaking will not cease to operate, but the Government will have to recast the line and again approach Parliament for money to rehabilitate the trust.

Mr. DUNSTAN—If members on this side were to vote for the line the Treasurer could say in the future, "You voted for the policy about which you have been protesting." We have been demanding information on the matter for months. We are not trying to put the trust out of business but to put the Government out of business if it does not give us the information we want. The Treasurer has failed time and time again to supply the information, and that is why we are protesting. We are entrusted with the task of finding money for these undertakings and we should be given information. The

Treasurer thinks he can treat the House with contempt, as he treats other institutions in the State. He says, "I have spoken, so let no dog bark." We on this side will not put up with any more shilly-shallying. We have a responsibility and we want to carry it out in a proper manner. We will not hand to the Treasurer, or boards or trusts, the right to say, "Mine is the policy and you shall not criticize, but if you do you are warned that I shall take it out on you in connection with some other vote." He said that if the Government was not supported in this matter he would take it out on our electors as a reprisal. Is Parliament the responsible institution in this State or should a dictatorship be allowed to continue in contempt of the rights and desires of the people?

Mr. SHANNON—This is not the first time that I have noticed Opposition members run off the rails when the Leader of the Opposition has been absent. They become a rabble when he is not here to keep them in line. I cannot imagine a vote of no-confidence in the Government being based on worse premises than on the voting of money for a transport undertaking. The usual procedure is to move for a reduction of £1 in a line, but members opposite have chosen a particular grant against which to protest. That suits their policy, but in their calmer moment they will realize the implications of their move. One or two of their members who are absent tonight will not be pleased with the move.

Mr. Dunstan—Who?

Mr. SHANNON—The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Dunstan—He is in complete agreement with the move.

Mr. SHANNON—If he had been present I do not think this move would have been made. He would have chosen sounder grounds upon which to base the attack.

Mr. Dunstan—He knew all about it.

Mr. SHANNON—If he did I withdraw my remarks but I have a high opinion of his judgment. He is a sound tactician and I do not think he would have been a party to such an utterly futile attack on the Government in connection with an essential undertaking. If this motion were carried, not only would the Government be put out of office but if the Labor Party occupied the Treasury Benches tomorrow it would have to reinstate this item. The tramways system must be kept in operation and the State will have to supply the necessary money until such time as the new board puts the trust on a sound financial basis.

Mr. Riches—But this money is for the purchase of buses.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not care what it is for. At the moment we are considering the new board and are endeavouring to provide funds to enable it to carry out its policy.

Mr. Riches—Which is to buy buses.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member apparently does not appreciate that Parliament instituted this new board in place of the old management to tidy up the mess in the trust's affairs.

Mr. Riches—But this money is to buy buses, not to maintain the present service.

Mr. SHANNON—I am afraid the honourable member is trying to explain away by subterfuge—

Mr. RICHES—On a point of order. The honourable member said that I was trying to explain away by subterfuge my attitude on this measure. I object to the word "subterfuge" because the Premier's explanation was that this money was required for buses. I want the word "subterfuge" withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN—The member for Stuart has taken objection to the word "subterfuge." I think the member for Onkaparinga will realize that that is a reflection.

Mr. SHANNON—In that case I am happy to withdraw. The member for Stuart misunderstands the position and has not grasped the situation clearly.

Mr. Riches—I have taken the Premier's word.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not care whose word the honourable member has taken. He is still not following the fact that money must be provided to enable the new board to carry out its policy to continue public transport in the metropolitan area, whether by trams or buses.

Mr. Dunstan—Who is to decide the policy?

Mr. SHANNON—The board, which was elected for that purpose. If the Opposition desires Parliament to become the Municipal Tramways Trust Board then I must dissociate myself from any such move. The board was appointed to examine the problems of transport in the metropolitan area and I suggest that if we are to tidy up the trust's transport problems we must not tinker with the persons we have asked to clean up that mess. If we call the board to account and instruct it in some form or another after charging it with the duty of carrying out that work we will not get very far. We will probably lose the services of certain valuable members of the board who understand and appreciate business

affairs. If left to carry out its policy I think it will get somewhere. It improved the trust's finances during the last financial year by about £100,000 which is not a bad effort considering that we are still in a period when people have plenty of money and are able to afford to drive their own vehicles to the city. If this matter had been thoroughly considered by the Opposition it would have taken a different line in attempting to contest the Government's financial proposals. It has said, in effect, "if we are successful in deleting this line, immediately we are elected to the Treasury benches as a result of this vote of want of confidence, we will have to reinstate the same line." It would probably have to add to it, because it is the policy of the Socialistic Party, surely, to support Governmental and semi-Governmental authorities.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I support the motion. I have every confidence that if it is carried it will not result in the end of the Tramways Trust in Adelaide but will be the making of it. When the old board lost about £792,000 in a period of 12 months, Parliament was told, when asked to reconstitute the trust, that the necessary expenditure would be £1,150,000, and that the undertaking would then become a paying concern. Up to the present £1,400,000 has been spent and we have been told that a further £6,000,000 is to be spent on diesel engine buses. Is this amount of £500,000 to be part of that £6,000,000? Since the appointment of the new board we have discovered some startling facts. The board has scrapped 40 modern tramcars. This change of policy has no doubt cost the trust, and the public, many thousands of pounds. We have also heard of allowances being made for deterioration in the services. There has certainly been a deterioration in the services and in the permanent way as a result of anticipating a changeover to buses. However, Parliament has been asked to continue to pour money down the drain, or to buy a pig in a poke. The trust has cut services on the lines that pay well, but it has run buses on the Beaumont route, which is not paying. On the other hand, on the Port Road conductors on an average shift take about £20.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The Beaumont service was established by the old trust.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I challenge the honourable member to prove that. The public has suffered from increased fares and reductions in the lengths of sections.

