

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 19, 1974

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: SEX EDUCATION

Mr. MATHWIN presented a petition signed by 77 persons who believed that it was essential that children be given sex education instruction in a context of warm, loving, and inter-personal relationship, and that trained, capable married persons from outside schools should be able to participate. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would incorporate their suggestions in the Act providing for sex instruction in State schools.

Petition received and read.

PETITION: SODOMY

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 102 persons praying that the Bill proposed to be introduced to legalize sodomy between consenting adults should not be passed by Parliament until it had a clear mandate from the people to introduce such legislation by referendum at the next periodic South Australian election, and praying that the House of Assembly would reject or amend any such Bill.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

OIL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware of the threat of a world shortage of oil?

2. If so, has it made any plans to cope with a shortage in this State and what are those plans?

3. If no such plans have been made, why have they not been made?

4. Is it intended to make any such plans and when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The Government has appointed a committee to inquire into, and report upon, all aspects associated with fuel for the provision of energy and associated matters.

3. and 4. See answer to question 2.

WINE EXCISE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action, if any, does the Government intend to take to oblige the Commonwealth Government to honour the undertaking given before the last Commonwealth election that the 50c a gallon excise on wine would be removed and not replaced with another impost?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has made the strongest representations possible in the interests of the wine industry in this State. There is no action it can take to oblige the Commonwealth Government to vary a decision made within its constitutional powers.

REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government still advocate a "Yes" vote to both questions at the referendum on December 8, and, if so, why?

2. If not, what is the policy, if any, of the Government in respect of each of these questions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government advocated a "Yes" vote to the two questions involved in the referendum held on December 8, 1973.

CROSS ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What work has been done at the intersection of Cross Road with Unley Road and Belair Road?

2. How long has this work taken?

3. What has been the total cost of the work done and how is that cost made up?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. It has been widened and left slip-lanes have been provided.

2. About four months.

3. The total cost has been about \$100 000. Alterations to Postmaster-General's services cost \$33 000, with the remainder being Highways Department labour and material costs and minor service alterations.

POST-RELEASE HOSTELS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government accept the recommendation of the Mitchell committee, set out on pages 183 and 184 of the report of that committee, that post-release hostels for older ex-prisoners should be established?

2. If so, does it accept that the need for the establishment of such hostels is urgent, and what action has been taken for their establishment?

3. If no action has been taken, is it intended to take any action and when? If not, why not?

4. If the Government does not accept this recommendation, why does it not accept it and does it intend to take any action to assist older ex-prisoners? If so, what action and when?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The wide-ranging recommendations of the Mitchell committee are now being considered and it is not yet possible to describe what has been uncompromisingly accepted or rejected.

2. The urgency of the establishment of post-release hostels is questionable. In fact, officers of the Prisons Department have found much more difficulty in placing women in suitable accommodation than they have had in placing men.

3. At this stage the Prisoners Aid Association, with the assistance of the Government, is conducting an experimental project, at the conclusion of which the value of such a hostel can be better evaluated.

4. As stated, the recommendation at this point has been neither accepted nor rejected. Recommendations made by other bodies are being studied, and, in fact, prisoners themselves are very divided in their opinions on hostels and the possibilities of them becoming just another type of institution. When it is considered that a good decision can be made on the most constructive form of post-release treatment, the Government will be willing to consider whatever proposals are made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Chief Secretary received a letter dated August 3, 1973, from the Prisoners Aid Association making a request for financial assistance in the establishment of a post-release house?

2. If so, has the request been met and how much financial assistance is to be given?

3. If the request has not been met, is it intended to meet it? If not, why not?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows.

1. The Prisoners Aid Association has made several submissions regarding financial assistance for the establishment of a post-release hostel.

2. The request has not been met for this specific purpose; however, the association grant from the Government for the 1973-74 financial year was \$40 000.

3. At this point the Prisoners Aid Association is renting a house and conducting a 'pilöt' scheme, at the conclusion of which everybody will be in a much better position to judge what expectations such a project may have. The Government is assisting in this experimental stage by having the Prisons Department undertake all laundry work free of charge, and also by having the department supply the home with vegetables and eggs from prison farms.

STATUTES

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it expected that the consolidation of the Statutes will be completed?

The Hon. L. J. KING: As long as Acts of Parliament are amended they would need to be consolidated, the consolidation and reprinting of Acts in pamphlet form being a continuing process. With regard to the new edition of consolidated Acts which is being prepared for publication in volumes as at a cut-off date, if all necessary corrective and consequential legislation could be drafted and passed, as the Government hopes, before the end of next year, the cut-off date for that edition would be either December 31, 1974, or January 1, 1975. Thereafter, if there are no setbacks like shortage of staff, printing hold-ups, paper shortage, etc., it is hoped to bring out two to four volumes (of about 800 pages a volume) each year, the number of volumes each year being governed by the amount of work required to be done on those volumes.

JUDICIARY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many Supreme Court judges were there on June 1, 1970, and how many are there now?

2. How many Local and District Criminal Court judges were there on June 1, 1970, and how many are there now?

3. How many magistrates were there on June 1, 1970, and how many are there now?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. June 1, 1970	7
January 22, 1974	9
2. June 1, 1970	2
January 22, 1974	14
3. June 1, 1970	21
January 22, 1974	27

CONSUMER LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government satisfied that the Consumer Credit Act and the Consumer Transactions Act are working well?

2. If not—

(a) is it intended to introduce amending legislation? If so, when and to what effect?

(b) is it intended to amend the regulations made pursuant to the Consumer Credit Act? If so, when and to what effect?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. Not applicable.

DOMICILIARY SERVICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government accept the recommendations of the Bright committee that rehabilitation be considered an essential form of care for the aged?

2. If so, has it taken any action to support rehabilitative services and what was the action?

3. If it has not taken such action is it intended to take any action? If so, what action and when?

4. If the Government does not accept the recommendations of the committee, why not?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Action has been taken by building up rehabilitation services, as follows:

- (1) At the Queen Elizabeth and its associated Western Domiciliary Care Service including a day hospital at Mareeba.
- (2) The opening of a rehabilitation unit at Northfield wards working in conjunction with the Eastern Domiciliary Care Service that is to commence shortly under the direction of the newly appointed Director of Rehabilitation at Royal Adelaide.
- (3) The establishment of the Para Domiciliary Care Service based at Lyell McEwin Hospital.
- (4) Preparations for the establishment of the Southern Domiciliary Care Service. This will provide for the development of rehabilitation and home-care services in the southern metropolitan district by arrangement with the Commonwealth Repatriation Department to use facilities at Daws Road Hospital.
- (5) Emphasis is being given to rehabilitation services in country areas, at Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Whyalla, Murray Bridge, and Wallaroo.
- (6) Mental health services: assessment wards at Glen-side (Downey House) and Hillcrest (Howard House) Hospitals have been established, together with day hospitals at each place for rehabilitation of mentally infirm aged persons.

For the 1973-74 financial year the total expenditure on domiciliary care services alone has exceeded \$178 000.

