

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Fruit Fly (Compensation),
Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS**UNEMPLOYMENT**

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether his department has studied the latest unemployment figures and whether he wishes to make a comment based on the department's analysis? I think that a total of 99,180 persons unemployed in July, including 12,822 persons in South Australia, calls for the closest scrutiny and the most pointed comment.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: My department has studied the latest monthly review of the employment situation published yesterday by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service. Its analysis of the situation does not provide any cause for congratulation of those in Canberra in charge of the economic destinies of this country. It is clear that unemployment, despite a series of early forecasts of improvement and another series of stop-gap measures, is getting steadily worse, not better. Now, 2 per cent of the work force is registered as unemployed, and the hard core of unemployed clearly is not shifting. Going back over the July unemployment total in recent years, we find that in 1969 there were 49,500 registered, and in 1970 it had risen only slightly to 50,400; in July last year it was 64,300. Since then we have had the disastrously misjudged Budget of last August, and last month's figure was 99,180, the highest July total for 10 years. The South Australian July totals show a similar disturbing trend: from 6,000 in 1969 to 12,800 this year.

To explain the worsening figures, the Commonwealth Minister concerned has used every excuse in the book in turn, month by month. This morning the economist of the *Australian* criticized the Minister for what he called his "crude attempts to obscure what is patently obvious". He added that the Minister had succeeded in deceiving nobody. The figures are there, plain for everyone to see, and

everyone, even members of the Opposition, knows why they have grown worse. Now, the Commonwealth Minister has attempted to shift the blame on to the recent oil industry dispute. I wonder what he will use next month to explain away what has again gone wrong with our national economy.

Some of the worst effects of the unemployment crisis (it is fair to describe it as a crisis, with almost 100,000 out of work) have been disguised by the Commonwealth's rural unemployment scheme. This scheme provided more than 13,000 jobs last month, and this has relieved the situation substantially in my own home city of Port Pirie. But, although I have welcomed this type of relief, I have never seen these grants as anything other than a temporary stop-gap. No man or woman with self-respect wants to gain his living from this type of dole payment. They, and we in Government, want a renewed flow of genuine, permanent, worthwhile employment, and this will come about only when people regain confidence in the national Government. The present national Government has had time enough to prove itself and I do not think I need spell out the results. They are obvious in these distressing unemployment figures.

COMMERCIAL VEHICLE SPEEDS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether a statement in this morning's paper, which quotes him as saying that the State Government is prepared to increase the speed limits for commercial vehicles subject to conditions, is a factual report of what he said? I refer to a report on page 15 of today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Government Would Lift Speeds—Virgo", in which the Minister comments on statements by the newly-formed Professional Transport Drivers Association that it wants higher speed limits and changes to the points demerit system. The last paragraph states: Mr. Virgo said the Government would increase the speed limits if legislation were passed to restrict loads carried by commercial vehicles, to require more stringent ranking provisions for vehicles and trailers, and to limit hours of driving.

One can be excused for believing from this report that the Minister is attempting to blackmail the industry into accepting restrictions and impositions which the industry has already stated are unacceptable and detrimental to the economic operation of the industry. Two of these conditions in particular were matters which were discussed by this House during

the last session and which the Government, in fact, allowed to lapse, because of the intense opposition expressed by the industry, which was strongly supported by the Opposition. The effect of this firmly supported the attitude expressed by the industry outside: that is, what was stated in the first instance. The Minister will know that the Government allowed the Bill to lapse after the industry had shown that it was expected to cause a 34 per cent reduction in the carrying capacity of the commercial vehicles of this State if the manufacturers' determinations of weight were applied, and this in turn would have meant a 24 per cent to 28 per cent increase in the cost of transportation. Also, it was found that the limitation of time could well have meant that loaded stock transports would be required to stop for 12-hour rest periods when they were within 30 to 60 miles of the abattoir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member seems to me making rather an exhaustive explanation. He must not debate the question.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister say whether the assumption one can draw from the quotes attributed to him in this newspaper report are correct, or whether there is another explanation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The report in this morning's newspaper is completely accurate. However, in view of the long and incorrect explanation given by the Leader, it is necessary for me to expand my reply further than merely making the bald statement that the report is correct. First, I make it plain that no-one, other than a person with political motives, would suggest that what I had said was blackmail. If the Leader is willing to say in public that he will increase the speed limits for commercial vehicles without requiring adequate brakes and without requiring the weight limit to be enforced, let him have the courage to stand up and say it. I ask the member for Bragg to do the same: instead of travelling around the country saying it, let him come into the House and say it here, but he has not the courage. He travels to Murray Bridge and other places and makes accusations, but then comes into my office and agrees with my point of view. I emphasize that there is no blackmail in this, but I make plain that the Government made its attitude abundantly clear to this House last year when it introduced the legislation, which required that the speed limit should be increased, that the brakes of vehicles should be upgraded and

meet a new specification, and that load limitations would be applied on vehicles.

Dr. Eastick: It's already there—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —subject to negotiation. The Leader is again saying that he will agree to a three-ton truck being loaded with eight tons of goods and being allowed to travel down the Adelaide Hills road. Is that what he is agreeing to, because that is what he is saying?

Dr. Eastick: No, he is not.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Probably the Leader is unaware that no load limits apply in South Australia.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Axle loads?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Axle loads have nothing to do with it: the member for Alexandra should know better, and I think he does. He knows full well that a 30-cwt. truck can be loaded with up to eight tons before breaking the law of the State.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's all right for them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Alexandra is willing to have on his conscience the deaths that a legalized increased speed would provide in those conditions, it is up to him to introduce the legislation. I will not have it on my conscience.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Isn't this rather irrelevant?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not being any more irrelevant than was the Leader in his rather long-winded and incorrect explanation. He said in his explanation that this legislation would increase costs by 34 per cent—

Dr. Eastick: I said by 24 per cent to 28 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not want to argue the point concerning a figure. The Leader has claimed that this would increase costs—

Mr. Gunn: Of course it would.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —and the member for Eyre agrees with him. Apparently he has a strong gripe against his Liberal Party counterparts in Victoria and New South Wales, because they have the same legislation on their books. I am sorry that the Leader is so intent on trying to make political propaganda that he is not aware that the legislation we intend to introduce is identical with the legislation in New South Wales and Victoria.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is replying to a question. He must be heard in

silence. The Leader of the Opposition had a fair amount of latitude in making his explanation, and the honourable Minister has had a fair amount of latitude in replying. If the point has not been made at this stage, there is no use in continuing.

Dr. TONKIN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: In reply to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister said that I had been going around the country (I think this was the import of his words) advocating the raising of speed limits to 50 m.p.h. for commercial vehicles without having regard to braking capacity, hours of driving, or load limits. However, I point out that that is not correct. Although I strongly favour increasing the speed limit, I have always been careful to relate this increase to the hours of driving, the size of loads, and the braking capacity of the vehicles concerned—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have a different view from that of your Leader—is that what you are saying?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister would agree that this was the case when I took a deputation to see him in his office. I believe that I have been instrumental, in a small way, in getting some drivers to see this point of view. It is my regret that the Minister does not seem to be prepared to come and meet them halfway.

PAYMENTS TO PRISONERS

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to my recent question concerning payments to prisoners?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Prisons Department is currently preparing submissions to the Government on prisoners wages, and particularly on the regulation which states that prisoners cannot earn more than 10c a day for the first six months of sentence. However, the honourable member stated that 10c a day is presently paid, 5c of which is paid into an amenities fund. This is not correct, as the amount paid to the amenities fund is 5c a week. In general, wages paid to prisoners in South Australia compare well with rates paid in other States, but the anomalies created by the limited payment for the first six months are well recognized, and departmental submissions will be presented soon.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. BROWN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry furnish councils with a report from the recent safety seminar held in Adelaide concerning the basic safety issues facing industry today? Over the weekend, I was appalled to find out that representatives of only five councils attended this seminar. I believe that there is much apathy in the way councils are looking at this important question of safety in industry. As large employers of labour, councils have an important role to play with regard to safety. Therefore, these matters should be brought to the attention of councils.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will see that each council receives a copy of the speeches made at the seminar.

OFF-SHORE LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Premier, the Attorney-General, or any other Minister intend to discuss with the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament the question of legislation on the territorial sea and continental shelf? Mr. Speaker, you may remember that last week the Premier and the Attorney-General were not in the Chamber for one or two days (I cannot remember how long). They were at a conference of State Ministers and the Commonwealth Minister on this subject of off-shore legislation. Last Friday's *Advertiser* contains the following report:

The Territorial Sea and Continental Shelf Bill, introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament by former Prime Minister Mr. Gorton in 1970, will be dropped.

In part, the Premier is reported as commenting on that as follows:

Mr. Dunstan said after the meeting that the States had consistently maintained that negotiation and compromise were the only ways to solve the problem of off-shore sovereignty. Had Mr. Gorton's plan eventuated and the Bill been challenged in the High Court it would have been "just a feast for the lawyers".

This morning's newspaper reports that the Commonwealth Labor Caucus intends to support any move by Mr. Gorton to have the Bill, the subject of the earlier comment, brought on. The report states:

Mr. Whitlam, said last night that Opposition support for Mr. Gorton's Bill, which is still on the House of Representatives Notice Paper, would depend on what happened during the next few days. However, despite any objections from Mr. Dunstan, it remained Labor Party policy that off-shore sovereignty should be the subject of Federal legislation.

He concluded by saying that he had not had any discussion on the matter with the Premier.

I therefore put my question to the Premier in the hope that he will take the initiative to have discussions with Mr. Whitlam.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One does not need to speculate on the nature of the honourable member's interest in this matter: it is obviously not the public interest. As usual, the honourable member is interested only in making a political point.

Mr. Millhouse: No. I'm only interested in knowing what you are going to do.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What I am going to do has been made clear in South Australia for a long time.

Mr. Millhouse: Haven't you used your influence with the Commonwealth people?

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be only one question at a time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member obviously does not have any influence whatever with his Commonwealth people. He does not even have any influence with his people in this House.

Mr. Millhouse: Get on with the answer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is the honourable member asking me? The question is whether I will communicate with Mr. Whitlam. I have already done so: I have pointed out to him the views of this State. I should expect that the honourable member would support my views in this. If he does not, I hope he will get up and say so, indicating that he supports Mr. Gorton.

Mr. Millhouse: Is Mr. Whitlam—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Are you supporting Mr. Whitlam? What are you trying to do? All you are trying to do, as ever in this House, is to stir, and nothing else. You are not interested in the public interest at all. You could not care less. What do you want? Do you support this Government?