The Hon. T. Playford—Was that done by the new board or the old?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I believe by the old, but there is every indication in a statement made by Mr. Young recently that there will be a further increase in fares. Parliament has had no say in the proposal to spend about £6,000,000 over 10 years on the trust's rehabilitation programme. It seems that the trust proposes to replace trams and trolley buses with diesel buses. Can that be justified? Diesel buses have proved to be uneconomic and unsatisfactory in other places. As far back as 1938 the chairman of the Melbourne Tramways Board recommended the abandonment of certain tramways for diesel buses. In 1940, 45 double-decker buses and 46 single-deckers were purchased, but practically all of them have been retired from service. The board even went to the Victorian Government for assistance to replace the buses with trams. Our Tramways Trust is not under the control of Parliament, and members on this side are not prepared to continue voting large sums to it under the same conditions as in the past. Diesel buses have an economic life of only 10 or 12 years, compared with 15 to 20 years for trolley buses and 30 for tram cars. Moreover, two buses are required to carry the same number of people as one tram car. On June 27, 1951, the Paine Commission made many recommendations about Adelaide's transport services and about the tramways in particular. Paragraphs 256, 411 and 412 of the commission's report pointed out the need for co-ordinating transport services under the control of a Minister who would be responsible to Parliament. This Government has ignored the recommendations of a commission to the detriment of the taxpayers. Members on this side of the House are taking their present stand in order that the people of this State will have some voice in the spending of their money.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—My mind goes back to the time when the legislation that has caused this debate was first before the House. Both major Parties then threw their arms around each other's necks and entered into an agreement that I thought was blessed with the bonds of holy matrimony. I have now concluded that this was simply a marriage of convenience, and as so often happens in such marriages, the parents are not very proud of their offspring. Tonight we find one of the parents anxious to deny parenthood. I am glad we have so many members who are in the legal profession, for I can see a job for them in drawing up an agreement on who is to pay for this offspring. There are

three members who would be fully justified in supporting this motion, for they foresaw what is taking place this evening.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Who are they?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The members for Mount Gambier and Stanley, and I. This evening the Treasurer tried to draw an analogy between the railways and the tramways, as he did two years ago in his second reading explanation of the Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment Bill. I denied the analogy then and I do so again this evening, because the railways are the responsibility of the taxpayers of South Australia whereas the tramways are the responsibility of the ratepayers of the metropolitan area. If, as taxpayers, we are willing to use our State revenue to subsidize the metropolitan area transport system, is it not valid to argue that every other part of the State should have its transport system subsidized? What right have the residents of the metropolitan area—the most thickly populated part of the State where the transport system could be expected to work reasonably well—to be subsidized, while residents of our far-flung outback areas receive no subsidies but must pay for their transport or do without it? That is the fundamental difference between the tramways and the railways.

The Treasurer said this debate was pre-meditated, and that may be true; but my first notice of this matter was when the Deputy Leader moved his motion. I support it because I am always opposed to the spending of public moneys in this way to the detriment of a large section of taxpayers. Even if the motion is not passed, the Treasurer has assured members that he will keep this vote in mind when preparing the Budget.

Mr. Lawn—Won't he resign?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That is not my worry; but, if sufficient members vote for the motion he will bear that action in mind in compiling his Budget. The less money spent in this way in the metropolitan area, the more there will be for the development of country districts, and that is a matter of great importance.

Mr. Lawn—The Government may not do that; it may reduce taxation.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That would suit me very well, because the less money taken in taxation the more the individual will have to spend. The Treasurer mentioned that the Auditor-General had protested against the action of the board in writing off huge sums without Parliamentary knowledge. It is handy

to be able to write off something you cannot pay, and that action merely shifts a debt from the shoulders of metropolitan ratepayers to those of taxpayers throughout the State. In 1897 when the tramway system was first sponsored in Parliament, its sponsors said that South Australian taxpayers would never be called upon to finance any deficit in the system, because it would build up the values of land around the city. It was stated that a small tax to be made on the increased land values would meet any loss, but now the Treasurer, in order to build up the trust's finances, has conveniently forgotten the statement by the sponsors; he does not suggest that ratepayers in the metropolitan area should be called upon to make up this deficit. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Stephens), told us on a previous occasion that a councillor, nominated by his council as a member of the trust, left Australia soon after his appointment and went to England on the money he received as a member of the board. Councils should not be able to walk out from under the results of their ineptitude. It is unjust that the people who have incurred the debt should escape the responsibility for paying it. Some Opposition members may claim that because of what has happened in the soldier settlement irrigation areas, I have no right to speak in this way; but they know very little about those settlements, which were developed entirely by Government departments. Today those departments are responsible for any losses incurred there. I object to the fact that this Parliament has no information and although the Treasurer has said that it is all available I do not accept that. A report of the Tramways Board was tabled in the Legislative Council over a fortnight ago, but no order has been made yet for its printing. It might contain information that would be valuable to this Committee, but it has not been made available so we would be justified in refusing any more money for this board until we have had an opportunity of seeing it and reaching a reasonable conclusion. The Treasurer said that the board is acting on the best available advice from the world's leading experts, but experts often cause Parliaments a lot of trouble. The last expert to advise the trust is employed by a transport system that loses far more money than ours. I desire to see a Parliamentary Committee set up to examine every aspect of the tramways. When I first entered Parliament the Treasurer, then Minister of Lands, said that he obtained more advice from Parliamentary Committees than from outside bodies or experts yet no

Treasurer has ever used Parliamentary Committees less than he has. Many members will support this motion and the Treasurer will have to cut down the allowance for the tramways, leaving them in an awkward position regarding capital expenditure. That is a good thing and it is largely because of it that I support the motion.

Mr. McALEES—As mentioned by the member for Chaffey and also the member for Stuart, much of this money will come from the country. My district has nothing to thank the Government for, and no matter what is done no harm could come to it. I do not want to see the tramways held up but I object to money from my district being used to help the metropolitan area, which is living on the country although the country could well live without it. I voted for this provision on the last two occasions because I did not want workers in the city to be inconvenienced, although a warning was given of what might happen if the trust were not conducted properly. The tramways are not being run properly; if they were it would not be necessary for them to come back year after year to Parliament for large sums of money. When this amount is passed and spent they will come back again, and will keep doing so until they are controlled by the people through Parliament, not by a handful of men. I support the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER—I opposed the move to assist the Tramways Trust financially because I believed it was not right for all taxpayers in the State to finance the undertaking. At the time the two major Parties were in agreement on the matter and the Independents, who could see the writing on the wall, were on the outside. Earlier this session the Opposition said it would not support any move to advance more money to the trust, but it was too late then because they had previously agreed to advances being made. We are already in too far, so we might as well agree to advancing the £500,000. I remember Sir William Goodman telling the Public Works Committee that buses could be run more cheaply than trams, and that in the future they would be used. Despite this statement, more trams tracks were laid. I oppose the motion because it is too late for the Opposition to do anything in the matter, but I agree that the Treasurer has not given us enough information.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I support the motion. I could not follow Mr. Fletcher's remarks. Like other Independents he viciously attacked