3 and 4. These questions are not relevant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to assist Elderly Citizens Homes of South Australia Incorporated with its rehabilitative programmes to provide "day patient" services in the Walkerville area?

2. If so, what help does it intend to give and when?

3. If it does not intend so to assist, why not?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. A special grant of \$30 000 was made on December 21, 1973, to the Elderly Citizens Homes of South Australia Incorporated to assist with the rehabilitative programme, including "day patient" services in the Walkerville area.

3. Not applicable.

WATER SERVICE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, adopted in August, 1968, that allows only a 1.27 cm service to each landholder abutting a main in a defined area of the Northern Adelaide Plains, been altered?

2. If so, when was it altered and what is the new policy?

3. If it has not been altered, what likelihood is there of a review of the 1968 policy and when?

4. If there has been no alteration of policy, on what basis has a 5.08 cm connection been provided to a Womma Road property, being section 4116, hundred of Munno Para?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The policy is to allow only one 1.27 cm service for each allotment in Virginia township; elsewhere in the Northern Adelaide Plains area 2.9 cm services for properties which abut a main are allowed

2. No alteration.

3. The position is being examined.

4. Following investigation a 5.08 cm industrial service was granted to Peter Copas Rose Nursery Proprietary Limited supplying sections 4116 and 4115 Womma Road, hundred of Munno Para, subject to the conditions that a 546 Ml capacity storage tank was installed and that the supply to this tank was taken only at night

MALLEN COMMITTEE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice).

1. What significance does the Government place on the Mallen committee's recommendations?

2. Will the Government table the full reports of this committee?

3. Which of the recommendations in the reports have been instituted, and by what means?

4. When is it expected that the remaining recommendations will be acted upon, and if not to be acted upon, why not?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has always heeded the recommendations of the Abortion Advisory Committee appointed by the Government and chaired by Sir Leonard Mallen, and has tabled the recommendations of this committee for the information of all members. The full reports have been made available in all instances except where confidential information of a personal nature is involved.

2. See (1) above.

3. Those recommendations relating to patient services have been instituted or are being planned for implementation

4. The remaining recommendations not yet implemented relate to changes in the present Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

HUMAN RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government made representations to the Commonwealth Government concerning the Human Rights Bill now before the Commonwealth Parliament?

2. If so, what is the purport of those representations and has there been any response from the Commonwealth Government? If so, what is it?

3. If representations have not been made, is it intended to make any such representations and, if so, what will be their purport and when will they be made?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows.

1. Yes

2. The South Australian Government has requested a meeting of law officers of the Commonwealth and the States to study the implications of the Bill with respect to State law, and the Commonwealth has agreed.

3. Not applicable.

OFFSHORE LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to challenge the validity of the Commonwealth Seas and Submerged Lands Act and, if so, when and how?

2. If a challenge is not to be made, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter is still being considered.

PLANNING LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Why did the Government not proceed with the Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), 1973, to amend section 41 of the principal Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government intends to proceed with the Bill.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Hope Valley Water Treatment Plant,
Kilburn Community College,
Lock to Kumba Pipeline Completion,
Mount Gambier Outfall Sewer,
Nailsworth Co-educational High School,
Nuriootpa High School (Additions and Alterations),
Nuriootpa Primary School (Replacement),
Port Pirie Harbor Deepening,
Woodville High School Additions.

Ordered that reports be printed.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: TRANSPORT POLICY

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received from the honourable Leader of the Opposition the following letter:

I wish to inform you that it is my intention to move this day that this House at its rising this day adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p.m. for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that the metropolitan transport policy of the Government and its implementation is not in the best interests of the people of this State.

I call on those honourable members who support the proposed motion to stand in their places.

Several members having risen:

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p.m.,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that the metropolitan transport policy of the Government and its implementation is not in the best interests of the people of this State.

This Government has, since assuming office, and when in Opposition prior to the 1970 election, made a series of promises to the people of this State regarding the programme it would implement as to public transport and the speed with which such a programme would be implemented. I refer to the policy speech made by the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) prior to the 1970 election, as follows:

A Labor Government will withdraw and revise the metropolitan Adelaide transport proposals. Freeways from north to south, to Tea Tree Gully, to Port Adelaide and Glenelg, will be necessary, but we do not believe that a massive concentration upon elevated freeways will produce eventually anything other than a city cut up and jammed up with private motor cars. We would be building problems American cities are now desperately trying to solve. The M.A.T.S. proposals will be re-examined by the State Planning Authority, assisted by a team of investigators experienced in the new technologies of public urban transit. They will advise, first, on how these newer technologies can best be incorporated into the development of Adelaide, and, secondly, how they can provide a new basis for industry here. We have all the technologies and all the industries necessary to make Adelaide the cheapest place of any major urban centre in the world to experiment with and produce economically . . .

Certainly, over the years that have passed since that statement was made we have seen experimentation which has not been to the advantage of the people of this State and which, in many cases, has cost the public dearly. One needs merely to refer to the dial-a-bus fiasco and the money lost in that respect, to the detriment of the people of this State, in this respect I refer to the money that came from the State coffers as well as the losses incurred by many people who were duped into a situation that was permitted by the Government. In the same policy speech, the then Leader of the Opposition said:

Under Labor the railway system will provide flexible door-to-door transport services.

Where, after almost four years, are these flexible door-to-door transport services? The then Leader continued.

The Islington railway workshops will actively compete for work of all kinds in order to ensure profitability.

However, what does one find regarding the Islington workshops? We have the statement, contained in the Lees report, that the workshops should be phased out. Although the Minister responsible has publicly rejected any suggestion that the workshops are being phased out, in reply to questions from Opposition members he has admitted that employees there are not being replaced as they retire. One sees a monster organization where people are standing around doing little or nothing, unable to provide the services that should be provided for the people of this State. It may well be said that some of the facilities are being used for the construction of the Christie Downs railway line and for associated works. However, this involves only a small part of the total work force, and a great sum is being permitted to be wasted by the Government in the retention of the railway workshops, and this at a time when the S.A.R. is letting out to companies in other States contracts for the supply of electrically motivated locomotives.

This lack of action by the Government in respect of such promises and proposals has occurred, and is still occurring, at the expense of the people of this State. The policy speech of the Australian Labor Party states:

We will endeavour to encourage the public to patronize public transport. We will require the reintroduction of periodical tickets, the provision of excursion fares, and reduced fares for travel at off-peak times.

These statements and claims were made in 1970 and most of them have been denied or turned down: little or no action has been taken. Certainly, the Government's promise to try to encourage the public to patronize public transport was a farce, because of the events that have followed the announcement. In 1973 the Premier said:

Cities cannot work if their citizens cannot move. We stopped the folly of the M.A.T.S. plan with its concentration on freeways and the private motor car. Now, to improve Adelaide's public transport system, we will undertake the construction of a double track suburban rail line to Christie Downs, with provision for express services.