Mr. Coumbe: Address the Chair.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should like to know from the honourable member what it is that he is after. Does he want to know what is the attitude of this Government? That is a proper question in this House. The attitude of this Government is that the only way this issue can be satisfactorily resolved is by initiating joint operations between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments, each passing legislation to support the other in an agreed division of administration of off-shore rights.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you convinced Mr. Whitlam on that point?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. He has asked one question and he is not going to monopolize the time of this Chamber to the detriment of his colleagues.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the position of this Government, and we have represented it to everyone, including Mr. Whitlam. If the honourable member is interested in doing something for this State, what is he doing in relation either to the present Commonwealth Government and its leadership or to Mr. Gorton? Which section of the South Australian divisions of the Liberal Party is he representing in making representations either to Mr. McMahon or to Mr. Gorton? Where does he stand? No-one knows.

SEX EDUCATION

Mr. WRIGHT: My question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Get up and make a personal explanation and let us know where you stand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members should contain themselves and let the business of the House proceed as it should. The member for Adelaide has the call.

Mr. WRIGHT: With the proposed introduction of sex education in South Australian schools next year, can the Minister of Education guarantee that specially trained teachers will be available for appointment to such positions? I was alarmed when I read in the editorial of today's *Advertiser* certain innuendoes that the Education Department could not provide fully qualified teachers to fill these positions.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the problem has been confused by somewhat contrary press reports on the subject. At the mental health seminar that was held on Friday and Saturday last week, criticisms were made about the proposed preparation of teachers who would be involved in this course. Representations are being made to the committee involved in the planning of the course and I have little doubt that the matter will be resolved to the satisfaction of most of the critics. Certainly, Dr. Speedy, who was the lecturer who made the main criticisms at the seminar and who is Vice-Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College, clarified the position in yesterday's *News*, in which he is reported as saying:

The criticisms are based on nothing more than a thumbnail sketch of the syllabus. There

is no detailed information available yet on which criticisms can be reasonably made.

Dr. Speedy is also reported as saying that the current proposal for teacher preparation to handle the course was fairly minimal but that he believed teachers who led the pilot course would have sufficient preparation. I assure members and the public generally that adequate teacher preparation for this course is an important aspect of its successful introduction and that proper measures will be taken if the course is to start next year. I certainly hope the course will commence next year, and I am consequently taking steps to ensure that the necessary work on teacher preparation is undertaken. It may be that the number of pilot schools at which the course can be introduced in 1973 will have to be somewhat lower, or a slight adjustment may be necessary by the introduction of a wider range of in-service conferences than has been proposed. However, I am sure that in one way or another those responsible for planning the course will be able to make appropriate recommendations that can be implemented to ensure that the course gets off to a successful start.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the classes dealing with sex education, initiated during the time I was Minister of Education, under the auspices of the Adult Education Department, are still being held? I was very much concerned about the problem of conducting sex education in Education Department schools as well as in independent schools, and I believe the Minister is also concerned about this problem. In order to try and help in this regard, I persuaded officers of the Adult Education Department to organize a pilot class, which I think was conducted at the Adelaide High School, for the purpose of teaching parents how to give their children sex education. I know that this class opened with about 30 couples, and I think it ran successfully for that year (I think it was 1969), about 17 or 18 couples still remaining in the class at the end of the year. The reason for instituting this class was based on the theory, of course, that sex education should begin in the home and that parents often find it difficult to communicate with their children on this subject in an articulate way. Therefore,, classes were commenced for adults, and there was quite a wide acceptance of the idea. Can the Minister say whether this class is still functioning and whether, in fact, other classes have been instituted by the department in other schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I am not aware of any developments in this matter and do not know whether the class conducted for parents at the Adelaide High School continued in 1970, I will check for the honourable member and give a reply.

SHARK SALES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government has considered the critical position caused by the Victorian Government's proclamation banning the sale of school shark, whether the Government has established that the mercury levels are dangerous, whether the Government has decided yet to do anything if professional fishermen are distressed by the Victorian decision, and whether the Government has decided to take up this matter with the Victorian Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To answer the last question first, the Government, through the Minister of Agriculture, who is the Minister responsible for fisheries in this State, has decided to approach the Victorian Government, seeking from it specific reasons why this ban has been placed on the catching of school shark over 28in. long. We also want to know whether the decision made by that Government can be reviewed. I have a report from the Director-General of Public Health regarding the situation in South Australia and mercury levels in sharks that have been caught recently. That report states:

Shark examined in South Australia has contained mercury varying from 0.3 parts a million in gummy shark (Wallaroo) and 0.7 parts a million in schnapper shark (Tumby Bay), to 1.0 parts a million in a large shark taken in Foul Bay. In the United States of America, it is permissible to sell shark containing up to 0.5 parts a million. This is also the Australian recommendation. Japan and Sweden permit up to 1 part a million. I understand Victoria has found amounts up to 2.5 parts a million in larger sharks. The level increases as the shark grows larger. Effects on humans depends on the amount of shark that people eat. There is some uncertainty about the safe limit, but the Australian recommendation of 0.5 parts a million would allow 1½lb. of fish to be eaten weekly with safety. It would appear to be unwise to eat the large amounts of shark (especially from large fish) that some people in Victoria appear to eat. Smaller amounts of mercury have been found in other fish.

The level of mercury increases with the size of the fish. As far as I am aware, it is not known whether there is a natural content of mercury in shark. In the case of water, recently we tested water from the sea off

Port MacDonnell, in St. Vincent Gulf, and in Lake Bonney, but mercury is a base element of water, anyway. It naturally contains mercury, but I do not know whether there is an amount of mercury naturally in a shark. Probably there is, but these things will be found out, because my colleague has asked the Director of Fisheries to prepare a full report on the Victorian Government's decision to ban the sale of some shark in that State and on the effect that that decision will have on the industry in South Australia. The honourable member has asked whether we have considered assisting the industry in this matter. As he knows, this decision came as a bolt from the blue so far as our Government was concerned. I am disappointed that the Victorian Government made the decision in isolation. I should have thought it would be fair and reasonable for that Government to contact the other States that would be affected by the decision, telling them what it was doing. However, this was not done. My colleague has also asked the department to collect further samples of fish from South Australian waters for testing by the Chemistry Department for mercury contamination, and he will be contacting the Victorian Fisheries Minister (Mr. Hamer) to discuss with him the effects of the ban on the fishing industry. In view of the differing opinions the health authorities have expressed about the effects and levels that mercury contamination in fish can have on human health, as evidenced by the reported statement on the front page of today's *Australian* by Dr. Mellamby (Director of British Monks Wood Experimental Station), no decision affecting the sale of fish in South Australia will be made until the full test results are available, and then only after detailed discussion and consideration with the Minister of Health and senior departmental officers in the Health Department. I think that that reply covers the main points that the honourable member has raised.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have you yet considered anything as to the distress caused by this decision?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, we have not been able to assess that. I understand that there are some part-time shark fishermen. For instance, cray fishermen in my area sometimes revert to part-time shark fishing in rough weather. I think there are only two full-time shark fishermen in South Australia: there may be more, but I do not think there are many. However, many fishermen fish for

shark for part of the year, and doubtless this decision will affect the market. The Victorian Government's decision takes away from the fishing industry an extremely large market and must have a detrimental effect. However, we do not yet know the extent of that effect and what we can do about it. We have not decided that yet.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 26 regarding provision of sewerage facilities at Honeysuckle Drive, Highbury?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have approved an extension of sewer mains to serve Honeysuckle Drive, Beckman Avenue, Gaybas Court, Duncan Crescent and Anson Avenue, Hope Valley. However, due to the heavy work load and the limitation of Loan funds available to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it is not known if the work could be carried out during this financial year. It may be necessary to defer the extension until 1973-74.

GAS

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, any information regarding the natural gas reserves in the North-East of the State? Towards the end of last session, I asked the Minister what was the position in the gas fields, particularly in view of the Australian Gas Light Company (and, possibly, New South Wales Government) project to pipe natural gas to the environs of Sydney. At that time the Minister told me that further investigations were being conducted as to the future reserves on this field so that the project would not interfere with our own reserves here.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member an accurate report off the cuff on the extent of additional reserves provided, but some extremely large gas wells have been provided since the honourable member asked the question. It seems that sufficient reserves have been provided, but I will get a full and accurate report for the honourable member.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you include in your report information about negotiations with New South Wales?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not directly negotiating with the New South Wales company. Last week I discussed the matter with the New South Wales Minister. However, the honourable member will appreciate that

the Australian Gas Light Company's project in New South Wales is wholly a company project. Although there may be enabling legislation the New South Wales Government is not involved in the pipeline as we are here.

Mr. BECKER: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked on August 10 about the repayment of Loan money by the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reference to a repayment deferred is to an earlier contemplated repayment to the Treasurer, and not to an outside institution. It transpired that the pipelines authority required during 1971-72, and will require during 1972-73, to make rather greater capital expenditure upon buildings and plant than earlier thought likely. It would therefore have been pointless to require the repayment during the autumn of this year and then be called upon for a comparable new advance from the Treasury to the authority during the winter. The authority is operating on a fully self-supporting basis, paying full interest upon its borrowings to both the Treasurer and institutional lenders and involves no cost to the consolidated revenue of the State. Its annual report and that of the Auditor-General on the authority will be available to the House shortly.

INDUSTRIAL LAND

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 27 last about the minimum size of industrial allotments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Trust recognizes the necessity to provide small sites for industry, and presently has in its industrial estates several subdivisions providing sites with an area of less than one acre. The question relating to the Lonsdale area presents some difficulties, because the topography of this general industrial estate, and particularly the area thus far developed, does not readily allow for small individual sites. A large area presently being subdivided on the southern side of Sherriff Road will include a subdivision with sites suitable for small industry. As I had earlier indicated, the trust provides sufficient land for expansion of an industry and encourages that industry to provide a garden treatment, safeguarding the total environment of the area. I might also point out that in May, 1971, the trust conducted negotiations with a Mr. M. J. Hilliard for the establishment of a small chemical-manufacturing unit at Lonsdale. A site of one-half acre on Dyson Road, Lonsdale, was offered to Mr. Hilliard, but the offer lapsed through lack of reply.

SALINITY READINGS

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about salinity readings at drainage outlet points on the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Levels and salinity of evaporation basin waters are recorded on a monthly basis, or as required. These records are available in the office of the Resident Engineer, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the District Officer, Lands Department, at Berri, and span a period of about 30 years. These are not at present in a consolidated form but this will be done and, on completion, the readings will be forwarded to the honourable member.