the Labor Party when it supported the Government move to advance money to the trust. Now he says that it is too late for us to move to prevent further advances. The motion has been moved because the Opposition is dissatisfied with the way semi-governmental undertakings have their functions transferred to boards and trusts completely beyond Parliamentary control. These Loan Estimates provide for grants to the Housing Trust, Electricity Trust and the Tramways Trust. It can be seen that the undertakings are under the control of trusts. We want the Government to assume full responsibility for the conduct of the transport services in the metropolitan area. How often have Opposition members stressed the need for the appointment of a Minister to control all forms of transport? Buses are a more modern means of conveyance than trams, which are outmoded. People who have seen the bus services in other States and other countries appreciate them. Apart from the matter of economics, tram traffic causes congestion. Trams have gone from London and there are only a few in New York. Western Australia intends to scrap all its trams. Mr. Macgillivray said that the Government there has taken over the most remunerative bus routes, but that is not true.

[Midnight.]

There are many other remunerative routes in Perth that probably will later be taken over by the Government transport system. I would prefer closer attention to be given to the question of the use of trolley buses as opposed to diesel buses in Adelaide. I believe that with the development of our electricity supply it would be more economical to run trolley buses, particularly in the event of war, because we could obtain cheaper power. There can be no comparison between railways and tramway losses. Railways are required to maintain hundreds of miles of tracks and must operate in areas which are unprofitable. Some members have complained about the country being required to meet some of the costs of city transport, but the primary producer obtains greater concessions from the railways than have ever been provided by the country for city transport. I believe it is necessary to assist the railways in the development of the State.

Mr. Shannon said that if this motion were carried we would lose some of the members of the new board. The Premier said we would lose them all. I question whether we would be any worse off if we lost some of

those members, as it would be a simple matter to replace them with equally competent men. There are private buses operating on routes in the metropolitan area which, if taken over by the trust, would add considerably to its revenue. Mr. Fletcher referred to the occasion when Sir William Goodman appeared before the Public Works Committee. I asked Sir William whether he could intimate when the trust would take over the Ascot Park and Edwardstown bus services—both remunerative routes. He replied that they were first on the list of routes to be taken over, but no attempt has yet been made to take them over. That reveals conclusively that the present board is not taking advantage of avenues by which it could increase the trust's revenue. I do not condemn the efficiency of the trust because it is outmoded in its transport system, but I am concerned that we should have no say as to how money voted by Parliament shall be spent. In a sense the Government has removed from local councils their responsibilities and liabilities and it should incorporate the trust as a Government department either under the supervision of the Railways Department or as a new department. Members would then be able to question certain actions and make suggestions as to how the trust's difficulties could be overcome. I am opposed to voting further money to the trust until such time as members obtain adequate information.

Mr. CORCORAN—I support the motion. I was rather surprised at the Premier's attitude when he discovered that the Opposition would oppose the approval of this grant. He adopted an attitude which he thought would have a demoralising effect on members, but he need not expect that his anticipations will be realized. I am making my stand as a custodian of the taxpayers' money as well as a member of Parliament. We have the right to demand sufficient information. I will not discuss the merits or demerits of making up the leeway in the trust's finances, but the Premier said that if we opposed the approval of this vote the trust would go out of business and the worker would be penalized to the extent that the transport he depends upon to take him to and from work would not be available. In supporting this motion I do not anticipate anything like that taking place. This amount is for the purpose of purchasing diesel buses to replace trams and has nothing to do with the daily functioning of the trams. I agree with the member for Thebarton that the tram is on the way out, but that does not

alter the fact that Parliament is entitled to the information it seeks.

Mr. DAVIS—I support the motion. I have listened with much interest and considerable concern to the debate tonight. I was surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Mount Gambier. Two years ago, when opposing the granting of money to the Tramways Trust, he said he was concerned about how it would affect councils, but tonight he has not shown much concern for the ratepayers of this State. We get little information from the Government about the Tramways Trust. If the Government thinks we will pass £500,000 for the trust without any information it is wrong. It has been said that the railways run at a loss. We realize that, but the railways run over the State and everyone benefits from them. Port Pirie does not get any grant for bus services for that city, but the people there have to contribute their share to meet the losses on the metropolitan transport system. I agree with the member for Thebarton that the board is not conducting its business efficiently and that it has handed over the payable routes to private enterprise. No business can make a profit if it is prepared to give the profitable lines to other people. The Treasurer said that workers in the metropolitan area would be in difficulties if we did not vote this £500,000 to the trust, but that is not right. We were told two years ago that if we granted certain sums to this undertaking it would be put on its feet, but it is still in difficulties. Seven years ago, when the Hon. R. S. Richards was Leader of the Opposition, he moved that an investigation be made into the railways, but members opposite carried a resolution that an investigation be made into the whole of the transport of the State. If that had been done we would probably not be in the position we are today with regard to our transport services. I do not desire to traverse all the ground covered by other speakers on this side of the House, but I am not prepared to give a silent vote on this question. I support the motion because it is in the interests of the taxpayers that it be carried.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Unlike some members, I accept the view that the tramways, like the railways, will never pay.

Mr. Corcoran—We do not suggest that they should.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I know that, but the railways and the tramways have been established to give a service to the public. Private enterprise is carried on mainly for profit, but the tramways, although they would like to make

a profit, are mainly concerned with providing a service. However, our main bone of contention is that the railways are under the control of a Minister who is answerable to Parliament for his sins of commission or omission, but the tramways are not. For many years members on this side have maintained that a Minister of Transport should be appointed who can be questioned about the activities of the Tramways Trust. We cannot always get the information that we require about the tramways, or the busways, as they may be called. Parliament has already allocated large sums for the Tramways Trust, but now we are asked to vote another £500,000 for it. I fear this sum is merely the forerunner of many other millions that will go in the same direction. We desire information on several points. I am no expert on transport—I doubt whether any other member is—but I would like some information for my constituents on the present bus *versus* tram controversy. Members are constantly being asked why the trust is introducing expensive diesel buses. I do not know whether buses are better than trams and I would like to have the information that would enable me to reply to any questions. Two Independent members have said—quite truthfully—that they opposed this scheme from the outset, and I must admit that I was one who supported it; but it was an experiment that we had to try.