The Premier said that in February, 1973, over 12 months ago. One may ask whether the money now being channelled into the take-over of the private bus services in the Adelaide metropolitan area will alter the priorities and the implementation of the rail electrification programme in that area. One may also ask whether the entitlement that South Australia otherwise would receive from the grant of \$32 000 000 of Commonwealth money announced in Canberra yesterday will be lost entirely in the funds required to take over the metropolitan private bus operators, an action that was taken so that compulsory unionism could be forced on the bus drivers.

That position follows from the problem that the Minister of Transport had last year when he tried to force

bus operators to kowtow to his demands. That action was defeated by the resoluteness of the persons in that industry and the many ordinary bus drivers who told the Government clearly that they did not desire or intend to be so controlled. It was compulsory unionism by the back door, and that has been part and parcel of (indeed, a major issue in) the recent take-over of the private bus operators' activities. The Premier, speaking for the Government, also said:

Subject to the Bureau of Transport's economics evaluation, the commencement of an underground subway through the city of Adelaide, and the provision of a rapid-transit system to the north-eastern suburbs via the Modbury corridor.

There have been many announcements by this Government about when it would introduce these measures, and each time the date has been put further and further ahead. The Government claimed in 1970 that it would not proceed with the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study programme and it repeated that claim in 1973, yet the Government has spoken about constructing facilities of this type along the lines and routes of the outline given in the M.A.T.S. report. The Government is still spending millions of dollars and, since assuming office, it has spent large sums to allow for the updating or widening of many arterial roads and for the eventual completion of freeways and corridors. The Premier also said that the Government would undertake the introduction of express routes using reserved bus lanes to suburbs such as Ingle Farm, Grange and West Lakes. Where are they? Where is the provision for them. How many of these projects will proceed now that more than \$3 200 000 has been swallowed up in the take-over of the private bus operators? The Premier also said that there would be improvements to metropolitan bus operations, including a pilot city-centre distribution system. At least we can accept that this has been undertaken with the introduction of the Bee-line buses. More is the pity that this service has not been extended so that people of North Adelaide and the suburbs south of the south park lands could be picked up and brought into the city centre, thus keeping many vehicles out of the city centre. We accept the introduction of the Bee-line service as being positive and worth while.

The Premier then spoke about bus services linking major transport terminuses, shopping and business areas. Surely, this applies to the movement of people between suburbs, particularly those living in the eastern suburbs and working at the Weapons Research Establishment who are not being helped by the changes which are now taking place and which are contrary to the promises made by the Premier as recently as 1973.

Mr. Dean Brown: Only six people travelled on one of their buses this morning.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, because the Government is not giving the people the service they require or the service they have come to expect, a service that allows for the economic transportation of workers to their places of employment. The Government's action has increased the number of private vehicles using the roads and has therefore increased the difficulties incurred in transportation generally. Many promises and re-statements of intention have been made by this Government. There has been a waste of money in the commissioning of what has become known as the Bieuning report. Recommendations made in subsequent transportation reports have not been implemented: they have been by-passed at the convenience of the they have been by-passed at the convenience of the Government. On October 4, 1973 (*Hansard*, page 1073), I said:

I ask the Minister of Transport what is the significance of the statement appearing on page 48 of the report on public transport in metropolitan Adelaide, wherein a footnote states:

... included in the long-term strategy due to the need to ensure a reserve, should the M.T.T. or other authority acquire the private operators.

An asterisk appears against "private bus replacement", and this would seem to indicate that in the directions given to the Director-General it was generally suggested that it could be Government policy to acquire private bus undertakings.

The Minister (Hon. G. T. Virgo) replied:

No such direction has been given the Director-General of Transport. However, the Director-General happens to be a fairly intelligent sort of person, and it does not require much skill to realize that the private operators in the metropolitan area are in a fairly difficult position. Whether or not a solution can be found to enable them to continue, it is not possible to state at this stage. Further, at least two of the routes currently operated by private undertakings will become Municipal Tramways Trust routes in, I think from memory, March, 1975.

As recently as October 4, 1973, the Minister indicated that the programme for metropolitan transportation, particularly in respect of private buses, was for the first Government involvement to take place in March, 1975. The Minister went on to say that the previous arrangement entered into by the Government, whereby a person who held a bus licence had to be given three years notice of the intent not to renew, had been extended by the Government to a period of five years so that the private operator was permitted more time to amortize his costs and undertake other activities.

So we have this stop-start Government programme on overall transportation, a programme that is forcing people into compulsory unionism against the best interests of the community and causing a massive rearrangement of the order of financial priority in connection with transportation. This must cause additional delays in those vital areas that have had a high priority as a result of reviews undertaken and of a recognition that the increased population in such districts as Tea Tree Gully and Mawson, including Christies Beach, requires an updating of their existing services. This updating of services has been denied as a result of this higgledy-piggledy stop-go policy on transportation.

I have outlined only a few of the broken promises made by the Premier on behalf of the Government: many more can be highlighted, although they are not as great in number as the number of broken promises emanating from the Commonwealth sphere, including broken promises in relation to interest benefits for people buying houses and other benefits connected with people's livelihoods. Those broken promises that I have pointed out indicate clearly that in four years of administration this Government has failed the people of South Australia in regard to implementing a satisfactory transportation system. I therefore ask every member of this House to support my motion.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): Not only the Opposition but also members of the public are justified in asking plainly and bluntly what is happening regarding the Government's policy on implementing its public transportation plans. This is an important question that more and more people are asking today. The people are bewildered at present and this matter has possibly been brought to a head because of the Government's recent actions in taking over the private bus operator system, as well as because of increases in metropolitan bus and rail fares. We all remember how, when the present Government was in Opposition, it was most critical and full of bright ideas of what should happen regarding public transport. First,

we had from the Minister of Transport a statement in 1971, and I regret that he is not here at present. Then we had the Breuning report, following by the Pak-Poy study, the dial-a-bus project and the Lees report. The Minister made two visits overseas to study the transport position, and we would support such a move if it were to have any tangible results, as there should be. The Minister made several statements last year in *Hansard*, one on September 13 followed by one on September 19. The first statement, at page 758, is as follows:

I expect shortly to receive recommendations in relation to express bus services and the possible implementation of exclusive bus lanes.

We certainly have not heard anything further about that project. He then went on to say:

the Director-General of Transport's office has been working towards establishing an overall order of priorities and programme for urban public transport.

To see what this was all about, I looked up the publication of September, 1973, headed *Public Transport in Metropolitan Adelaide*, put out by the Director-General of Transport, who said that the report showed that "our total capital requirements for the five-year planning period (excluding any provision for service provided by private bus operators) will be approximately \$55 000 000", that is, on 1973 values. He then went on to say that the expenditure would be used to electrify the "existing Adelaide-Brighton-Hallett Cove railway, extend the line to Christie Downs, and to acquire new rolling stock".