BAROSSA VALLEY WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say what is the basis of the newspaper report that there will be a water shortage in the Barossa area later in the century? We are aware that there will be a general water shortage in the metropolitan area if more adequate provision is not made soon; I think everyone is aware of this and knows of our dependence on the Murray River for our future water supplies. However, I am wondering what are the peculiar circumstances regarding the Barossa Valley which gave rise to this newspaper report.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may be aware that I tabled in this House, I think last week, the report dealing with the filtration of the metropolitan water supply, and that report contains statements on which is based the newspaper report referred to. As the report that I tabled refers to the reasons leading up to a possible shortage and also to the steps that may be taken to prevent it, I refer the honourable member to that report. If he cannot obtain a copy of it, I shall be happy to make a copy available.

HILLS FACE ZONE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation report to the House on the decision, publicized in this morning's *Advertiser*, of the Planning Appeal Board to uphold the appeal by Lady Becker, of Sydney, against the refusal by both the State Planning Office and the City of Marion to allow her to subdivide a property, part of which is in the hills face zone at Seaview Downs?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This matter has created much public interest and is also, of course, a matter of interest to the Minister

of Education. I should like to explain this matter fully to the House and, although it is difficult to do this, bearing in mind some of the complexities involved, I will do my best to outline the details. The area referred to adjoins Major Road and extends to the north. Generally speaking, there are three paddocks extending from Major Road to the developed part of Seaview Downs. The highest of these paddocks on the hills face has been purchased by the State Planning Authority as open space, and the next two lower paddocks were both owned by Lady Becker. As members may know, the hills face zone is not delineated by way of a straight line: because of the complex nature of the area it involves an irregular line which, in effect, cuts across, in an "S" shape, the two blocks on the hills face that are owned by Lady Becker. As a result, say, half of each of those two blocks might be subdivided and developed, whereas the other half of each block within the hills face zone would be subject to the 10-acre provisions. The original application made to the authority in about 1970 was to subdivide, in total, the lower block and to develop the half of the higher block that is outside the hills face zone.

The reason for seeking to develop the total of the lower block, even though about half of it was within the hills face zone, was based on the provision within the Planning and Development Act that gives the authority discretion to approve development within the hills face zone if it represents part of a total project and if the hills face is in no way adversely affected. The application was refused by the authority, and an appeal was then lodged with the Planning Appeal Board. While the appeal hearing was proceeding, discussions were taking place between the Director of Planning and the owner of the land, and it was finally agreed that the appropriate way to develop the area in the best interests of local residents and of preserving the hills face zone generally was for the State Planning Authority to purchase the whole of the second block, that is, the higher block adjoining the other land already owned by the authority, consisting of 30 or 40 acres that could be developed. A total of about 80 acres was purchased by the authority for additional open spaces in that area. As a result, the appeal board has agreed that the other block, which included an area comparable to that provided by the authority for open space, can be developed. In fact, there has been an exchange of land in the area to counter the oddity of having the hills face

zone running in such an unusual shape, which has resulted in some area of the hills face zone being developed, and another area of equal size, plus considerable additional land, is now available to the community for open space. The situation has been the rationalization of a problem concerning the hills face zone and one that has developed because of the State Planning Authority's having discretion when there is development adjacent to the hills face zone which it could be argued would not affect the amenity of the area. In this case it seems to me, at any rate, that the community will not be adversely affected, but, because a similar situation could occur and because of the doubt in the minds of people about the full protection of the hills face zone (and the community in this State is jealous of the protection of this zone), it is intended, in order to prevent similar problems arising where we may not be able to find a solution, to amend the Planning and Development Act this session. Such an amendment will clarify the position and avoid any problems that might arise in similar situations.

EGGS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the control of egg production?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following the Victorian Government's agreement in principle to egg production controls, this matter was again discussed at the recent meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council held in North Queensland. Agreement was reached between the Commonwealth and the States on the principle of controlled production; and in South Australia, legislation will now be drafted without delay for presentation to Parliament soon.

AMBULANCE

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked the Attorney-General last week about the word "ambulance" being printed backwards above the windscreens of ambulances?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Chief Secretary has supplied the following report:

Some two years ago officials from the St. John Council for South Australia, the Police Department, and the Road Safety Council investigated the possibility of having the word "ambulance" backwards above the windscreens of ambulances. Present emergency warning devices, particularly the visual ones of the rotating red dome light and the front flashing light above the bumper bar, both being easily

visible in a rear vision mirror, are considered adequate. In addition, the policy of adopting a standard vehicle colour, design, and sign-writing on a State-wide basis also aids identification by motorists. Investigations show that the reaction time of a motorist seeing the red rotating and flashing lights is about $\frac{7}{10}$ ths of a second, and it is considered that this could not be improved by including the word "ambulance" above the windscreen.

CONCRETE SLEEPER INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier assemble the Senators of this State, regardless of their political affiliation, and request them to forcefully present to the Commonwealth Government the South Australian case for the use of concrete sleepers on Commonwealth railway construction in this State? On July 19, when I asked the Premier whether his Government was concerned about this matter, he said that he and the industry had submitted, or were submitting, a case to the Commonwealth Government. Since then I have not seen a public announcement about this matter. I understand, from information supplied to me, that the initial construction of the railway to Alice Springs is much closer than some people believe, in which case this question could be considered as urgent to the industry here. In support of my question, I shall not repeat the statement that it is a multi-million dollar industry for South Australia, when those involved in technical aspects maintain that it is not employment in South Australia that is most important (important though that may be). It is considered that concrete sleepers will provide a much more satisfying permanent way than will timber sleepers. Because of the political consequences and the apparent representations that are being made on behalf of political interests in Western Australia, will the Premier assemble the South Australian Senators in one force in order to support the case that he and the industry have placed before the Commonwealth Government in Canberra?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find this an interesting suggestion, and if the honourable member will assist me by using such influence as he has in the Liberal Party—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If he has any!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:—and have the Liberal Senators meet with me, I shall be pleased to arrange for the Labor Senators to meet with me.

Mr. Hall: I am sure they would meet with you if you invited them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should hope that is so. I have not been able to obtain

this kind of support before but, if the honourable member and his colleagues and friends will assist me, I hope that we may be able to manage something. Together with the industry, I have made representations to Canberra. A full case has been sent to Canberra on this matter, and I have made the representations that the industry thought I should make. However, if anything further can be achieved by political influence in the Senate, I shall be glad to try that, too. I will send out invitations to the Senators to meet with me on the subject, in order to present a full case, which has been assembled by the industry in South Australia, and I will welcome the honourable member's assistance.

RURAL SECONDARY SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education say how many rural secondary scholarships, with less than the upper limits, were granted in 1972? In reply to my question last week about rural secondary scholarships, the Minister said that 416 applications had been received in 1972: of this number of applicants 226 were awarded scholarships and 14 applications were rejected because of the means test. He said that the number of applications were rejected because of the means test did not indicate the number of applicants who, because of the means test, might have received less than the upper limit of scholarship benefits that could be received.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me this morning that he wanted additional information, I can supply it now. Regarding the scholarships that have been issued, 142 scholarship holders received full benefit, that is, the full \$370, and 85 received less than the full benefit. If the honourable member adds the two figures, he will obtain a total of 227, which is one more than the number given by me last week. That discrepancy arises because an additional scholarship has been awarded since the honourable member asked the question.

SCHOOL FIRES

Mr. SIMMONS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the protection of schools against fires?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Education Department, in conjunction with the Public Buildings Department, is already testing a burglar-fire alarm system, but for reasons of security the test schools may not be named. The Computergard system will be examined

at the same time, but a decision is unlikely to be made for several months as to the benefit to be derived compared with cost outlay.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question concerning the m.v. *Troubridge*?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I told the honourable member on August 9, 1972, road transport on the West Coast, or anywhere else in the State, is not subject to Government control. The honourable member will recall that I had much difficulty in understanding him in this House.

Mr. Gunn: Only because your own members were interjecting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It appears from reading the question of the honourable member that he is afraid that this Government may reintroduce transport controls, which formerly applied in this State under successive Liberal Governments and which are rigidly applied in the Eastern States by Liberal Government. Prior to the State election in 1970 the present Premier publicly stated that a Labor Government would apply an open-road policy and this policy has been followed. However, the honourable member may be interested to know that a large section of those involved in road transport have suggested that the current policy is not in the best interests of either the State or road transport. Regarding the forcing of people to use the *Troubridge* service, as implied by the honourable member, I assure him that when the general public realize the improvement that has occurred in the general transport pattern to Port Lincoln (following this Government's far-sighted move to restore that service, which was discontinued by private enterprise) the people will voluntarily use the service. In fact, I expect that, despite his prejudice, the honourable member may well use the service himself.

SCHOOL RESIDENCES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning school residences?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My officers agree with me that the headmaster of a school and his family should no longer be considered as part of the school all day and every day, and therefore most residences are now being built away from schools as this is generally the wish of teachers also. However, in some cases there are special circumstances that

require the building of a residence on the schoolgrounds. As far as Crystal Brook is concerned, the available school area is not large, and as no sites were procurable near the school, a site was purchased from the Housing Trust on the opposite side of the town. This has been done in many other country areas. The headmaster is fully aware of the circumstances and accepts the site for the proposed new residence.

PORT LINCOLN BERTH

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Marine say whether the Marine and Harbors Department has investigated the jetty and maintenance requirements for the fishing fleet at Port Lincoln and considered the feasibility of constructing additional facilities near the Government slipway at Porter Bay? Last week, during the debate on the Loan Estimates, I sought information from the Minister who misunderstood me and said he thought I was playing politics. I assure him that I was not: my question was prompted by a genuine concern, and I am sure that, on reflection, the Minister will realize that. I last raised this question on March 22, when the Minister told me that, on the completion of the present wharf extensions, berths 1 and 2 would be made available for fishing vessels. The Minister also said that the Government was not willing to spend large sums on the provision of temporary facilities, and I accept that, although I am naturally disappointed. However, over the weekend I have heard that the latest departmental thinking is to use the present bulk berth, which will become redundant when the current extensions are completed; yet wave shields have been fitted and the area behind this can be used for bow and stern berthing of vessels in calm water. There are over 100 fishing vessels in Port Lincoln. The slip can take two to three small vessels or one or two larger vessels only and, because of the limited space, there is obvious difficulty in carrying out work. There is a need for a traverse slip on which boats can be repaired over a long period.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting and expressing his view. He was granted leave only to explain his question as far as necessary, but he has gone beyond that boundary. The Minister of Works.

Mr. CARNIE: I am expressing not my views, but the views expressed to me by fishermen.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has to comply with the Standing Orders. The member must frame his question in accordance with Standing Orders. He is now out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member should be aware that, in addition to the representations he has made to me, I met a deputation of fishermen's representatives and, following that deputation, I sent the Chief Engineer (Mr. O'Malley) to Port Lincoln to have on-site discussions with the people concerned. I know nothing of the report to which the honourable member has referred concerning wave shields, but I shall be happy to check up with the Chief Engineer regarding the latest situation which, as far as I am aware, has not changed. I did read a report in either the *Port Lincoln Times* or the *Sunday Mail*, in which reference was made to the lack of these facilities.