Mr. William Jenkins—You haven't given the board much of a chance.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—It seems to be a serial story of writing large cheques. You cannot go on indefinitely trying experiments that become more costly, for the time comes when you demand more information about them. That explains the attitude of Labor members this evening. In the interests of my constituents I am not willing to sign a blank cheque for millions of pounds or to pour money down a drain without knowing where it is going. I seek more information on how this money will be spent. I support the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS—I, too, support the motion. In opposing it the Treasurer said it was premeditated, and that is true. He said he had not been told about it, but, when Party decisions are made they are not disclosed to the other Party.

The Hon. T. Playford—For many years a courtesy has existed whereby I tell the Leader of the Opposition what business we propose dealing with.

Mr. JENNINGS—Actually, sufficient notice was given in the Address in Reply debate, for

most Labor members who spoke then made it clear that they did not intend to vote further money to the trust, unless they were given more information about its future intentions. Members have been told that departmental officers study the suggestions and arguments advanced in that debate and report on them to the appropriate Minister, and, if that was done on this occasion, the Treasurer had ample foreknowledge of our intentions on this matter. The Treasurer said he would examine the accounts of the trust. Apparently, he is in the fortunate position of being able to do so, and it is only right that, as Treasurer, he should have that opportunity. I claim, however, that, although all members have an equal responsibility to the State, unfortunately most have no opportunity to examine the trust's affairs. Members supporting the motion desire more information not only on the present financial position of the trust, but also on its future intentions. Some members on this side have repeatedly opposed the projected scrapping of trams in favour of buses, and they are entitled to their opinion; but on several routes in my electorate I would prefer to see buses running in place of trams.

Mr. William Jenkins—You all have different ideas.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes, because we have no information before us on which to base an opinion. In my electorate the Enfield tramline terminates at what was once the boundary of the built-up area, but now that terminus is three miles on the city side of the northern boundary. This necessitates a feeder bus service from the terminus to a point three miles away, and passengers have to transfer from the tram to the bus. I would much rather see the bus run right through for the convenience of my constituents. The same thing applies to the new settlement at Hillcrest, from which people must travel on a feeder service to the North Walkerville tram terminus. Northfield residents must travel by bus to the Buckingham Arms corner and there change to a tram. The Northfield journey is a foretaste of hell: the bus seats are full before it leaves; it takes on many standing passengers *en route*; it is full long before arriving at the Buckingham Arms; invariably it arrives late and passengers miss their tram; and in most cases the next tram is full. Many of our public instrumentalities are in a bad position at the moment but usually we can obtain information in this House about them. Whether it suits us is another thing, but at least when we question a Minister we know that the matter

has been taken to the highest possible level. It is entirely different with tramway matters. I have frequently approached the general manager, the traffic manager or other senior officers of the trust but I have obtained very little information from them. Before the Show adjournment I asked the Treasurer a question about the activities of the trust. He promised to obtain information for me and I have no doubt referred the matter to the trust, but I have not yet had an intimation that the information is available to him. If I asked him a question about his own department he would have an answer within a few days. No doubt he has the same difficulty with the trust as we all have. Some time ago I took a deputation to the traffic manager of the trust to discuss a feeder bus service from the Enfield terminus. People using these buses have to pay 6d. a day extra because they have to purchase separate tickets. The trust was asked if something could be done to introduce a through ticket system by arrangement with the proprietor of the bus service and although the traffic manager agreed that the practice in existence was wrong, it still continues and will do so in perpetuity. That is no way to conduct a public undertaking. If the trust were placed under the control of a Minister, members could take up matters with him, and I have yet to meet any Minister who will treat individuals unjustly. As we are voting large sums to the trust each year from the public purse, I ask who owns the trust? Presumably all the assets are owned by the ratepayers in the metropolitan area. If this Parliament votes money on behalf of the people, the full and complete ownership of the tramways should surely be vested in the people of South Australia. The member for Onkaparinga said that we were not consistent in opposing a socialistic undertaking, but this is not socialistic; even if it were, one of the best features of socialism is that undertakings can be attacked in public. I support the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE—I do not support the motion, although I have considerable sympathy with the mover and with the ideas that prompted him to move that the line be deleted. Principally because we have no general knowledge of how the tramways are run and what occasions these very heavy losses, I have always opposed these payments, but after very close study I have grown to appreciate that under existing conditions the tramways can never pay, nor can the railways because 70 per cent of total freights are carried by road. I have travelled

to every corner of the metropolitan area and from what I have seen realize that the tramways cannot pay because many people who are employed in industry do not patronize the trams, nor do they use the railways. There is a good reason for that. People who live in the Housing Trust area at Gilles Plains and who are employed at St. Marys have to use both tram and bus services to get to their place of employment. In this way much time is taken up in travelling, so they make use of the motor car. In the areas where small industries are established we see rows of parked motor cars of elderly vintage used by the workmen in those industries. At little expense they have organized their own transport, and when that is multiplied thousands of times throughout the metropolitan area it becomes impossible for the trust to make its undertaking pay. I would like to see every man own a motor car, and if it means a saving of time in his getting to work there is every justification for his having one. The accounts of the trust are audited by the Auditor-General. The new trust meets the same difficulties as the old trust.

Mr. Macgillivray—It is making bigger losses.

Mr. QUIRKE—It has had to take over the heritage of using wornout assets. Usually I am not prepared to agree to mammoth expenditure in the city to the detriment of the country where so many things are needed, but I am willing to give the new trust an opportunity to rehabilitate the undertaking, although I think it has an impossible task in making it pay. We should have been given more information about the disabilities under which the trust is labouring. It has not had time to submit a tangible way in which the undertaking can be made to pay, and to give it the opportunity to do so I will support the proposal to advance it £500,000. I realize that when 62 per cent of the State's population has been congregated in the city it must be conceded certain rights. Workers in the industries which have been concentrated in the city must have a means of transport. I appreciate that this system cannot and will not pay its way, but it must be continued. Parliament should be supplied with information as to the trust's losses and lack of that information prompted this motion.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In moving to strike out the proposed vote of £500,000 to the trust I indicated that I had used some of the Leader of the Opposition's thoughts. I did not appreciate Mr. Shannon's remarks. Whatever the Opposition is, it has proved tonight that it is a united Party. The Opposition

came to a decision and stood by it and has demanded that the Government explains the purposes for which this money is designed. Mr. Shannon suggested that the Opposition was off the rails on this occasion but I dispute that. The Treasurer indicated that the tramways system is the workers' means of transport and I agree, but I contend that the board has not measured up to its obligations. In the 1952 amending Act section 5 of the principal Act was amended by striking out the definition of "trust" and inserting in its place the following definition:—

"Trust" means the Municipal Tramways Trust as constituted for the time being under this Act.