He then said that the remainder of the funds would be used to upgrade the existing Glenelg tram route, to do certain studies, and for the acquisition by the Municipal Tramways Trust of replacement buses. That immediately indicates to the House and to the public that up to 1975 at the earliest no funds will be available for or spent on physically improving the present public road transport system in the metropolitan area. That is what we see from an official report put out by the Director-General of Transport under the aegis of the Minister of Transport.

What we should be doing now is physically implementing practicable measures to upgrade public road transport. This is terribly important not only for the convenience of the public but also for the purposes of overcoming congestion on the roads and of reducing the pollution problem, because there are too many cars on the road with only one occupant. This official report to which I have referred has something to say about private bus systems in South Australia, namely:

The metropolitan area, under the M.T.T. control, is served by 95 bus routes, 34 operated by the M.T.T., the rest by private operators or companies. In 1972, the M.T.T. operated 11 000 000 bus miles over 164 miles of route, while the M.T.T.-licensed private operators ran 7 000 000 over 254 route-miles.

This report made a significant acknowledgment of the services being provided. It states on page 14 that the M.T.T. operates a fleet of 375 buses and that the licensed private operators operate a further 257. We see on page 33 of this report, under the financial programme, that a total of \$3 600 000 is provided in the period 1973-78 in connection with private bus replacement programmes to complement the M.T.T. programme. What happened regarding the private bus operation was undoubtedly a major piece of surgery: it was pretty rough treatment. Having just indicated to the House the extent of the services provided, I suppose we can say that the discussions on the private bus operations fall into two separate categories, and they all seemed to take place in the one week. First there was the threat announced by the Minister on behalf of the Government that it intended to take over all

or the major part of the private bus operator services in the metropolitan area. A few days later there was the action taken after the private bus operators were forced into a position of acceptance. The Minister said:

It is not a matter of Government policy of pushing out the private operators. We acknowledge the work these operators have done and the value they have been to the transportation system.

Despite the report to which I have referred and the Minister's own statement in the House a few months ago that he did not wish to take over these buses, the Minister proceeded to hold the gun at the head of private bus operators, refusing to subsidize their fare structure. These operators, who had been operating at a loss for some time, had expected either a subsidy on their operations or a revision of the fare structure. As the Minister said some time last year (and I think also a few weeks ago), the Government of which I was a member made a decision with regard to the five-year term of the licence for these operations; I am well aware of that. However, the situation on this occasion was in a different category altogether, as the bus proprietors were facing a loss in the running costs of their operations. Obviously the thing to do (and this is what they expected) was for the Government to subsidize these operations or to adjust the fare structure in some way, just as the Government did when, out of funds approved by this Parliament, it subsidized the operations of the M.T.T., the Minister announcing a fare increase affecting those who patronize the trust's services. As the cost of one service should not be higher than the cost of the other service, private bus operators should also have been subsidized. I should have thought that would be the cheapest way to deal with the situation that arose.

The position was that private bus operators, who were operating at a loss, could go on for only a certain time. If they had refused to operate their services, they would have broken their contract. Therefore, they had no real choice in the matter: either they had to carry on at a loss or cave in and comply with the Government's request. At the end of the week in question, we saw a forced take-over of these services. Government back-bench members are usually the first to criticize any commercial take-over, yet in this case the Government is taking over a privately run organization. These bus proprietors had little choice. Of course, the matter of the cost involved must be considered. Although many estimates have been bruited about in the newspapers, we do not have any reliable figure at present. As responsible members of Parliament, all of us here, whichever Party we belong to, have a duty to be concerned about the cost of the Government's exercise.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think the Minister knows?

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister is on record as saying that for a certain period the capital cost of taking over the bus services and the allied equipment (and this is a cost valuation, not including goodwill) could vary between \$3 000 000 and \$4 000 000. In addition, substantial management fees are involved. I believe that the Government owes it to members of this House and to the public to say what is the cost involved and whence the funds will come. Does the Government intend later this session, in the Supplementary Estimates, to include a special line to cover this project? What will be the future of the operators who are being forced out of this business? I should have thought that the Government would be most interested in the people who have driven these buses.

Of course, some members of the Government have long memories: they recall the dispute a couple of years ago in which many of these bus drivers refused to join the

Transport Workers Union. We all remember what happened on that occasion, but what is the position now? Regardless of whether these buses will be operated, under the auspices of the M.T.T., by the present operators and their drivers or whether the trust will take over the services concerned, the Government must say whether all the drivers concerned, whether they want to or not, will have to join the respective union. Is this another way of getting compulsory unionism into this field? Will these men, who previously bitterly resented efforts to force them to join the union and exercised their democratic right to resist that force, now be made to join the union, whether or not they want to do so? This could be another instance of the Government's policy of unionism at all costs.

The Minister has said that he will provide certain services. However, as he is not here, I will attribute these remarks to the Government. The Government has said that it is confident that an adequate service will be provided. Certain private bus services that emanate from other areas pass through my district, several buses going to the Weapons Research Establishment at Salisbury. I cite this as one example.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You need more than one example.

Mr. COUMBE: I am glad that the Premier is listening and has noted this example, because I have received numerous complaints that yesterday and today there have been at least 60 extra cars in the parking lot at the W.R.E., those cars belonging to people who previously used the private bus service. How does the Government reply to that? With regard to this service, it has been said that some buses will go to a station (perhaps at Salisbury), with passengers transferring there to a train, which will then complete the journey to the W.R.E. Does that offer equal accommodation and comfort to these people? I suggest that statements such as these sound phoney. The travelling public and the taxpayers must be considered. Moreover, we must consider the capital costs and management fees involved. Surely, from the taxpayers' point of view, it would have been far cheaper to subsidize the fare structure of these services, just as I have pointed out was done in the case of the M.T.T. We must build up cross-suburban services by using the surplus Tramways Trust buses that have been referred to in newspapers, rather than use some of those buses to make up for private services that have been taken over.

I know that a certain operator has caused confusion in this regard; nevertheless, I am talking about other services. If, out of the funds approved by this Parliament, the M.T.T. has surplus buses, they should be used to upgrade present services and to provide cross-suburban services. One of the faults of the Adelaide public transport system is that there are too many radial routes.

The public was further bewildered last week when an increase in rail fares was announced. The Minister sugar-coated the pill when he said that some fares would decrease. Although that may be so, many other fares will increase because, according to the newspaper report, the overall return from the increase will be \$200 000, with some fares being rounded off to the next silver coin. Many travellers will pay much more in fares than they paid before. It is no wonder that the public is completely bewildered as to the Government's so-called transport policy. When they were in Opposition, Government members were vocal about what they would do in this field, but all they are succeeding in doing at present is to completely bewilder the public. At page 62 of his

very good report, referring to private bus replacement programmes, Dr Scrafton states:

This project is not described in detail as it is believed that the Federal Government at the present time would not be receptive to the use of capital made available for transport development in assisting private bus operators to acquire new vehicles. For the time being, both State and Federal Governments are seeking alternative methods of assisting the private sector of the public transport industry. However, it should be recognized that the private bus operators in metropolitan Adelaide provide about one-third of all bus services in the metropolitan area. It would be inadvisable to allow the M.T.T. program to proceed too far without ensuring the private sector is given equal consideration in acquiring new vehicles.