BEDFORD PARK COLLEGE

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Education inquire whether the grounds at the Bedford Park Teachers College are adequate in size and quality? I have received the following letter from Mr. Alan Lewis, who is apparently the Secretary of the General Student Committee Incorporated:

The position of the college grounds has been, for various reasons, deteriorating in both extent and quality, and we wish to express our deep concern over this state of affairs. We understand that Laffers land is available for use, and the G.S.C. wishes to know the Government's intended use for this land.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: True, the grounds at Bedford Park Teachers College have been reduced in size, largely as a result of the depredations of my colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport, who has acquired a certain part of that land for road-widening purposes. The question of the use of Laffer's land is currently being considered; it involves a complicated series of negotiations. At this stage I would simply say that the interests of the Bedford Park Teachers College are certainly being borne in mind. I think we can ensure that, one way or another, a suitable playing area for the college will be obtained.

STUDENT CONCESSIONS

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport give instructions that the South Australian Railways allow monthly student concession tickets to Adelaide University students in future during the second-term vacation? Representations have been made to me as a result of the university's refusal, until

recently, to issue certificates on students' applications for monthly concession fares for the current month. I understand that this was at the behest of the South Australian Railways. I am told that it was done because the second-term vacation this year, for the first time, covers four weeks. I am informed that daily concessions can still be obtained as well as a quarterly concession covering this period. Moreover, students can obtain about the same percentage of concession if they wish to travel to Cairns on holiday instead of to Adelaide for study. Will the Minister ask the department to consider the changed nature of university schedules and to avoid penalizing those students who wish to travel to the university for study and examinations during the vacation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be happy to have a look at the problem that the honourable member has raised. My attention has previously been drawn to the matter. Certainly an anomaly has been discovered. My understanding of the situation is that the alteration with regard to the issue of tickets was made not because of a four-week vacation period but because of the date of the vacation period, as the whole of the month was involved. I understand that this is the first time that that has occurred. Usually, the vacation period falls so that there is a substantial portion of lecture time in each month. Remembering that these tickets are issued so that students can attend lessons, the decision not to issue them is in accordance with the existing regulations. However, as I think there is an anomaly, I shall certainly be happy to have a look at the matter and to see whether the problem can be solved in the future.

OIL SEED

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether the Industrial Development Branch has considered or reported on the establishment of an oil-seed factory in this State? In the present agricultural situation, oil-seed rape is one of the crops suggested as being useful to diversify production. If the seed so produced has to leave the State for treatment in secondary industry, there is some loss to the State. Therefore, I suggest that there are advantages in establishing an oil-seed factory locally.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I know of no firm proposal, I understand that there has been some discussion about the possibility of such a factory being established. I will get a report for the honourable member.

CHILD-MINDING CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of July 19 about the proposal to establish a child-minding centre at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The board of management has further investigated the possibility of operating a creche at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, including the investigation of the method of operation of the creche at the Alfred Hospital in Melbourne. After careful consideration, it has been decided not to establish a creche at this stage, because the staffing situation in the nursing service is at present quite satisfactory and recruitment is at a high level.

OFF-SHORE LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have a supplementary question.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He has two a day as a rule.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham should be given the courtesy of being able to put his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say when he communicated with Mr. Whitlam and whether his communication has had any effect on Mr. Whitlam's view of the territorial sea and continental shelf legislation? In his previous reply, the Premier said that he had already communicated with Mr. Whitlam on this matter. I draw his attention to the fact that according to a part of the report in this morning's newspaper there has been, on Mr. Whitlam's assertion, no communication between the two.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham realizes that neither the Premier nor any other Minister is responsible for newspaper assertions. If the honourable member wants to ask a question, he can ask it, but it is wrong to quote from newspapers and to ask for those quotations to be explained. This Chamber is the place where members get their information.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can only assume that communication was made this morning and that therefore the Premier will have more to tell us than has already been made public. I therefore ask him when he communicated with Mr. Whitlam and whether he has had any effect on Mr. Whitlam's thinking on the matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I communicated with Mr. Whitlam some time ago, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Millhouse: He does not seem to remember.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps the honourable member should discuss that with Mr. Whitlam. Why does he not do his own checking on this subject? The South Australian Government's views have been communicated to Mr. Whitlam over a period. Whether or not Mr. Whitlam has had any change in his views has certainly not been communicated to me.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Education tell the House anything about the proposed new course of religious instruction for State schools? As I am interested in and have had discussions with some church leaders about this subject, I was interested to learn that the Minister had set up a committee of church leaders to investigate the matter. I should like the Minister to elaborate on his proposal for the future of religious instruction in State schools.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I wrote to the heads of churches asking them to consider appointing representatives to a special committee to draw up an agreed scheme for a new system of religious instruction. The heads of churches had many meetings and it was agreed that there would be no point in participating on such a committee and doing a tremendous amount of work if there was not a real chance of obtaining a substantial measure of agreement. I understand that, with the agreement to appoint five representatives of the churches to the committee, a substantial measure of agreement has been reached. The committee will comprise, under the chairmanship of the Assistant Director-General of Education (Mr. Steinle) representatives from the churches, the Institute of Teachers and the teachers' colleges together with a representative from the South Australian State Schools Association, and it will be charged with the responsibility of evolving a scheme, including recommendations that must be made regarding amendments to the Education Act. When that has been done, final agreement will have to be reached between me and the heads of the churches before any new scheme is introduced.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry give any further information about flammable clothing? I have asked similar questions many times, as have other members, and as recently as July 26, in reply

to a question from the member for Glenelg, the Minister said (and I recognize that there are difficulties in the setting of such standards):

A committee of the Standards Association has prepared a draft standard, parts of which are quite technical. In accordance with normal practice the standard has been circulated for comment and this committee is to meet this week to consider the comment received. Can the Minister say what is the latest position regarding this very contentious subject?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am sorry that I can give no further report to the House about this matter. The committee was to meet either last week or this week, and I understand it is compiling a report. Until I receive the report I am unable to give any information to the House, because the Standards Association is having trouble in Australia on reaching agreement, as are standards associations throughout the world, I understand.

CHOWILLA FERRY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the Chowilla ferry?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Chowilla ferry is at present submerged, but arrangements are now in hand to pull the ferry from the water. Work is commencing this week. Further consideration will be given to the future of the vessel when it has been examined after salvage.

GLADSTONE POLICE STATION

Mr. VENNING: In the temporary absence of the Attorney-General, can the Minister of Roads and Transport give me the Chief Secretary's reply to my recent question concerning the Gladstone police station?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Chief Secretary states that the contractor undertook to commence construction of the Gladstone police station and courthouse during the week commencing August 14, so it started yesterday. He expects to achieve completion within 40 weeks, that is in May, 1973. Presumably the honourable member did not go near Gladstone yesterday: if he had done so, he would have seen it for himself.

LAMEROO SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the Lamerloo Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not expected that there will be a significant change in the dates for the new Lamerloo Area School buildings. Tenders for the mechanical engineer-

ing services in the new school were called on August 7, 1972, and will close on September 1, 1972. Electrical services that are to be installed are being checked at present, and tenders are due to be called in the last week of August. Tenders for the main building will be called in late September or in the first week in October, 1972. The reason for the month's delay in calling tenders for the main building is that, in the process of redesigning the school to effect a reduction in costs, it was found as late as June last that the structural plans that had been prepared earlier could not be used and that in many areas a new approach was necessary. I assure the honourable member that they are proceeding with this work with all possible haste.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister say whether the school council knows of further changes in the structural plan? If it does not, will the Minister provide me with more details of the structural plans and the changes and say why these changes or new approaches in many areas have been found necessary?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand that this is a technical matter relating to the working drawings. The honourable member will appreciate that the drawings have been prepared previously, and tenders were called. I do not think there have been any further modifications to any of the proposed areas of the school. As it is a technical matter, there is no need to do as the honourable member suggests. However, I will try to obtain a reply for the honourable member tomorrow, if I can.

MURRAY NEW TOWN

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Premier assure me that the Government will make known as soon as possible the site for the proposed Murray New Town? I have been told by the manager of a machinery firm (I have no doubt there could be several other machinery firms in a similar predicament) that four orders for implements have been cancelled because of the belief that the purchasers' properties may be in the area set aside for the new town. Also, a building contractor has said that he had quoted prices for jobs which would have been accepted had not the owners of the land believed that they might be in the area for the proposed new town. The commercial life of Murray Bridge is being affected because the site for the new town is unknown.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will certainly do as the honourable member has requested.

PETROL SHORTAGE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 10 concerning service station rentals payable during the petrol shortage?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter of relief from rent for petrol resellers during the period of the fuel crisis and the subsequent rationing of supplies was raised by the permanent head of the Department of the Premier and of Development with representatives of the oil companies. The South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce has also made representations to the eight oil companies, requesting that petrol retailers in company-owned outlets not be required to pay rent during August. The Government does not intend to consider the matter further until the results of these representations are known.

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the release of certain towns from the petrol permit regulations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No separate instructions were given regarding Lyndhurst, Copley or Leigh Creek. The *Mobil Australis* began discharging petrol at Port Pirie yesterday, and supplies will be delivered progressively throughout the North.

Mr. BECKER: In view of the effect of the recent oil strike in this State, I ask the Premier whether the Government will consider establishing a fuel storage depot near the metropolitan area. I understand that the ban on petrol sales in the State during the past week was imposed in order to maintain reserves to meet the needs of essential services. Would it not be more practicable for the State to encourage the building of a storage depot close to the metropolitan area that would hold sufficient supplies for essential services in future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think it highly improbable that we should spend money of that kind when storages at Birkenhead are sufficient to store more than is necessary for essential services. However, I will put the matter to the committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When were the forms, used as permits pursuant to the Liquid Fuel (Rationing) Act, printed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: : The first of the forms were printed on Monday, July 31, 1972; further forms were printed as required on various days between August 1 and August 10, 1972.

GUMERACHA POLICE RESIDENCE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the absence of the Attorney-General, has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about work on the Gumeracha police station and courthouse premises?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: General painting and repairs at the Gumeracha police and court premises are programmed to be undertaken early this financial year. It is intended to arrange for the work by private offer. Subject to satisfactory response, work is expected to commence in from six to eight weeks.

ROAD TAX

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain how many inspectors are employed to collect the road maintenance tax and the estimated cost of collecting and policing this tax?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will do that.