New section 9 provided:—

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

Who recommended the Governor to appoint those five members? I assume Cabinet made the recommendations and if the Government of the day saw fit to appoint those members it should be obliged to supply the information members have sought tonight. New section 43a of the Act provides:—

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

Is the proposed expenditure of £500,000 designed to enable the trust to provide the necessary services to cater for the needs of the population? In these Estimates, under the heading "Municipal Tramways Trust—Loan to," the following appears:—

Expenditure less credits to loan account from repayments and cancelled securities as at June 30, 1954—£6,331,931.

We are more particularly concerned with the estimated expenditure of £500,000 which, according to the Estimates, is designed for the purchase of passenger vehicles, £350,000, and for buildings, machine tools and equipment, restoration of roads, £150,000. The amount of £350,000 is for the purchase of new diesel buses and I do not accept the Treasurer's contention that if this motion were carried the trust would go overboard and there would be no trams tomorrow. The trust will continue to operate if this motion is carried, but the Government may regard this as a vote of no-confidence. A report was tabled in the Legislative Council recently but as far as I know the responsible Minister has not ordered that it be printed. Has the Government got anything to hide? Are we

not, as the representatives of the people, entitled to the fullest knowledge? There is no reason why we should not have the opportunity of perusing tramways reports. For the Treasurer to say that the Tramways Trust would go out of existence in a few weeks if we refused to grant this £500,000 is just eyewash. This money will be spent only on the purchase of buses and on the restoration of roads. It means that the trust has to pay more money to restore the damage already done to roads by ripping up tramway tracks, for which it has already paid £62 to £65 a chain. Should we be expected to grant further money for the restoration of the roads? I do not know who is responsible for completely sealing the roads after they have been torn up, but I noticed a job that the city council was doing in Wakefield Road. Despite modern equipment it employed men with hand pumps for spraying tar on the road. If the Opposition agreed to pass this sum on the Loan Estimates and the Treasurer brought down the Budget in a few days he could say that we should have opposed this grant and not criticized the tramways under the Revenue Estimates. We must be consistent, more consistent than the Treasurer. There have been ample opportunities for the Government to put the tramway's reports on members' files.

I shall quote figures that have never been challenged by the Treasurer, so I believe they are accurate. In 1952 he estimated that the trust would require £1,180,000 to assist it over a period of five years. I believe he said it would require £800,000 in 1952-53 and 1953-54, but the board's revenue has been supplemented to the extent of £1,400,000. It therefore seems that the board has not functioned efficiently. If the Treasurer had had the courtesy to give the information we on this side require I should have supported the contention of the member for Chaffey and others that many committees of experts have been appointed to inquire into transport matters, though members' suggestions have always been ignored. Even at the eleventh hour it is not too late for the Treasurer to give members the information they desire. I have no objection to the appointment of a committee of members from both sides of the House to go into this question, and I do not think the member for Chaffey would have any objection.

The Hon. T. Playford—I think he would.
Mr. FRANK WALSH—I doubt it, but the Opposition maintains that the Tramways Trust could still operate if we passed the

motion. The board has an obligation to show that it is prepared to encourage patronage of the tramways but it has not done so during the last two years. Fares have been increased and sections have been shortened but the sooner the trust makes the service more attractive the sooner it will get the support of the travelling public. Members on this side desire information that has not been forthcoming from the Treasurer. I trust the item will be struck out, for I believe the Tramways Trust can still operate even though that is done.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When I spoke earlier I was at a disadvantage because I had not heard all the reasons for the remarkable alteration that is proposed. I had heard the Deputy Leader say he opposed the vote of £500,000 to the trust because it was losing money and because it was replacing trams with buses. I now find, however, that they were not the only reasons for the motion. Several other members mentioned the bus *versus* tram question, but there is no unanimity on it. Indeed, one Opposition member said that, from his experience of world-wide travel, he believed buses were most suited for the job in Adelaide, but the Opposition is divided on this question. As the debate developed two other queer reasons for the motion were revealed. I am informed, by way of apology, that it is desired, not to put the tramways out of business, but merely to deny them the money to enable them to keep going. I am also informed by the member for Adelaide, Mr. Lawn, that the real reason for the motion is that the trust is not controlled by a Minister, and other members have suggested that, if it were so controlled, the money would be granted.

To enable members to appreciate the development of the trust, I will refer briefly to its history. In 1906 the Government consisted of the Hon. Thomas Price (Premier, Commissioner of Public Works, and Minister of Education), the Hon. A. A. Kirkpatrick (Chief Secretary and Minister of Industry), the Hon. A. H. Peake (Treasurer and Attorney-General), and the Hon. Laurence O'Loughlin (Commissioner of Crown Lands and Minister of Immigration). I have often heard it claimed, and never heard it denied, that Thomas Price was a great Premier and the real originator of the Labor Party in this State. From my reading, I believe him to have been a man of the type and integrity of which any Party would be proud. He held enlightened views; he played a major part in providing education for the masses; and I have never

heard him criticized. Tonight, however, we have been told that the body he set up was undemocratic. Mr. Price established the trust and it continued in its original form until 1952.

Mr. John Clark—But much has happened to it since.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will give members full details of what has happened since. Until 1952 this Parliament had no authority over the trust except that the Treasurer, subject to the vote of Parliament, was authorized to finance its loan activities and, as the present legislation still provides, to take a debenture in order to provide the capital necessary to commence and maintain that organization. For a few years before 1952 the trust had not kept abreast of the times but, prior to that, it was maintained successfully, under the original legislation, for almost 40 years. Although a Labor Premier established the board, we are told tonight that, because it is not under the control of the member for Adelaide, it is undemocratic. A Labor Premier, for whom I have the greatest personal regard, provided for Government financing of its activities, but tonight we have been told that it is a dreadful practice.