That is an extract from an excellent official report that was commissioned by the Government and released by the Director-General of Transport. Because of the bewilderment and resentment that is building up in the public mind, I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Deputy Leader has said that he and the public are bewildered. His bewilderment was evident from his speech. The speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy were indeed confused this afternoon. It has been the Government's responsibility for some time to try to dispel the confusion on the Opposition benches. Unfortunately, however, much of that confusion seems to have been wilful. The Leader, when introducing this motion, said a few things with which I should like to deal briefly. Obviously, the gravamen of the complaint this afternoon relates to the take-over of private buses by the Municipal Tramways Trust.

Dr. Eastick: It's much wider than that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not effectively much wider than that. I should like to deal with what the Leader said, as far as one can discern anything from the many contradictory statements he made. First, he made a mistake on the Government's policy regarding the M.A.T.S. plan. That policy is clear: the Government did not accept the degree to which private transport was to be concentrated under the M.A.T.S. proposals, and the clear implication that public transport would decline. The Government refused to accept the whole of the freeway and clearway proposals in the original plan, and submitted to and had accepted by Parliament, as we had promised, a supplementary development plan that confined the freeway schemes to those contained in the policy speech from which the Leader quoted this afternoon. The Leader said that that was a broken promise; but it was not and, what is more, he knows it was not. He then said that we promised experimentation, and claimed that this was a waste of money. However, the only experimentation to which he referred was in respect of the dial-a-bus scheme, which was not an experiment conducted by the Government itself. The Government had previously investigated a dial-a-bus scheme and had intended to proceed with an experiment. However, a private operator, although informed by the Government that the scheme in which he was to indulge was not the one recommended, decided to proceed with it, and the Government promised to facilitate any experiment he undertook, which it did.

Mr. Coumbe: It was paid for by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the member for Torrens thinks that the Government should not be examining these things, I'm really saying that it should retain in South Australia public transport of the nineteenth century standard that obtained during the term of office of the Government of which he was a member. The Leader of the Opposition then complained, in a most contradictory manner, about

the Islington workshops, saying, first, that the Government should retain them and, secondly, that some contracts should be let to concerns other than the workshops. What does he want?

Dr. Eastick: You analyse it a bit further.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Does the Leader want us to retain the workshops or to sack the men? We have retained the workshops and have given them every conceivable Government contract that we could—

Dr. Eastick: At what cost?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —including bridges and harbor works. Does the Leader want the Government to get rid of the workshops altogether and sack the men? If that is what he wants, let him say so. He protested that the Government was not replacing men working at the workshops as they retired and then, in the next breath, complained that we were retaining the workshops.

Dr. Eastick: Are they being gainfully employed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader does not think these men are being gainfully employed, let him tell the Government to sack them. If he thinks that, let him say so instead of having two bob each way. The Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy have said that the Government has not honoured its promises regarding the improvement of public transport, saying that the money available for this purpose would not be spent until 1975. However, I should now like to inform members of the budgetary situation in this respect.

Dr. Eastick: What date have you got on that document?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Today's date. The Leader can have this document to refer to afterwards if he so desires and if he cannot absorb what I am reading.

Dr. Eastick: I would like you to table it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall be happy to do that. The document states:

Project: Christie Downs railway extension, including additional track from Brighton to Port Stanvac, and the line to be electrified. Expenditure approved by the Australian Government for 1973-74, \$3 900 000.

Of that, the Australian Government's contribution is \$2 600 000.

Dr. Eastick: The Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so. The total expenditure approved by the Australian Government is \$3 900 000, and the total cost of the project is \$12 000 000. The report also states that work on upgrading the Glenelg tramway is to cost \$300 000, of which \$200 000 is to be contributed by the Australian Government, the total expenditure being \$800 000. The sum of \$1 300 000 is to be spent this year on new buses for the M.T.T., of which the Australian Government is to contribute \$870 000. Other capital works nominated by the Minister involve expenditure of \$550 000, of which the Australian Government is to contribute \$370 000. The total to be spent on improving public transport this year is therefore \$6 050 000, yet the Leader says that is not to be spent until 1975. The Leader has said that the Government is not honouring its promises regarding public transport or spending the necessary money thereon, but that statement is nonsense. The Government is spending it and, indeed, it is spending far in excess of the sums ever spent in any one year by the Government of which he was a member.

Dr. Tonkin: Whose money is it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it is the taxpayers' money, and they want it spent on public transport.

Dr. Tonkin: Where's it coming from?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Partly from the Australian Government and partly from our taxation revenue. We did not get it from the Liberals!

Dr. Tonkin: But how much was spent on roads?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is obviously implying that nothing was spent on roads. I seem to remember that he was referring to public transport. I refer now to the private bus operators.

Dr. Tonkin: This will be good!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sure it will be, and I hope it will be informative to the honourable member, because obviously he is very ill informed at present. Fares on M.T.T. and licensed bus services were increased on April 29, 1973, but in July, 1973, representatives of the Bus Proprietors Association approached the M.T.T. and the Minister of Transport, claiming that members who were licensees of the M.T.T. were getting into financial difficulties because of the Government's policy of keeping public transport fares low.

The April increase had not yielded sufficient revenue to solve their problems, although it was an agreed increase. They sought to increase their revenue by a further fare increase or a Government subsidy and claimed that additional revenue was required for the following purposes:

To allow them to increase the wages of their employees to bring them closer to M.T.T. employees;
to permit them to purchase new buses instead of secondhand ones; and
to provide a satisfactory return on the funds employed in their businesses.

They also asked for an indication from the Government of their future in the transit industry. Previously they had asked that, if there were to be any discontinuation of their business, they be given five years notice, and that was agreed to by the Government. It was decided that, before the request for an indication from the Government of their future in the transit industry could be considered, the actual financial position of each private bus operator should be determined to establish the need for extra revenue. Agreement was reached between the Government and the Bus Proprietors Association that the financial position of Bowman's Bus Services should be determined first as a pilot study.

A public accountant was employed by the Bus Proprietors Association to go through Bowman's accounts and records in conjunction with M.T.T. officers and estimate Bowman's financial result for the year 1973-74. This study was completed at about the end of December last year. The matter was then submitted to Cabinet for discussion, following which a further report was prepared by the trust estimating the capital outlay and annual operating costs of the trust's operating all metropolitan licensed services

A third report was also prepared, estimating the additional revenue that would accrue to the trust if fourth and fifth section adult fares on M.T.T. and licensed services were increased by 5c, with corresponding increases in child fares. The Government then decided that no subsidies would be paid to the private operators. I will make clear why this is so. If the Government once undertook the payment of subsidies directly to private operators, it would have been in an impossible negotiating position with them. Members must know that, in dealing with the private operators, we could have been held completely to ransom on subsidy and there would have been no way in which we could have protected the public purse properly.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We were held to ransom anyway by Lewis Brothers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will deal with that and also with the suggestion of a tough take-over. The Government decided that the fourth and fifth section fares for both M.T.T. and licensed operators would be

raised and that requests by private operators for increases in other fares would be considered. They were to be allowed to increase their fare structure in order to cover their operating losses, and it was made clear to them that they could do that. The Government also decided that private services would be phased out, commencing in February, 1979, and the reason for that was that, on the study we had done in relation to the conduct of private services, it was quite clear that large parts of the metropolitan area were not served properly by off-peak services. The vast majority of Housing Trust areas served by private bus operators did not have proper services in off-peak periods and did not get comparability with the remainder of the metropolitan area in public transport services.