OIL REFINERIES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier say whether the Government has approached the oil companies or whether encouragement regarding the establishment of a second oil refinery in South Australia has been considered? Having regard to the effect of the recent oil strike in South Australia, I should like to know whether the establishment of a second oil refinery at, say, Port Augusta to serve the Upper North and West Coast areas of South Australia, as well as Broken Hill and Alice Springs, has been considered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS: In view of our dependence on one inadequate oil refinery, will the Premier investigate the possibility of setting up another refinery in South Australia, possibly in the Port Pirie area, and will he include in that investigation the feasibility of a joint enterprise between the State Government and the Soviet Union in the financing, building, feeding and operation of the refinery? A report in *Nation Review* of Saturday, August 5, indicated that because of enormous increases in oil production the Soviet Union now provides about one-sixth of the world supply and that in recent times Soviet oil contracts to customer nations have been singularly generous. For example, Soviet crude is being made available to the Italian state monopoly, E.N.I.T., at about 40 per cent of the world price, while Japan has negotiated for supplies of oil from Nakhodka, near Vladivostok. Because of the know-how of the Russians in oil refining and their desire to

obtain markets for their oil, could the Government investigate the possibility of developing this additional source of oil and refining capacity to make this State less dependent on American oil interests which, according to some reports, are holding this nation to ransom, and at the same time make more efficient use of our local supplies in the North-East of the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, major interest in the development of a second refinery has been in relation to our own supplies of crude oil. However, I will take up the honourable member's suggestion.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT RUBBISH

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently regarding Highways Department rubbish in Rosedale Avenue, Warradale?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: About 40,000 cub. yds. of surplus material (not rubbish) is to be excavated during the construction of Drain 6 of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, and this material is to be stockpiled at the 7¼-acre property in Rosedale Avenue, Warradale. All this material, and more, will be used in the embankment of the Ascot Park rail-road grade separation structure, which is due to commence in the 1973-74 financial year. Such stockpiling will produce a twofold reduction in costs, first by reducing the lead for the dumping of surplus material, and, secondly, by providing material for the embankment at the cost of cartage only.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier make adequate provision in his forthcoming Budget for renovations at the Henley and Grange community Olympic pool? This pool caters for many people in the community and I understand that last year 45,000 adults and children used it. There are 325 persons in the Henley and Grange Swimming Club, and this is the only Olympic pool in the western suburbs, and, I understand, the only salt water pool in the metropolitan area. I understand that construction of a pool of this size would cost about \$300,000, whereas the cost of renovations would be only a fraction of the cost of a new pool. As a constituent and an interested resident of that area, I ask the Premier the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for the district has already taken up this matter with the Government, but the honourable member doubtless would recollect that there is no

scheme in the present provisions for Government assistance for swimming pools that would allow for renovation of this pool. I will examine that matter to find out what we can do, at the behest of the local member.

COOBER PEDY TENURES

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, say whether the Government has considered altering the land title system at Coober Pedy? At present occupiers hold the land on which they have built their houses or business premises on an annual licence basis, and these licences can be terminated on one month's notice. As the Government is contemplating establishing local government in areas such as Coober Pedy, has it considered making blocks of land available on a freehold basis?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the question with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member. The honourable member would know that, when I was Minister of Lands in the previous Labor Government, we established the system of annual licence. Before then, the occupiers had no tenure at all. The difficulty in Coober Pedy then was (and, I understand, still is) in properly surveying the land, and there was the matter of considering establishing a new township farther away that would be properly laid out. However, I will check with my colleague and let the honourable member know the position.

NURSES MEMORIAL CENTRE

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 10 regarding the nurses memorial centre?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Discussion had taken place with me originally, and there have been subsequent discussions between the committee and the Deputy Director of Planning. Arrangements have been made for representatives of the committee to meet me for further consultation on Thursday, August 31.

VAUGHAN HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the continued absence of the Minister of Community Welfare, I address—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call, and I want to see whether he is in order. I cannot hear what is being said.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I had better start at the beginning again, Mr. Speaker. In the continued absence of the Minister of Community Welfare, I address this question to the Minister of Works, as the most appropriate Minister. Can the Minister now give to the House the report of the Director of Community Welfare concerning the situation at Vaughan House? The Minister may recall that last Thursday, in the absence of the Minister of Community Welfare, I asked him two questions on this matter. The Minister then said that he had inquired on Thursday morning and that the Director was preparing a report, which would be available to the Minister of Community Welfare on the following day. I subsequently drew the Minister's attention to a contradictory statement by the Minister of Community Welfare himself, published—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I now draw the Minister's attention to a report in the *Advertiser* on the following day (Friday), headed "Windana Staff Concerned at Attacks by Inmates". The previous report related to the position at Vaughan House. I therefore ask the Minister of Works whether he has the report. If he has not, will he arrange for the report to be made available as soon as possible, preferably tomorrow, and will he also arrange for members, including me, to visit the institutions to see the position for ourselves?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Last Thursday I told the honourable member that I had inquired of the Director, who said he would be reporting to his Minister on his return the next day. At no time did I say he was making a written report. I said he would be reporting—

Mr. Millhouse: You said he was preparing a report.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At no time did I say he was making a written report to his Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: You said he was preparing a report.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is the situation. No doubt the Director did report to his Minister the next day when the Minister returned from Canberra. It is as simple as that. I do not know what the honourable member expects me to do—whether he expects me to run up to the department to see whether a written report was made. As the honourable

member knows, it is not unusual for a Director to give a verbal report.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister who is at present representing the Minister of Community Welfare ask that Minister to arrange for members to visit Vaughan House and Windana Remand Home in order to discuss with members of the staff the situation at those institutions following recent newspaper reports? In explaining my question to the Minister of Works I made this suggestion, but the Minister ignored it in his reply. As we have not had a report on what is a controversial matter in the community, I ask this question as an alternative method of getting information.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

PROSPECT INTERSECTION

Mr. COUMBE: I wish to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport a question, a reply to which he gave me some time ago but on which I desire further information. Has the Minister further information on the position concerning the busy and dangerous intersection of Main North Road and Regency Road, Prospect? Does he recall that last session he gave me a reply, which confused me nearly as much as it confused the Minister when he gave it to me—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Cut it out.

Mr. COUMBE: —and he admitted this. I point out that three corners of this intersection have now been rounded off, and a large hotel (the Northern Hotel) is on one corner. Can the Minister say whether any plans have now been finalized for improving this intersection, or what future plans his department may have in this regard?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report.

HOSPITAL BOARDS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport, in the absence of the Attorney-General, a reply to my recent question about hospital boards?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For some time the Government has considered that a change in constitution of the boards of management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital would be desirable. It is known that the Director-General of Medical Services, who under the provisions of the Hospitals Act is *ex-officio* the Chairman of the Board of Management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital,

has expressed the opinion that it is inappropriate for him to retain the position of Chairman, and that reconstitution of both boards should take place as soon as possible after the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Health Services in South Australia, headed by His Honour Mr. Justice Bright, has been received. A major revision of the Hospitals Act is likely to be proposed after the Government has had the opportunity of studying the committee's report, and such a revision would almost certainly include recommended changes in the constitution of hospital boards. It will be appreciated that the Government is reluctant to recommend any present changes in the constitution of the boards of management of the two larger teaching hospitals in isolation from possible recommendations from the Bright Committee which could affect the organization and management of all hospital services throughout the State.

SWIMMING POOL DEVICE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Local Government arrange a meeting with council representatives and other interested bodies to witness a demonstration of an invention that can be used to alert householders or neighbours when a child falls into a swimming pool? Members of the community in general are concerned about the number of tragedies occurring each year as a result of children drowning in private swimming pools. A constituent of mine has invented a device, which would cost less than \$100 to install and which seems to have the capacity to help solve this problem. The device is quite small and, at a demonstration I witnessed this morning, it appeared effective. It is operated by a transducer being placed about 3ft. below the surface of the water in the pool. When an object of reasonable density enters the water, the transducer transfers the water movement into alternating electric current of micro voltage, which is conducted by coaxial cable to an alarm inside or outside the home. More than one alarm can be used. Wind waves do not activate the mechanism, but heavy footsteps, similar to those of a child running around a pool, will activate it. The inventor, for personal reasons, does not wish to have his name made public at this stage, and has no financial resources to take a chance on spending money on further development; but, if in the opinion of experts the invention is worth developing, this could be arranged. The opinions of the bodies directly concerned with child deaths that occur by drowning would help greatly regarding what-

ever further action is considered necessary. I ask the Minister whether he will help to arrange such a meeting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: First, I think the device would have to be examined by experts in order to determine its potential value. The problem I foresee regarding the honourable member's proposal is that the Government might be involved in promoting private enterprise in a specific area, and I think this matter would have to be considered carefully. However, if the honourable member provides me with sufficient information on the matter, I shall be happy to have it investigated.

RAPE SEED

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about rape seed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the guaranteed price for rape seed in Adelaide for the 1972-73 season has been fixed at \$94.50 a ton for low erucic acid varieties and \$90.42 for other varieties. Growers will face a freight charge of about \$14 a ton if the seed is shipped to Melbourne for processing.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when the Government will make a decision about adopting daylight saving again in this State?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The matter is being considered and, as I have said, when the decision is made I will inform the honourable member as early as possible, in order to ensure that people generally are aware of the Government's intentions.

LOXTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about repaving the yard at Loxton High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Following an inspection of the Loxton High School grounds early this year, it was intended to undertake paving as part of a contract for an effluent disposal system. This system is not yet ready for contract, and, therefore, it is intended to include the paving work as a variation to the group tender for the Loxton Research Centre, Morgan Primary School, Waikerie Primary School, and the Paringa police station that is expected to be let during this month.

THEBARTON SCHOOLS

Mr. SIMMONS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Thebarton Primary and Infants Schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In response to the honourable member's request, the Headmasters of the Cowandilla Demonstration School and the Flinders Park Primary School have been asked to carry out surveys of pupils at their schools who live within 500 m of the Thebarton Infants School. When the results are known, the several surveys will be submitted to me, and I will let the honourable member know the results.

JAMESTOWN ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what plans the Highways Department has to repair the Jamestown main road, Highway No. 40? This road, which carries much of the traffic in the northern part of the State, carries the bus that connects Jamestown to Riverton and to the railway line serving that area, and is significantly important to the area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain that information.

RAILWAY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about who are the members of the special investigating committee set up to consider various matters in the South Australian Railways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The members of the special investigating committee appointed to consider operations, efficiency, etc., in the South Australian Railways are as follows. The Chairman is Mr. I. J. Lees, B.Sc.(Hons.Eng.), F.S.A.I.T., M.I.C.E., M.I.E. Aust., Management Services Engineer in the Highways Department (who was formerly Investigating Engineer with the Public Service Board).

Mr. Hall: Government orientated?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The other members are Mr. D. C. Rodway, B.Ec.(Hons.) from the Premier's Secretariat, and Mr. H. C. Evans, B.Ec., Senior Auditor, Auditor-General's Department.