The original Act provided that the Treasurer could advance moneys to the trust, the conditions under which he could advance it, and the type of debenture to be taken as security. Tonight one member said he opposed the advance of money to an undertaking we did not own, but the debentures of the trust are owned by the State Government and backed up by the right to rate the whole of the metropolitan area in the event of default. The undertaking is covered by a debenture that is cited every year in all relevant financial documents. This debenture is over all the assets, and is a security for the money that is proposed to be lent, interest payments and everything else as provided by legislation established by that very democratic leader, and probably one of the greatest men South Australia has ever had, the Hon. Thomas Price. In 1952 the Act was amended and the trust brought more directly under Parliamentary control, because it was provided that the board had to be appointed by the executive of this Parliament, which members opposite said was an improvement. Some criticism has been levelled tonight against members of the board and it has been said that they are not doing their job. I resent that because I know the type of service they are giving and I know some facts that have not yet been made public;

I would not mention them tonight but for this matter being raised. Many members have said we have not been provided with sufficient information, but this undertaking has been inquired into more than any other matter that has come before the House and more reports have been published and more authorities consulted than on any other public activity. The reports have been tabled and printed and I do not believe it is the fault of the Tramways Trust if members have not taken the trouble to read them. After a request made in this House, two reports were published and a committee that was held to be competent by members in general was set up. It made a searching investigation, and as a result forwarded an interim and a final report, setting out clearly the reasons why the previous board had not been successful. The reports referred to the difficulties associated with the previous board and made recommendations on the type of administration that should exercise control over this very important undertaking. One recommendation was that the Government take over the control of public street transport and appoint a trust of five members with ability, experience and qualifications necessary for its efficient management. The report also recommended that the chairman should be a man with a great deal of experience in big industrial or business enterprises. The board was established on the basis of those recommendations, and it was not seriously opposed by anybody except some Independent members who opposed it largely because it provided for expenditure in one part of the State and not in another. It was not easy to get a man of the ability and experience necessary for this undertaking because such men had plenty of work in big organizations prepared to pay them much more than the paltry fee provided by this trust. He would have to take over an undertaking that would require an immense amount of time, that was run down and could not be expected to pay its way for a long time. Very few top-ranking men would be prepared to do this. After consultation with my colleagues, it was decided that Mr. Barker was the person who would be best able to do the job. I approached him and he told me that he had an enormous undertaking to control, and that his duty to it was such that he could not accept this position and do justice to the organization. I asked him to put the proposition to his fellow directors, which he agreed to do, and he said that if they did not object he would accept the position. But he wanted it clearly understood that he would not take any

fees for his services under any circumstances. While members are so glibly attacking the board, Mr. Barker is overseas at his own expense studying transport services in other communities to see if there are any innovations that can be introduced by the trust to better the services provided in South Australia.

Mr. Lawn—Is that the only purpose for which he has gone overseas, and has he gone at his own expense?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not sure about the purpose, but no public money is being spent on his trip. Before he left he came to me for the necessary entry to the places where information could be obtained. We are not competent to criticize the operations of the new trust for it has been functioning only 18 months. We should not criticize the integrity and loyalty of the members because they have done a good job under adverse circumstances. If the trust gets reasonable support it will rehabilitate the undertaking and make it efficient and modern. Mr. Macgillivray said he did not believe the taxpayers' money should be used to assist the trust. Other members are sensitive about taxpayers' money being used in this way, but not about assisting the railways. This year the Commonwealth grant to South Australia will be adversely affected on account of our railway operations, but not because of the voting of money to assist the tramways. The losses by the undertaking are not up to the average losses of transport undertakings in other States, all of which are under the control of Ministers, and I am informed by my economist, who studies these matters closely, that there is no likelihood of such adverse action by the commission. Opposition members say that we have no Minister to control the affairs of the trust, but its operations are always subject to discipline by Parliament in the way chosen by Mr. Frank Walsh tonight. It has been said by members opposite that insufficient information is available about trust activities. In the legislation setting up the new trust it was provided that an annual report should be presented to Parliament. One report has already been tabled in this place. It has been on the table since September 2, and every member has had the opportunity to peruse it.

Mr. Macgillivray—Has it been printed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. If it had been sent immediately to be printed it would not have been on the table during the time that we were considering the Metropolitan Transport Advisory Council Bill. It is a full report and

deals in detail with all the matters raised by members opposite and I do not think they should criticize the trust if they have not taken the trouble to read the report. Since this report has been tabled I doubt whether any member opposite has spent any time examining it.

Mr. Hutchens—I had it for two days.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Then the honourable member was not correct in saying that information was not available to him.

Mr. Hutchens—I did not say that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member could have told his colleagues that the information was available. The Opposition complaint, which became a parrot cry, was “Why is Parliament kept in the dark?” There were references also to increases in fares, but the report states:—

During the year ended June 30, 1954, there was no alteration in the fares. The fares schedule of the trust is on a comparable basis with those applying in other capital cities.

The report provides a detailed account of traffic conditions, variations in traffic conditions, the total revenue per passenger mile and all information even remotely associated with fares. Information is available to members in detail and to move for the striking out of this vote on the basis that information was not available can only have the effect of damaging the trust in its operations. The trust would not ask for money, pay interest on what it borrowed, and give a debenture for it unless it were needed. I said earlier that this amount comprised £350,000 for the purchase of new buses and £150,000 for the restoration of roadways and the reconstruction and re-equipping of workshops. If members desire information as to what reconstruction is intended and in what respect workshops are to be re-equipped they can obtain it by perusing the report. The suggestion that the trust should be penalized because information is not available to members cannot be supported by logical argument. It is Parliament's responsibility to decide whether or not it should assist the metropolitan transport services. The Treasurer always has more demands upon his money than he has money with which to meet them. I did not subscribe to some of the recommendations in the report of the Inquiry Committee. It was suggested that a good part of the service should be handed over to private enterprise.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is the best part of it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is the honourable member's opinion, but not mine. The Government believes that the city's transport plays an important part in the State's economy and it is justified if it provides an efficient and cheap means of transporting the people to work. I realize that an increase in fares would place an additional burden on the man who must travel to work by the public transport system. As the city expands, the distances a workman must travel automatically expand and the average fare increases. In some large cities in the old world, transport is one of the major items of expenditure in the workman's budget. I would have thought that if there were any one matter with which the Opposition would agree it would be the provision of money to enable not the privileged class but the person who must use public transport daily to get to his place of employment. That system must be as efficient as possible and the trust was reorganized to achieve that. I am quite prepared to have a vote taken on this motion. If the Committee indicates by its vote that it has any hesitation at all in supporting the public transport I will inform the trust that that is the position. I am prepared to stand by the vote not only from the point of view of its being technically a vote of no-confidence in the Government, but in its broader ramifications. The Government realizes that any Government must take notice of the Opposition as well as its own supporters.