The only way in which we could ensure that they would get comparability would be by running a public transport service. To do this, it would also be necessary to integrate with other services so that we could run effective collector services in some areas for the rapid transit service we were developing for metropolitan railway lines in relation to newly electrified services. However, to ensure that there was proper notice to the bus operators, we told them that they would be phased out after 1979, and that was the notice that they had asked for. There was no ham-fisted notice of take-over: they were given exactly the notice that they had asked for, and no less. That information was conveyed to the Bus Proprietors Association, and the bus proprietors then stated that the proposals, which included those that they themselves had asked for last year, were totally unacceptable, and they threatened to strike.

Dr. Eastick: Were they under any threat?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under what threat? What threat was there? They were given notice that there was an intended transfer to the public transport system as from February, 1979. That was the notice for which they had asked.

Dr. Tonkin: They were given the necessary incentive by way of ultimatum, I suppose.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. We told them that we wanted them to remain and negotiate with us about their phasing out. If they wanted to go earlier, they could approach us about that. These were the things which were told to them. It was stated specifically, "We will not pay subsidies. You may increase your fare structure to cover your operating losses. We will not phase you out before 1979. If you wish to negotiate with us for an earlier take-over because of a particular difficulty in your company, we will look at that and negotiate with you."

What kind of ultimatum is that to bus operators? It was not an ultimatum at all. They were told that they could increase their fourth and fifth section fares in accordance with M.T.T. changes and that in relation to other areas of fares they could negotiate with us in order to cover their operating losses.

Mr. Payne: They pulled the gun.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What they did was strike. They said, "Unless you come to terms with us, we will withdraw all our services and leave the public to walk." When workers in this State do that kind of thing, members opposite jump up and down and say what a terrible thing it is that no consideration of the public interest is shown by these people and that they are holding the public to ransom. However, when the boot is on the other foot, look at what happens!

Mr. Coumbe: What about your attitude on that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let us keep to this topic, shall we? I want to say a few things more about this

before I conclude. Following the discussions between the representatives of the Bus Proprietors Association and the Minister of Transport (and it was not the Minister of Transport who was making threatening noises: he acted with the utmost tact in the whole of this matter)—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: After discussions, the Bus Proprietors Association submitted a plan for the immediate take-over of private services by the Government. This would relieve them of the responsibility for continuing to operate unprofitable services for the five-year period until 1979. We then agreed that, if that was what they wanted, we would negotiate on an immediate take-over, and we agreed to proposals later at a meeting of the individual bus proprietors. The agreement was ratified by the Bus Proprietors Association.

The terms of the agreement provide for the M.T.T. to purchase at present-day market values the assets used in operating the private bus services. Payments totalling \$187 500 are to be made to the private operators as consideration for options granted by the licensees to the trust for the first right to purchase the assets of the proprietors. Existing employees will be offered continued employment in their present positions. When the services are operated as regular trust services, the employees will be offered employment as regular trust employees, subject to certain conditions such as medical fitness, being under 65 years of age, etc.

Dr. Eastick: What is "etc."?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will come to that point. The bus proprietors may offer their services to the trust to ensure continuity of the bus services. The agreement allows each private operator to elect to relinquish his services or continue to operate them until the expiry of his licence period.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Keep going!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am keeping going, and I hope the honourable member will appreciate that. The proprietors are free to operate if they choose to, and three private services have elected to continue. They are Langs Motor Services Proprietary Limited, Footes Bus Service Proprietary Limited, and Salisbury Transport Industries Proprietary Limited. These licensees may elect to discontinue their services with three months notice. The remainder of the trust's licensees have elected to relinquish their services as from February 24, 1974.

After February 24, 1974, the M.T.T. plans to operate the previously private bus services from the existing depots using the existing buses and staff. The same bus time tables will be run and the same rosters will be worked by the employees. Later, when the trust has had an opportunity to construct depots and purchase new buses, the services will be progressively transferred to M.T.T. depots and be operated as regular trust services. Lewis Brothers Coach Services Proprietary Limited did not sign the agreement and gave notice that its services would be discontinued from Monday, February 18, 1974. This company did not sell to the trust any of its buses or other assets used to operate the bus service.

The trust has used buses retired from service several years ago to operate these services. The situation in Salisbury with the Weapons Research Establishment service is unique, because that is not a public service operated for the benefit of members of the general public but is a collector service operated for a certain works. Obviously,

the M.T.T. could not normally operate a service of that kind; otherwise, every works in South Australia could demand a special collector service.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have tried to initiate a series of proposals to replace the existing service and to ensure that it is maintained to employees, and we are having discussions now with the Commonwealth Government in an endeavour to see that that is done. Following a request from the tramways union in relation to over-award and service payments, such payments will be available to members who are employees in the private bus services area, but will be available only to members who join the union.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That situation is no different from their previous employment practice, as these employees were not paid over-award and service payments. However, if they wish to gain the benefits that have been established for them by the Tramways Employees Association, they will obviously need to make a contribution to get them.

Mr. Gunn: Compulsion!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no compulsion: they will get the benefits if they pay for them. That is the present position, and I believe it is entirely proper and defensible.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask why this motion should lapse at this time. I draw attention to Standing Order 59, which provides:

A motion without notice that the House, at its rising, adjourn to any day or hour other than that fixed for the next ordinary meeting of the House, for the purpose of debating some matter of urgency, can be made only after notices have been given, and before the business on the Notice Paper is proceeded with, and such motion can be made notwithstanding there be on the paper a motion for adjournment to a time other than that of the next ordinary meeting. The member so moving must make in writing, and hand in to the Speaker, a statement of the matter of urgency. Such motion must be supported by four members rising in their places as indicating their approval thereof. Only the matter in respect of which such motion is made can be debated. Not more than one such motion can be made during the same sitting of the House. Such motion may not be amended, and at the close of the debate shall be withdrawn.

There is no mention of when that motion shall lapse, and I submit that there is no reason for the debate to close at 3.15 p.m.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that it has always been the practice of this House to ring the bells at the time the business of the day should be commenced to signify the end of an urgency motion debate. This time, before the adoption of the new Standing Orders, was 4 o'clock, but with a reduction in Question Time, which must end at or before 3.15 p.m., this is the time to call on the business of the day, as referred to in Standing Order 59. Therefore, I cannot uphold the point of order.