Mr. Hall: They are all Government servants?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Anything wrong with public servants?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The people most able to do this work are people within Government departments.

HOUSE INSURANCE

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on July 20 about house insurance by the State Bank?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The insurance arrangements made by the State Bank in connection with its housing loans are conducted with the minimum of administrative costs and paper work. As a consequence, the bank is able to set a schedule of premium rates which, in general, compare most favourably with the premium rates of commercial insurers, and at the same time make possible (because of very low administration costs) lending at a rate of interest to home owners lower than would otherwise apply. For new loans the bank is now operating on a 6 per cent a year interest rate for loans up to \$10,000. There are a few cases where a State Bank borrower may, because of special arrangements he or his credit union or his employer may be able to make with a non-tariff private insurance company, be able to secure insurance cover rather below State Bank rates, but with an overwhelming majority of borrowers this is not so. To permit those few who so desire to take their insurance elsewhere would simply not be practicable in the general interest. It would greatly increase the bank's costs of administration, and of ensuring not only that all securities are properly covered by insurance but also of ensuring that all insurable damage is properly made good in the interests of both the borrower and the bank.

In such cases most borrowers would be substantially worse off, in that the bank would not be able to continue to offer either such favourable premium rates or such favourable interest rates as at present. It is, therefore, unavoidable that the occasional borrower who may be able to get these especially privileged insurances will have to forgo that rather minor privilege if he wants the greater privileges attaching to the low-interest long-term high-ratio housing loans of the State Bank. So far as cover is concerned, the bank endeavours to see that this is for full reasonable values. By effluxion of time, some covers become out of date with rising values, but the bank is prepared and willing to arrange increases to full cover, though naturally not to an excessive figure.

Recently, there have been occasional problems arising because of alterations in the boundaries in insurance areas for rate determination purposes by the private tariff companies, as the suburbs have extended and as the ambit of coverage is varied. For instance, in some areas previously classed as rural the tariff companies have recently reclassified the

areas to require lower rates and, accordingly, the State Bank premium in an occasional case may, pending review, be rather less favourable. This circumstance may apply to the case of the home referred to, but which cannot be specifically identified. The bank is proceeding as quickly as possible to review its area classifications and its specific coverages to rectify any occasional anomaly, though with some 24,000 cases this is a rather massive job. If the honourable member would like to supply the bank with the name and location of the borrower cited, further investigation of the particular case will be made, to ensure that no error has occurred.

SUICIDES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many suicides occurred in South Australia during the year ended June 30, 1972?

2. What were the ages of these persons?

3. How do these figures compare with the previous three financial years?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. There were 140 suicides in South Australia during the year ended June 30, 1972.

2.	Under 20.....	No. 17
	20 to 30.....	20
	30 to 40.....	21
	40 to 50.....	27
	50 to 60.....	29
	60 to 70.....	14
	70 to 80.....	9
	80 to 90.....	3
		140
3.	1968-69.....	142
	1969-70.....	163
	1970-71.....	130

The honourable member can note a decline in the suicide rate under a Labor Government. Suicide is very often imitative. It has been noticed that, on the few occasions that the press gives publicity to a suicide, invariably in the ensuing few weeks the number of suicides, by the method reported in the press, increases dramatically. For this reason it is not the practice to hold inquests into suicide deaths, or to release information on such deaths to the press.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Is it the intention of the Minister of Works to inform Parliament of the contents of the report of an independent consultant on the new Government Printing Office?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The report of the independent consultant was made to the Director of the Public Buildings Department. Subsequently, the Director reported to me and his report contains comments of all the consultant's findings. I am willing to make available to the honourable member a copy of the Director's report to me.

CITRUS JUICE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has a survey been undertaken to assess what volume of citrus juice would be required to provide a substitute for children who are unable to drink milk?

2. Has any estimate been made of the cost to the State in providing this volume of juice to children concerned?

3. When was the Commonwealth Government last approached by this State to subsidize citrus drinks for schools?

4. What reply was then received?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. *Vide* No. 1.

3. November, 1970.

4. No. There is no provision in the Commonwealth Act for the provision of fruit juices as an alternative to milk.

NORTH-WEST RESERVE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What is the total area of the North-West Aboriginal Reserve?

2. What plans has the Government to develop this reserve?

3. Is this reserve suitable for cattle raising?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The area is 27,620 square miles, of which 1,485 square miles on the eastern boundary is leased to Ernabella Mission.

2. There are no immediate plans for the development of the reserve. Much research has been carried out, but plans for development are still being formulated. The final say in the implementation of any enterprises of course rests with the Aboriginal communities in the area.

3. The northern one-fifth of the reserve is considered to be suitable for cattle raising. This is the area that is contiguous with the Musgrave, Mann and Tomkinson Ranges. The remainder consists mostly of the Great Victoria Desert, inhospitable sandhill country consisting mainly of mulga, mallee scrub and spinifex grass, and would not be suitable for cattle

raising. The introduction of a cattle industry would depend on the availability of water supplies. Serious consideration would also need to be given to the long-term environmental effect of raising cattle in this area. There is at present approximately 850 head of cattle on the reserve, enough to meet the food needs of the inhabitants.

MARALINGA

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Has the Government made any further approach to the Commonwealth for the use of the Maralinga area?

2. Has any offer been made by the Commonwealth Government to make this site available for the use of the Aboriginal people of this State?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Negotiations are in hand with regard to the future use of the Maralinga area.

2. The South Australian Government has made an approach to the Commonwealth Government to have the Maralinga area made available for Aboriginal purposes. The Commonwealth Government has indicated its willingness to accede to this request upon certain conditions which are at present subject to consideration and negotiation.

ELECTORAL ENROLMENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the cost so far of the campaign to enrol those aged between 18 and 21 years on the State electoral roll?

2. What is the estimated total cost of the campaign?

3. How long will the campaign last?

4. How many enrolments of such persons have there been to date, district by district?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The cost of advertising so far is as follows:

	\$
Press.....	3,706.40
Radio.....	2,676.00
Agency service fee.....	319.12
	<hr/>
	\$6,701.52

2. The estimated total cost of the campaign is \$7,585.62.

3. The campaign will last until the end of August, 1972.

4. The enrolment to date of 18-year-old to 20-year-old persons is shown as follows:

ENROLMENT OF 18-YEAR-OLD TO 20-YEAR-OLD PERSONS AS HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ELECTORS SINCE JUNE 30, 1972

House of Assembly District	Total
Adelaide.....	153
Albert Park.....	155
Florey.....	195
Gilles.....	135
Hanson.....	189
Henley Beach.....	141
Peake.....	144
Price.....	130
Ross Smith.....	186
Semaphore.....	140
Spence.....	130
Torrens.....	210
Ascot Park.....	185
Bragg.....	122
Brighton.....	196
Coles.....	170
Davenport.....	185
Glenelg.....	178
Mitcham.....	152
Mitchell.....	168
Norwood.....	171
Unley.....	127
Alexandra.....	101
Fisher.....	164
Heysen.....	109
Mallee.....	75
Mawson.....	140
Millicent.....	79
Mount Gambier.....	98
Murray.....	90
Victoria.....	70
Elizabeth.....	145
Gouger.....	87
Goyder.....	106
Kavel.....	95
Light.....	94
Playford.....	159
Salisbury.....	102
Tea Tree Gully.....	131
Chaffey.....	49
Eyre.....	63
Flinders.....	84
Frome.....	86
Pirie.....	58
Rocky River.....	102
Stuart.....	73
Whyalla.....	103
Total.....	6,025

DUNCAN INQUIRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government propose to offer rewards in connection with recent murders apart from that of Dr. Duncan?

2. If so—

- (a) in connection with which murders;
- (b) when will such rewards be offered; and
- (c) how much will be offered as a reward in each case?

3. If not—

- (a) why has a reward been offered in the case of Dr. Duncan?

- (b) what makes that case different from other cases?

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

1. No.
2. See answer to No. 1.
3. (a) Because the circumstances associated with the case of Dr. Duncan were such as to cause the Criminal Investigation Branch, the Homicide Squad, and the Commissioner of Police to consider it desirable that a reward be offered. (b) The particular circumstances of all cases differ and police officials have not deemed it necessary to recommend the offer of a reward in other cases outstanding at the present time.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What increase in cost has occurred in respect of the Festival Centre project in the 12-month period to June 30, 1972?
2. What is the completion date and is this subject to alteration?
3. What arrangements has the Government made for an official opening?

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

1. The total increase in cost during the period was \$358,672, of which \$343,572 was due to rise in costs for labour or materials and \$15,100 to extensions of time.
2. The original date for practical completion was August 25, 1972. The adjusted date for practical completion is November 17, 1972. It is expected that the theatre will be completed by Christmas, 1972, and that the opening performance will therefore be able to take place during the first half of 1973, after the necessary period of testing and tuning.
3. It is for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to make arrangements for the opening and to choose the time for the announcement of those arrangements.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1973.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That I have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to apply, out of the General Revenue, a further sum of \$60,000,000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending June 30, 1973.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wish to refer to a matter of considerable importance to my constituents in the watershed area of the Adelaide Hills and the area north of the Hills. After by-laws under the Waterworks Act had been proclaimed on February 9 last year, I moved the disallowance of those by-laws. I was supported by the member for Fisher and the member for Heysen, but the House did not see fit, on that occasion, to disallow the by-laws. Subsequent representations have been made to me and, about three weeks ago, I was present at a Williamstown meeting attended by about 200 primary producers from the surrounding area and by representatives from other Hills areas, who were greatly concerned about the working of these by-laws and about their future as primary producers in water catchment areas.

All members are aware of the sweeping nature of these by-laws. These changes encompass things which primary producers have taken for granted since their land was first settled, but which can no longer be taken for granted. It has been accepted in the primary industry for many years that a feature of this industry is that the man on the land has the ability to diversify and keep his property productive. These by-laws, however, deny a freehold primary producer the right to diversify his production. In this respect his ability to increase profitability will be restricted.

The zone 1 by-laws are particularly restrictive. One feature about them is that there is no right of appeal against their provisions. It is also disturbing to see that, if a producer engages in activities of the type that it has been considered his right to engage in ever since the country was first settled, he will be guilty of an offence, and he has no right of appeal. All members must realize that this will restrict a producer's ability to operate his property and to keep it working profitably. Now his property will be downgraded and, if it becomes unprofitable, he will find it difficult to sell. When we dealt with water supply legislation in this House last year, the Minister clearly stated that the Government would not consider paying compensation in such cases. These people are being denied the fundamental rights that have been enjoyed with regard to this land since 1836. They are being denied the right to farm the properties as they see fit. If they seek to farm their properties other than

as is prescribed in the by-laws, they will be guilty of an offence.