Mr. STOTT—I want to make my attitude clear. Twelve months ago the question of assistance to the Tramways Trust was raised forcibly by me and other Independent members. We stressed that the Government was going too far in voting money without having an overall plan, but we had no assistance from Labor members. That was the right time to tackle this problem, not now. Labor members argued that the new board should be given a chance to rehabilitate the tramway system, but tonight's vote of no confidence in the board is too late. One of the main reasons for the motion is that Labor members fear the board will substitute diesel buses for trams, but as a result of my visits overseas I endorse what the Treasurer said about these buses. Surely Opposition members realize that we must take trams out of King William Street, for they are cluttering up our main north-south highway. By using diesel buses the traffic would flow much more freely through King William Street. The greater use of buses by the trust would be a mark of progress.

Mr. William Jenkins—Diesel buses have greater mobility than trams.

Mr. STOTT—Of course. Colonel Light planned for the Adelaide railway station to be situated in the west parklands, but the big vested interests that bought up Rundle Street had so much influence that the station was erected on North Terrace, leaving one north-south highway to serve the city. We must use buses in King William Street, so that passengers can be picked up at the kerb, not in the centre of the road. That would allow freer movement for motor traffic and there would not be bottlenecks at all intersections. When the satellite town near Smithfield is established congestion in this street will be even worse. I criticized the Government 12 months ago for not having an overall plan, with a Minister in control of transport. Parliament voted £700,000 for the new board. It cannot now, after giving it the right to start rehabilitating the service, refuse it this £500,000. That would not be logical. I do not agree that trams should be retained.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The member for Thebarton agreed with you that tramcars were outmoded.

Mr. STOTT—He has travelled overseas.

Mr. Corcoran—We were not discussing that but the fact that Parliament had no voice in the management of the tramways.

Mr. STOTT—I agree with the honourable member there. I made that protest 12 months ago and said that if we had a Minister of Transport we would know for what purpose we voted money to the tramways. I support the line.

Mr. LAWN—Earlier in the debate I showed plainly where I stood. After hearing the Treasurer speak for the second time there should be no doubt in any member's mind on the wisdom of the motion. During his first contribution to the debate the Treasurer said that, if the motion were carried, the trams would stop tomorrow and people who could not afford motor cars would be deprived of a means of travelling to their places of employment. During his second contribution he did not say the trams would stop tomorrow but he said the motive of the Government in voting this money was to enable people to get to work by a more modern means of transport. The Treasurer criticized members on this side on their statements in this debate but I remind him that we are not regimented as are Government members. Most Labor

members have spoken in this debate, but from the Government side we have heard only two speakers, the Premier and one other member. What is the attitude of Government supporters on this matter? Have they not minds of their own? Have they decided to support or reject the motion? Do they know why this money is being made available or is it that they are not allowed to speak once the master has spoken?

The Treasurer suggested that some members on this side supported the motion because the trust was not under the control of a Minister; but if he was suggesting that that was the only reason for their supporting it he was misleading the House for I said that I opposed the granting of this money because it would be used to tear up tram tracks and replace trams with diesel buses. I strongly oppose making money available for that purpose because we would then have to go overseas to get increased quantities of diesel fuel oil. The Treasurer went to some lengths to describe the Honourable Thomas Price and his praise of that great Labor leader was typical of that which we hear of many Labor leaders after they are dead.

He said the Honourable Thomas Price had made it possible for a board to control the Tramways Trust but there may have been reasons for that policy of which we do not know. It may have been thought that the people who would benefit from the increase in land values caused by the extension of tram routes should be ratable to meet any losses incurred by the trust and that they should be able to control the trust by means of a board appointed by district councils. Mr. Price may have been certain that an Upper House elected on a restricted franchise would not pass a Bill seeking to bring the tramways under the Government's control. Whatever the reasons, conditions have changed greatly since 1906.

Two years ago the Treasurer said a little more than £1,000,000 would be needed over five years to help the trust out of its financial difficulties, but that sum has been voted in the past two years. It has been said that Parliament is not competent to criticize the activities of the trust, but does the Treasurer say that members should not have the right to criticize any Government or semi-Government undertaking? If that is so, we should abolish the Parliamentary set-up in the State and institute a dictatorship. The Premier is sitting pretty because he knows the gerrymander makes his dictatorship of this

State safe. He suggested that Mr. Barker was an admirable man to carry out the chairmanship of the trust, and was performing a public duty for practically nothing. After accepting that duty and deciding to scrap the trams and introduce diesel buses, involving the taxpayers in considerable expenditure, he decided he should go overseas to make himself conversant with transport problems. The Premier said that he did so at his own expense. However, he has not gone overseas to inform the Government about this undertaking, but has done so for his own business undertaking. Even if he went at his own expense, that would not justify this Parliament in voting £500,000 every time this matter is put before it. The trust can increase fares, shorten sections, tear up tram tracks and replace trams with buses, without any criticism from Parliament. It could abolish monthly passes used by the workers and Parliament could not stop it. How many times has the Premier said that the Tramways Trust, Electricity Trust and Housing Trust are outside Parliamentary control? I object to that when I am asked as a member of this House to make money available to them, because I feel they should be responsible to Parliament through a Minister, as all transport should be.

Mr. DUNSTAN—My main reason for feeling dissatisfied with the set-up of the trust is that I do not get sufficient information about its policy. The Treasurer suggested that everything members could wish to know was in the latest report, but that they had not looked at it. Is there anything more in the present report about the policy of changing over from trams to buses than there was in the last report? These reports are cast in the most general terms; they do not give the precise information that members want and have asked for on numerous occasions. I have raised this matter many times but so far have been unable to obtain a satisfactory answer. The Premier expects us to accept his assurance that he has gone into the matter and is satisfied, but we would not be doing our duty if we accepted this without inquiring into the matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In 1952 the Treasurer estimated that the trust would require £1,180,000 to assist it over a period of five years but that amount has been exceeded already. He suggested that the greater portion of the £500,000 is to purchase buses and restore roadways. If the trust had decided to maintain the existing system I believe that the programme outlined by the Premier could have been carried out.

The Committee divided on the question—
“That the line—Municipal Tramways Trust, Loan to—£500,000”—stand as printed.

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Brookman, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Fletcher, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, William Jenkins, McIntosh, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford (teller), Quirke, Shannon, Stott, Travers, and White.