Dr. TONKIN: I suggest that, because this matter was not debated when Standing Orders were amended earlier in the session, the matter of an urgency motion was not covered at all. With great regret, I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must put his notice of dissent in writing.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bragg has moved to disagree to the Speaker's ruling for the following reason:

Because there is nothing in Standing Orders to provide that motions for adjournment for the purposes of debating a matter of urgency shall lapse at 3.15 p.m., and that the practice of the House has always allowed that that time is 4 p.m.

Dr. TONKIN: I think by that wording I have outlined my motion for disagreeing to the Speaker's ruling. When Standing Orders were amended, it was never intended that the time for discussing matters of urgency should be brought back from 4 p.m. to 3.15 p.m. This was certainly not referred to by those introducing the amendments. I think the Attorney-General was in charge of them, and this matter was not referred to at any time. It is a tradition that the Opposition can use Question Time and every means at its constitutional disposal under Parliamentary Standing Orders to ventilate matters of importance and concern in the community. I do not believe that the practice you have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is any different: in fact, I think your quoting of the practice of allowing until 4 p.m. supports my proposition.

I believe that the time available to the Opposition for protest, for examination, for dissension and for questions has been reduced quite enough under the present system; I believe it may have been reduced by design. Be that as it may, however, it has been cut down and, if it is to be cut down still further for discussing matters of urgency, it will be a sorry day for democracy in this State. This situation may well serve members opposite, particularly the Premier, who was making pretty heavy weather of what he was saying before I raised my objection. It may well serve him to gag, through you, Mr. Speaker, this debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. I made the ruling, and the honourable member should withdraw his remark, as it is a reflection on the Chair.

Dr. TONKIN: I happily withdraw it. I would not for a moment suggest that you, Mr. Speaker, were anything but an impartial and fair-minded Speaker. That is why, on reflection, you may well find that the ruling you have given is not entirely in the best interests of the House and may not be in accordance with Parliamentary practice. I believe the Premier would like this debate gagged, but I am not saying that you are doing it. I think members of the Government have obviously been most embarrassed by all this; they certainly did not take much interest in it. I believe we have the right to debate this matter as far as we can, and 4 o'clock will not be time enough. However, we will try to make it do. I maintain my disagreement to your ruling.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion because another Standing Order covers this situation. Having quickly perused the report of the Standing Orders Committee, which sought to make that change, which I believe has been detrimental to the proper working of the democratic process in this House, I quote from Standing Order 237, which, by implication, refers to the time of 4 o'clock. Headed "Adjournment of motions" it states:

If all motions—
which include the type of motion we are dealing with today—

(other than motions by a Minister of the Crown) shall not have been disposed of two hours after the time fixed for the meeting of the House—

and the implications of that are certainly obvious—
on any day on which private members' business takes precedence, the debate thereon shall be interrupted . . .

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is not today, but never mind.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a general statement on any motions before the House. That is the only reference to 4 o'clock—in other words, two hours after the meeting of the House. It is an accepted practice of the House that two hours is the time allowable for this type of motion, and thereafter Government business will be resumed. In the report of the Standing Orders Committee, which was ordered to be printed on October 16 of last year, Report No. 22, there is no reference to an amendment of Standing Order 237. Therefore, we on this side submit that the accepted time for these motions to be debated is until 4 p.m., when Government business is resumed—two hours after the meeting of the House on that day. For that reason and because I do not believe it was intended by the report of the Standing Orders Committee that debate on this type of motion should be gagged, a proper interpretation of Standing Orders would enable this debate to continue.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): First, Standing Order 237 does not apply to this situation, as I am sure all members will agree. Standing Order 237 refers to a situation that relates to private members' motions on a day on which private members' business takes precedence. Today is not a day on which private members' business takes precedence, so Standing Order 237 does not apply. That Standing Order applies only on a Wednesday afternoon when private members' business is still being proceeded with prior to the motion, which is moved every session, that Government business take precedence. Under the previous Standing Orders, the two Standing Orders that gave rise to the practice of the House that motions of urgency had to be withdrawn by 4 o'clock were, first, Standing Order 59, which provides that such a motion can be made only after notices have been given, and before the business on the Notice Paper is proceeded with. It must finish prior to the business on the Notice Paper being proceeded with, and the normal time for that, of course, was 4 o'clock. The old Standing Order 127 provides:

Unless otherwise ordered, the period allowed for asking questions without notice shall not exceed two hours on the first day of a session and, on other days, shall cease at 4 o'clock.

That Standing Order gave rise to the ordinary business of the House commencing at 4 o'clock.

Mr. Coumbe: You remember that one very well, don't you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do indeed. That is the Standing Order that gave rise to the time at which the ordinary business of the House commences—4 o'clock. Standing Order 127 alters that, because it provides for a change in the time allowed for Question Time, as follows:

Provided that in any event on a day other than the first day of a session the period shall expire at fifteen minutes past three o'clock.

So the time at which Government business commences each day is now set specifically at 3.15 p.m. Standing Order 59 provides that a motion for adjournment must be completed before the business on the Notice Paper is proceeded with. Mr. Speaker, I think your interpretation of the Standing Order is correct. I have no recollection of a debate on this matter taking place when the Standing Orders were being revised but it is the Speaker's duty to apply the Standing Orders. This is a correct interpretation

and, in these circumstances, it is a reflection on the Chair for the member for Bragg to move that the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to, because what the honourable member is doing is moving that our Standing Orders be ignored and that we pay no attention to them.

Dr. Tonkin: Nonsense!

Mr. Goldsworthy: What rot!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Neither the member for Bragg nor the member for Kavel was concerned to produce any valid argument on the Standing Orders to suggest that the debate on a motion of urgency should, under our new Standing Orders, last until 4 o'clock. The honourable member's argument cannot be sustained; the Speaker's interpretation is correct.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I do not believe the member for Bragg's motion is a reflection on the Speaker: rather, it is a demonstration that the Liberal and Country League members are, as usual, 12 months behind the times. They say they did not know of any debate on these matters when Standing Orders were being amended; they found out only long after the event occurred. That is characteristic of them. The one thing that has happened today is to stifle the boredom that is taking place in the House. There has been no motion of urgency, only a mass of detail and no evidence of urgency. There is no excuse for the Opposition to claim, as it has done, that this debate has some special significance.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the attention of the honourable member for Goyder to the fact that the motion being considered by the House is one of dissension to the Speaker's ruling on a point of order raised. The debate must be confined to that motion. The member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: I return to the point that I have not previously in this House spoken to honourable members who understood anything differently from your ruling on when this debate should terminate. As I shall vote against this motion, I want it known that I will do so because there is a practical reason for the Standing Orders that control this House. I regret that the Opposition has been so lax in its argument as to fail to attack the ideology of the Government.