The same general provisions apply with regard to zone 2. The only ameliorating condition here is that, if a farmer wishes to engage in any diversification in production, he must apply to the Minister in writing. The Minister may, without reason, refuse permission for him to engage in these activities. I remind members of the provisions of these by-laws. By-law 54 (a) provides:

No person shall erect, construct, enlarge or establish a cowshed or cowyard, a poultry shed or poultry yard or a stable or stockyard on any land within a watershed zone 1.

There is no appeal against this by-law, and no provision exists whereby cases can be considered on their merits. I know of many properties where the activities referred to in the by-law could be carried out and where there could be no conceivable contribution to the pollution of metropolitan watersheds. By-law 54 (c) provides:

The owner or occupier of any cowshed or cowyard, poultry shed or poultry yard, stable or stockyard—

and this includes sheepyards and cattleyards, holding pens and shearing sheds—

existing at the time these by-laws came into force shall be entitled to continue and maintain such cowshed or cowyard, poultry shed or poultry yard, stable or stockyard provided that it is not relocated elsewhere in a watershed zone 1, rebuilt, extended or materially modified. . . .

I think that we can see from these by-laws just how completely restricted will be the activities of a primary producer in zone 1. Along with a member of another place, I attended a meeting at Williamstown about three weeks ago where about 200 primary producers expressed their grave concern about these by-laws. Last week a primary producer in zone 2 told me that he wished to continue in primary production, passing on his property to his son, who was reaching an age where he had to think of his future. If he was to go on the property, he would have to leave school and return home to his father. The future of this property depends completely on the ability of the producer to change production. At present he is in the process of changing from sheep production to cattle production, enlarging his present cattle numbers. For this, additional feeding pens and so on will be required but, under these by-laws, this sort of activity will be restricted. He is worried not only about his own future but also about the future of his son whom he wishes to take over the property later.

Members will realize that the rights of these people that have been enjoyed since the State

was founded are being denied. Most citizens will agree with this. No-one denies that the metropolitan watershed must be protected, but I believe these by-laws are far too sweeping in their application. If it is deemed necessary to apply these blanket provisions, thus interfering with the freedom of producers to go about their everyday business in the way they see fit, I believe the Government has a moral obligation to consider paying some compensation in this regard. However, there is no suggestion that, if these people are disadvantaged to the extent that their properties do not remain in viable production, the Government will buy the properties. What will these people do? Obviously people will not be interested in buying properties that are unprofitable. Thus these producers will be faced with the situation of not being able to sell their property; not being able to diversify; not being able to make a profitable living from it; and not being eligible for compensation from the Government for their loss of profitability.

All fair-minded people must realize that this is a completely unsatisfactory and unfair situation for these producers. They are willing to accept their obligation with regard to the safety of metropolitan water supplies, but I think we are being unrealistic and completely unfair if we expect them to make the sort of sacrifice inherent in these by-laws. To expect them, for the sake of another section of the community, to be completely restricted in what they can do on their properties is a denial of their right to work the properties as they see fit—a right they have always enjoyed. If the Government believes that it is absolutely necessary to have these by-laws, I think it is incumbent on the Government to see that the properties are acquired or taken over so that these people are adequately compensated for their loss.

The position with regard to valuing these properties is not clear. At the Williamstown meeting, a representative of the Engineering and Water Supply Department explained the necessity of protecting the watersheds, and this is readily understandable. However, the reply to a question about why these people had no right of appeal was not so readily understandable. The position with regard to the downgrading of the value of these properties was not at all clear. The Chief Government Valuer was present at the meeting. He explained that the value of the properties would be the market value at any time. I find it abundantly clear that the value of these

properties will decline if they become unprofitable; not all that many people in the community are interested in buying unprofitable properties. There has been a tendency for so-called North Terrace farmers to take over properties as investments, but that is not the sort of thing that helps farmers. I believe that the members for Heysen and Fisher will support my remarks in defence of those who are being denied rights that they have enjoyed for generations. I have raised this urgent matter today because of the hardship it is causing to my constituents.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support what the honourable member has just said. Some effort has to be made in connection with protecting reservoirs, but I do not believe that these sweeping regulations are necessarily the answer. The Engineering and Water Supply Department admits that it does not know the source of the pollution, and it may take 10 years to discover the source. I believe that each case should be examined on its merits, and decisions should be made accordingly. When the previous Government was in office it introduced regulations providing for 20-acre subdivisions; I opposed those regulations, and I still do. Large tracts of country were cut up into 20-acre blocks, but that country should not have been treated in that way.

People living in the metropolitan area think of buying a 20-acre block and enjoying a different way of life, but they do not realize the work involved in keeping those 20 acres free of noxious weeds. There will be more pollution resulting from the 20-acre blocks than there would be if the country had been left as broad acres. No-one can make a living on 20 acres unless the land is used very intensively and, if it is used in that way, even more pollution will be created.

Over the years people have gone to townships such as Belair and Blackwood and have created a greater pollution problem than that created by animals. When reports are made that sewage is running down the creeks, the Government says, "We must do something about the pollution that has been created." It then decides to install an expensive sewerage scheme. Now, the Government has said that the activities of some landholders will be restricted. This is a rank injustice. Since the establishment of 20-acre subdivisions the valuations of properties have increased and, consequently, rates and taxes have increased. We must be realistic and just.

This afternoon the Minister of Labour and Industry eloquently answered a Dorothy Dix question on unemployment, but I point out that Western Australia and South Australia have the largest number of unemployed people. Actually, the three States governed by Labor Governments have greater unemployment than the other States have. This is a reflection of the way in which Labor Governments manage funds. Labor spokesmen have suggested that there will be greater unemployment if a Liberal Government is elected at the next election; such propaganda destroys confidence at a time when there is more money in the banks than ever before. When the present Premier was Leader of the Opposition he said that there would be 200,000 people unemployed within a short time.

Mr. BURDON: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can you say what is the relevance of Government finance to the motion before the House?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Treasurer has moved to introduce a Supply Bill. Under Standing Orders, on that motion being moved, members have the right to bring forward any matters of a grievance nature. I therefore cannot uphold the honourable member's point of order.

Mr. McANANEY: I have never yet suffered an injustice from you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while you have been in the Chair, and you know how I object to injustice. In the last year the State Government added an extra 27½ per cent to the taxation burden on the people of South Australia; such actions destroy the confidence of the people in the economy. When a previous Labor Government took office in 1965 it imposed a tremendous amount of taxation in its first six months of office, and in the following months we had growing unemployment in South Australia. That situation continued while that Government was in office. If a Government takes purchasing power out of the hands of the people, they lose confidence quickly.

Mr. Hopgood: You know who took purchasing power away.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member is giving his usual academic view and forgetting the realities of life. Much additional credit has been allowed last year. There has been much more money in the banks than previously, but people have lacked confidence, because of the Jeremiahs. When the honourable member is older, he will understand how important confidence is. I worked in a bank during the

depression days and I knew that people did not have the confidence to borrow the money available. They merely paid the interest on their overdrafts.

Mr. Hopgood: The banks didn't play a very constructive part in that crisis, as I recall.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member was not born then.

Mr. Clark: But he can read.

Mr. McANANEY: I emphasize that this matter affecting the Hills must be considered humanely and realistically. We can prevent pollution of the reservoirs without creating injustices.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not think any member of this House or anyone else in the community would disagree that we should try to keep our water quality as high as possible. However, an injustice occurs when we make a minority suffer financially for the sake of the majority, without offering compensation. The present Minister (and, probably, our Ministers had the same view) is not willing to provide a discretion, and that is how the injustice applies in the Hills catchment area. The Minister should have discretionary power about different places. In the past, Governments have changed the laws without considering the adverse effect.

Our society is so affluent that we can expect the majority to pay compensation, which a court can decide if there is a dispute, to those affected adversely. We must decide whether that compensation shall be related only to the aesthetic value of the land or whether we must consider that they have lost the right to use their land to make a living. A further point is that, because of the regulations, the land is devalued automatically because of lack of interest in it by other people in the community.

The regulation introduced in the period between 1968 and 1970 was unjust to the people in the Hills area. Provision was made for 600 square miles of the Hills to be cut up into 20-acre allotments. The population density in township areas would be greater, most blocks being one-quarter of an acre to one-half of an acre. If the total Hills area was cut up into 20-acre allotments, more than 1,000,000 people could live in the water catchment area. We should provide that outside the township areas there will be no subdivision, but we should offer to those who wish to obtain their living from land outside the township areas some compensation by Government grant or by complete

exemption from land tax if we do not allow land tax exemption throughout the whole State (which is the policy of my Party in relation to rural property). At the same time, we must ensure that people conform to the health regulations so as to preserve the water supply.

If a property owner decides to sell because he cannot continue to work the land, a person interested in developing the property may subdivide it into 20-acre allotments and get \$1,000 an acre or more for it. When the council is fixing a rate for the area, it first considers the value of land as shown by the most recent sales and it uses that basis in fixing a value for property adjoining property that has been subdivided. People in the Hills area are trying to obtain a living from primary production on land that government and semi-government authorities have valued at more than \$1,000 an acre.

This is an impossible position, except in some cases of intense cultivation, such as by florists, and in the case of big poultry farms. The Government will not consider paying compensation to these property owners and has not moved to introduce legislation. The same Government is willing to spend \$300,000 of the people's money to develop an eating house at Windy Point. At the same time, we hear the claim that no development should be visible from the city and that we should protect the hills face zone that overlooks the city.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The member for Mitcham has been asking for the development of Windy Point for years.

Mr. EVANS: That is no concern of mine. The attitude of people changes from day to day, as the Premier knows. He, particularly, was concerned with preserving the hills face zone. Now he is offering to spend money belonging to the people to develop an eating house, in competition with private enterprise in a sector that is struggling to survive. The Premier knows as well as I that hotel owners and restaurant owners in the city are having great difficulty in making ends meet, and the position will be worse when we tighten up on drinking drivers. The Premier also has made an announcement about a hotel in Victoria Square that the Government wishes to encourage. We will compete in the same field, although the Government may have had second thoughts for the better and perhaps it will not go on with that project. A proposal to develop an eating house in the hills face zone involves the misuse of public money. If it is desired to have a restaurant at Windy Point, people in

the private sector should have to lease the land for such a development. Why should we be gambling with the public's money in this way when there are so many other areas to consider?

And what will be the effect of this development on the local environment, especially when we bear in mind, for instance, that people in the Hills area must build a house behind a knoll so that it cannot be seen from the city? They must paint a house a special colour and plant trees around it, etc. We are intending to build a restaurant so that people can enjoy the view from Windy Point, yet this building will be clearly visible from the city, and it will be a large building if it is to cost about \$300,000. In the meantime, the Minister of Works knows that many of the houses in the Mitcham hills areas do not have sewerage facilities and that effluent is flowing down the streets. The Minister says that the sewerage cannot be provided because the money is not available, yet the Commonwealth Government has made more money available to this Government than has been granted to any other South Australian Government.