Noes (11).—Messrs. Corcoran, Davis, Dunstan, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Macgillivray, McAlees, Riches, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Michael, Christian, Teusner, and Sir George Jenkins. Noes—Messrs. Tapping, Stephens, John Clark, and O'Halloran.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Line thus passed.

Grand total, £27,295,000—passed, and resolution agreed to by the House.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend moneys for public works and purposes and to enact other provisions incidental thereto.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time. The Bill is based on the Loan Estimates which have recently been dealt with by this House. Clause 3 defines the Loan Fund as consisting of any moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund Account in the Treasury at the commencement of the Act; all moneys received after the commencement of the Act in repayment of advances made, all surplus revenue applied to the Loan Account in accordance with the Public Finance Act; and any money borrowed under the Bill now before the House. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer may arrange for the borrowing of £24,595,000 in accordance with the Financial Agreement. Clause 5 deals with the issue and application of money from the Loan Fund, and provides that sums not exceeding £27,295,000 may be issued for the purposes mentioned in the first schedule to the Bill. This clause also provides that if the amount mentioned in any line of the first schedule to the Bill is

insufficient for that work or purpose the Treasurer may issue additional money from the Loan Fund for that work or purpose, but under no circumstances can the Treasurer issue more than £27,295,000 from the Fund during the year for the purpose of the works mentioned in the first schedule.

Clause 6 provides that the Treasurer may borrow the moneys necessary to pay flotation expenses required for the purpose of arranging for the borrowing of the moneys required under this Bill. Clause 7 makes provision for the use of moneys in the hands of the Treasurer for the purpose of the works mentioned if the moneys in the Loan Fund are at any time insufficient for the carrying out of the works but any moneys so used shall be repaid from the Loan Fund as soon as there is sufficient money in that Fund to make the repayment. Clause 8 gives power to borrow additional sums if further loan money becomes available, that is, money in addition to that authorized by Clause 4. The purpose of this clause is to permit the Government to borrow a further sum of £2,318,000 if this amount becomes available. At the Loan Council meeting held in June, the programme of works for the year was fixed at £200,000,000, but it was estimated that only £180,000,000 could be raised. I estimate that if by chance the £200,000,000 can be raised by loans, this State would have made available to it a further £2,318,000 for capital works purposes, and Clause 8 is for the purpose of allowing the Government to borrow the further amount and apply it to the construction of works and for the purposes set out in the First Schedule.

Clause 9 gives the Treasurer power to borrow and apply loan money in 1955-56 during the period between June 30 and the commencement of the next Public Purposes Loan Bill. The moneys borrowed pursuant to this clause are not to exceed £7,000,000, and they must be issued out of the Loan Fund and applied to meet expenditure on loan undertakings mentioned in the First Schedule to the 1954 Loan Bill. Clause 10 makes provision that Clauses 6, 7 and 9 shall not cease on June 30, 1955, as the functions of these clauses operate after that date. Clause 11 authorizes the expenditure of money received from the Commonwealth for Commonwealth-State housing purposes, and provides that amounts received from the Commonwealth for this purpose shall be paid to a special account, and the Treasurer shall, out of the money so credited, pay to the Housing Trust such sums as are required for the purposes of the Housing Agreement.

This clause also provides that all money received by the State from the Commonwealth as grants under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, or any amendment to that Act, or any Act which may be substituted for it, shall be paid to a special account and the Treasurer shall, when requested by the Minister of Local Government, issue and pay out of the moneys so credited, the sums that are required for purposes specified in that Act.

Clause 12 makes provision for the validation of the expenditure of £3,397 4s. 1d. by the Harbors Board during the period 1949 to June, 1954, on land and premises at Osborne known as the Meyer Recreation Oval. Expenditure of this amount was authorized by the Harbors Board, but subsequently the Crown Law authorities advised that the Harbors Act did not empower the Minister or the board to carry out work such as the Meyer Recreation Oval. Arrangements had been made by the board to establish this recreation ground for the use of employees engaged in the coal gantries at Osborne. The oval has been established adjacent to the Draper railway station and the above amount has been expended on grading the area, planting grass, and providing fencing and water facilities. Much of the work has been done by volunteer labour by the men engaged at the Osborne gantries. It did not appear to the board at the time the expenditure was authorized that they were carrying out any work which was *ultra vires* the Harbors Act, and it was not until the Auditor-General raised the question and obtained an opinion from the Crown Law authorities that the board and the Government became aware that this expenditure was not authorized by the Harbors Act. Clause 13 means the date of commencement of this Act as the 1st day of July, 1954. I commend the Bill for consideration of honourable members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—Apparently the Legislative Council desires to receive this Bill some time today. I have also been informed by the Treasurer that certain moneys are running out. It is not my intention to unnecessarily delay the passage of this measure but other members should not be denied the right of either supporting or opposing the proposal. Clause 5 provides that if certain moneys should not be sufficient for the purpose for which it is intended the Treasurer may immediately obtain additional sums from the Loan Fund provided no more than £27,295,000 is issued from that fund during the year. This

is a dragnet clause which offers the protection the Treasurer has sought on other occasions. Clause 11 appears to establish a new procedure under the Commonwealth-State housing agreement. It probably confirms what the Treasurer referred to earlier in relation to what can be expected from the Commonwealth Government in respect of the housing scheme. It will be interesting to see how far the Housing Trust will proceed and what concessions, if any, it obtains under the scheme. I do not object to the proposals for the Harbors Board, nor for the expenditure involved in the establishment of what is known as the Meyer Recreation Oval. It is pleasing that a narrow view is not being taken as with many other recreation reserves, for it seems that people will be able to play sports on this ground on Sunday afternoons. I understand that those associated with this reserve have raised considerable sums for charitable organizations, and I believe that the playing facilities will be improved. I support the second reading.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I am concerned about clause 12. I consider that the £3,397 proposed

for the Meyer recreation oval should come out of general revenue, not Loan money.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not sure of this, but I think that the money that has been spent by the Harbors Board came from general revenue.

Mr. Stott—Then what is this doing in the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is there to get formal approval of the expenditure. The money has been spent over a number of years. Civilized communities realize that an employee is more than just a man working for an organization. It is desirable that facilities and amenities be provided for employees. If the honourable member desires, I will ascertain whether the expenditure has come from Loan or revenue money.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 2.48 a.m. on Thursday, September 23, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 28, at 2 p.m.