Dr. TONKIN: I will ignore the most recent campaign speech and refer briefly to the comments of the Minister of Education, who said that the Opposition was suggesting that Standing Orders be ignored. We are not suggesting that Standing Orders be ignored; far from it. Indeed, if the Minister takes the trouble to look more deeply into the propositions he has made, he will find that he has been supporting our point of view. Private members' business, under Standing Order 237, takes precedence only on Wednesdays when private members' business is still before the House. Matters of urgency, I submit, are private members' business introduced on an urgent basis. If it is good enough to introduce private members' business (and this is what the motion is) urgently, the practice of allowing debate until 4 o'clock is entirely suitable, absolutely fair, and what was intended. If it is not, I am—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Shattered?

Dr. TONKIN: Well, that is one word: I am disillusioned. It confirms me in my view that the Government has no concern for the well-being of the people of South Australia or for freedom of speech in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's remarks are definitely out of order. We are dealing with a dissension motion.

The House divided on Dr. Tonkin's motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy,

Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen and Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. King and Virgo.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

VAUGHAN HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I did not expect that the Government would be generous enough to allow me to move the motion standing in my name, but I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, particularly because of the happenings of the last fortnight, there should be a full and independent inquiry into the administration of Vaughan House and the methods of rehabilitation being used there.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Then you will not get any private member's time for the remainder of the session: I warn you. It is one or the other. If you take the business out of the Government's hands, you will not get any private member's time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know why the Premier should say that. We have come to the end of Government business; the next item of business on the Notice Paper is my motion. I do not know how the Premier can say that, by going on with my motion, I am taking the business of the House out of the Government's hands. It is impudent of the Premier to try to say it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has raised a point of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I take the point of order that items under the heading "Business Lapsed from Thursday, November 29, 1973," cannot be considered now unless a motion is moved, first, to restore such items of business to the Notice Paper. They have lapsed at this stage and, unless there is a motion requesting the House to restore these items of business to the Notice Paper, they remain lapsed and disposed of until they are brought on again.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order at this stage, because the motions referred to lapsed from Thursday, November 29, 1973. They cannot be taken as having been deleted from the business of the day and are therefore placed at the end of the Notice Paper, after the ordinary business of the day. They lapsed from that time and are placed at the bottom of the Notice Paper. Standing Order 231 provides:

If, at the adjournment of the House, any motions on the Notice Paper have not been called on, such motions shall be set down on the Notice Paper for the next sitting day, at the end of regular business.

That is what has happened today, and I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I respectfully agree entirely with your ruling. When anyone is right, no matter where he is in the House, I will say so and, with respect, Mr. Speaker, I agree that your ruling is entirely correct. However, I am, as always, in a co-operative mood. I heard the Premier's interjection that, if I go on with this, there will be no private members' business for the rest of the session: I think that that was the effect of

what he said. I am willing to do a deal with him: I am willing not to go on with this motion today if the Premier will give time tomorrow to the member for Goyder to introduce his Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which is also a matter of very great importance. It is quite obvious to me that the Government has not any business to go on with. The House is sitting, and the Government is merely trying to block debate on other matters properly before the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education has risen on a point of order.

Mr. Millhouse: Not another one!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is on his feet in connection with the following motion:

That in the opinion of this House, particularly because of the happenings of the last fortnight, there should be a full and independent inquiry into the administration of Vaughan House and the methods of rehabilitation being used there.

The honourable member's remarks have nothing to do with the subject matter of that motion: they are completely irrelevant, and I request that he be asked by you, Mr. Speaker, to confine his remarks to the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. The member for Mitcham is moving the motion as contained in Notices of Motion: Other Business, No. 1. His remarks must therefore be confined to the motion as published in the Notice Paper. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, Mr. Speaker, but I would take a nod from the Premier on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You won't get one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well. I move:

That in the opinion of this House, particularly because of the happenings of the last fortnight—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which last fortnight?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education has been playful in the last 10 minutes in an attempt to get the Government out of the hole into which it has fallen. If the Minister looked at the Notice Paper he would see that this is an item of business on the Notice Paper, and he would also see that on the line above is the date from which it lapsed—Thursday, November 29, 1973. If the Minister used those powers of deduction that he claims to have, he would realize which fortnight was meant. I shall start the motion again:

That in the opinion of this House, particularly because of the happenings of the last fortnight, there should be a full and independent inquiry into the administration of Vaughan House and the methods of rehabilitation being used there.

Of course, this notice of motion was put on the Notice Paper some months ago and necessarily, because it refers to happenings that occurred at about that time, it is in this wording but, of course, the substance of the motion is still very important, and nothing has happened in the meantime to alter the gravity of the situation. We have had over a long time disturbances, problems and troubles at Vaughan House. We have had the introduction of new methods, so called, under the direction of the present Minister of Community Welfare. There have been numerous complaints from many who know much of the workings of Vaughan House, who know what is going on

there and know about the methods, the treatment and the reaction of the girls.

What this motion asks is that there should be an inquiry into what is going on. I know that the Labor Party believes in what its Commonwealth Leader has been pleased to call open government. If the Labor Party believes in open government, it can have no objection whatever to there being an inquiry into the happenings at Vaughan House in view of the public disquiet. As there has been a controversy in the papers and elsewhere about Vaughan House, why should there not be such an inquiry? Since the House last sat I can remember seeing an article by Miss Helen Caterer, who was a member of the Social Welfare Advisory Council, who visited Vaughan House and gave a great deal of time (and still does) to voluntary work associated with it and other comparable organizations. She made a very good point in the article.

The present Minister of Community Welfare is my successor; my predecessor was the present Premier. In his time we had a good deal of publicity about the enlightened methods used at Vaughan House and other institutions, and I am willing to accept that they were enlightened methods. I hoped when I was Minister to continue and improve on them. Although, in the very nature of a place like Vaughan House, there are always problems in the treatment, care and control of those who are there, under the present Minister there has been a multiplication of those problems—certainly a multiplication of the problems apparent to the public. I believe there is no way in which public disquiet can be avoided except by a full and free public inquiry into what is going on. If there is nothing wrong, there is no reason why there should not be an inquiry to make that plain to everyone. If there is something wrong, the sooner it is known and corrected the better. Those are the reasons why I put this notice of motion on the Notice Paper, and I am very glad that, fortuitous though it may be, I have an opportunity to move the motion today. I hope that it will have a great deal of support, at least from this side of the House.

I regret that the Minister himself is not here to speak in the debate. By coincidence, I travelled home today on the same plane as Mr. Ian Cox, the Director-General of Community Welfare. He told me that the Minister was at a conference of Attorneys-General. I am sorry about that, but I am not really responsible for the timing of this debate; the fact that the Government has not any business to put before the House has allowed me to bring it on today. I hope that, as a former Minister in charge of this portfolio, the Premier will be willing to speak in the debate and will not simply adjourn it, as I believe he would like to do to save embarrassment for himself and other members. The Minister of Environment and Conservation may laugh at that, but I could see embarrassment written on the faces of some members who sit behind him and whose faces he cannot see. Those members, like me, have a genuine concern about this matter and would like to see it cleared up. I hope that the Premier will not simply gag the motion but will be man enough to stand up and debate it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 20, at 2 p.m.