Although we are spending this large sum on an eating house, we cannot afford to protect the health of our community; we are apparently willing to see our children play about in the streets in green slime. It does not matter if children become diseased or stricken with gastro-enteritis. We are intending to cater for tourists, at the same time expecting our constituents to take second place.

The member for Mawson, who has studied the provision of sewerage facilities in his district, recently thanked the Minister of Works for what had been done in this regard. Does that mean that, because the majority of people in my district do not vote for the Australian Labor Party, they will be denied these facilities? The present position is totally unfair for people living in my district, as well as in other districts. I do not believe that Hills area dwellers object to people from the plains coming up into the area for picnics and general recreation purposes but, when the facilities of the national parks, for instance, are not up to the required standard and are a nuisance to neighbouring landholders, the complaints of those landholders are justified.

The member for Heysen often refers to noxious weeds. I admit that an attempt is being made in the Belair National Park to solve this problem, and the officers concerned deserve credit for that. But, in respect of railway land and certain other Government-

owned land, the attitude has been that, when the private landholder in the area clears his land of noxious weeds, the Government will clear its own land. If a Government, regardless of which Party is in power, cannot accept its responsibility in this regard and observe the laws of the land, what right does it have to tell a private landowner what to do? The present position is undemocratic and unjust.

One woman living on land adjoining Mount Barker Road, who is a widow and to whom the land in question was left, is having to pay about \$1,100 to have African daisy removed from her property, and she has a real problem in meeting this commitment. However, certain Government areas are infested with noxious weeds. The \$300,000 proposed for a restaurant at Windy Point would go a long way towards helping eradicate noxious weeds in the Adelaide Hills, for the benefit not only of people living in this State but also of tourists visiting from other States. The member for Glenelg refers at times to the cost incurred by seaside councils in providing recreation facilities, but those councils at least gain rate revenue as a result of flats and hotels built in their areas, whereas that is not the case in the Hills area, where people have to pay higher rates in order to maintain areas used largely by people living in and near the city.

Restrictions apply to subdividing land in the Hills area and, in addition, this involves many people who are in doubt about the route of the scenic road. Although this road is desirable and necessary, there are about three propositions concerning its route and, as people may not be able to build a house within 300ft. of the eventual route, many do not know what they can do regarding their land. The Minister of Works has said that he cannot say exactly where the Clarendon reservoir will be sited or when the necessary Loan funds will be available, but we must acknowledge that people living in the general area are in doubt about this matter and cannot sell their land at a satisfactory price.

They are forced either to stay where they are or to go to the Minister on bended knees and say, "How much will you give me for my land?" Unfortunately, because this matter has been in doubt for about three or four years, the value of the properties concerned has not appreciated, and people who have sold their land have received prices that have remained fairly constant for some time. They have not gained the benefit of inflationary trends that have occurred in other areas, and I believe that

matter should be considered. The Land Acquisition Act should be changed so that we may consider inflationary trends in relation to properties, which are to be acquired, up to the time they are acquired, so that the owners may claim compensation.

The matter could be decided by a court if there was disagreement. Also, we should consider the loss of interest on money. A person may have to move while waiting for the dispute with the department to be decided; he moves out, starts another property, and borrows money to develop his new property at an interest rate of 8 per cent or 9 per cent, although he is receiving only about 6 per cent from the Government as interest on the money in dispute. We have to change the Act quickly, because it affects not only people living in the Hills area but also others residing throughout the State, including the metropolitan area. Where a Government or semi-government activity interferes with the value of an individual's property to the benefit of the majority, the majority should pay, and the minority's rights and opportunities should be protected. I hope that members will accept that situation as being fair and democratic.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): My concern for the rights of the minority (and in many cases a small minority) makes me rise in this debate. I speak more specifically for a constituent at Lyrup who owns land adjacent to the Murray River and whose livelihood is not involved in viticulture or horticulture but in a small enterprise namely a piggery. This person has a small area of about 30 acres that he has operated as a piggery and, in conjunction with this, he has grown vegetables. He has a water licence to enable him to water seven acres, but unfortunately the seven acres is not the most suitable seven acres of his holding to develop as vegetable-growing land. Because of the way licences are issued, at this stage he can apply the water only to certain sections that are specified in the licence.

Recently, he gave up his job and took up his piggery as a full-time project. His father undertook to provide him with funds to build a proper (if I can use that term) pig house; in other words, a unit in which the pig can be kept confined within a house and not allowed to run in the open. It would be properly managed and not, as happens in many instances, allow the pigs to run in the open, wallow around, and make an unsightly mess. However, at present this man is running pigs in the open in most

unfortunate circumstances, because he is unable to improve the standard of management of his piggery. I appreciate that there is a problem, particularly with the nitrates and phosphates in the waste from piggeries, because of the highly concentrated food fed to pigs.

It is well known that these are contaminants, that increase the growth of algae and other weeds, and are most undesirable pollutants. However, I make the point that this man has been engaged in this occupation and fully employed in managing a small piggery. He wants to improve the standard of his management by constructing proper pigsties. He hoped that he would be able to grow vegetables in conjunction with this project in order to make a living more secure. However, because of two things his livelihood is in jeopardy: his water licence is restricted to the most undesirable portion of his block from the point of view of growing vegetables, and he cannot upgrade his piggery. In fact, he has been told to stop his pig-raising operations.

This man, with little capital but with enough enterprise to go into a business of his own, has been told that he can no longer operate his land as he wishes; instead, he may be forced to sell his land, if he can find a buyer. When he bought his small parcel of land it was possible to sell such parcels, but he will have great difficulty in selling this land now and be able to realize on his investment. I emphasize that, at present, a person in this position is not entitled to any form of compensation. As the member for Fisher said, I believe that, if we can pay \$414,000 to buy 149 acres of sports area, and if we can find \$300,000 with which to build a restaurant, then, if the Government has that sort of money to provide services or facilities for a few people, is also has the right and obligation to protect the interests of a minority that has been penalized in many cases (as my constituent has been penalized) because he is one person, one of a disorganized group of people who cannot raise a voice except through their member in this House.

I appeal to the Government to consider providing adequate, reasonable, and fair compensation to these people whose livelihood and asset is jeopardized through no fault of their own, other than the fact that they happen to live in an area that comes within the bounds of a new Engineering and Water Supply Department regulation. I repeat that, in these circumstances, the State has an obligation to compensate these people who have to suffer for the benefit of the majority.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I shall relate to the House details of a situation with which I am familiar and which, in many instances, is similar to the case referred to by the member for Mallee. I believe that the Government should provide compensation for the person in the circumstances that I shall now detail. I cannot say with certainty how many people are involved at the lower end of the river, although the member for Mallee was able to refer to a certain number. I shall use a specific instance, but perhaps other people are in a similar situation. The most grievous aspect of it is that this gentleman, as I understand the present situation, will receive no compensation. I am pleased that the Minister of Works has returned to the Chamber, because I have found him always to be a reasonable man, and I believe that he will further consider seriously this matter, following the instances given by the member for Mallee and the details that I shall now give him.

If the owner of a small parcel of land is half-way through a project, in fact, \$6,000-worth through a project, of erecting pigsties and, because of new regulations being issued, his sties are just within the 300ft. provision, he has a real problem. No provision is made for compensation in relation to this development or, indeed, in relation to the removal of the sties. I agree that it is time we had such a regulation in order to restrict stock from walking into and drinking from the Murray River. I agree also that it is necessary to control pollution (I have no complaints to make about that) and that there are situations in which it is desirable to place pigsties farther away from the water.

I am concerned that the farmer to whom I have referred cannot in his financial situation repeat this expenditure of \$6,000 on another portion of his property. Not a drop of water is escaping from this piggery. When the piggery is hosed down, all the liquid waste from the animals runs through a series of drains into a large water-tight concrete collection point. This man is willing, if necessary, to provide pumps and pipes to take this waste half a mile from the property in order to distribute it over his sandy land so that there is no possibility of pollution.

However, over the last two or three years he has half completed this project. If this piggery is to become a viable unit, the owner must complete the remaining half in an entirely different position some distance from the part already completed. It will be completely uneconomic for him to run his piggery in two

portions, one \$5,000 or \$6,000 development in one part and the remainder on another part of his property. This would be foolish and, indeed, uneconomic. This man has shown much initiative and has done much of his own building work trying to make this area comply with the regulations, at least to the point where the river is not polluted by his project. Surely, the Government represents people. Indeed, it has told us often enough that it does, and here is an excellent opportunity for it to show that it means business, as it is creating hardship for people. I should therefore like the Minister to have a fresh look at this situation.

I am led to believe that on the opposite side of the river, where the dwellings, dairies and piggeries are half a mile from the river, it is possible to wash down piggeries, the waste from which finally finds its way into the back salt channel, and eventually into the pump-house. That material is then pumped into the river. Merely because one man is within 300ft. of the river he is penalized, despite his securing all his wastes in concrete receptacles and being willing to pump it half a mile away. On the other hand, a man who is half a mile from the river but whose effluent is finally pumped into the river is allowed to continue to do so. This anomaly therefore exists. Although time will take care of the situation to which I have referred, the individual to whom I have referred and who has completed half of his new development is entitled to some consideration. If that development must cease, surely he is entitled to some compensation so that he can reassemble his equipment at a point where it is out of reach of the river. He wants to build a viable unit, and he would have liked to do that on the site he has now partially developed. I hope that further consideration will be given to this situation.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I, too, wish to raise my protest on behalf of a minority of my constituents regarding the south-western suburbs drainage scheme which, as I have said on many occasions, has been foisted on a certain part of my district. The Patawalonga lake is now to be widened; one bridge has been partly demolished and is to be reconstructed, as the lake is to be widened 300ft. at that point. Farther north, a wooden bridge which was condemned four or five years ago, is still being used by motorists. It will probably not stand up to another 18 months of constant usage by traffic. When the whole scheme is completed in about 18 months, the Patawalonga lake will have been widened, the

Anderson Avenue bridge will have been removed, and the only access to the Glenelg North peninsula will be over the King Street bridge. This is creating an awkward situation for the people who live there and whose only access to Glenelg and the school is either across the lock at the Patawalonga outlet or by the Anderson Avenue bridge, if one is lucky enough to cross it before a car comes along and runs one down. One could also take a three-mile detour over the temporary road, a situation that has amazed my constituents.

At a time when we hear so much from the Government about road safety, the problems of reducing the death toll, and the number of accidents on our roads, someone suddenly dreams up this idea of having a temporary road from Military Road to Tapley Hill Road. A "T" junction has been created a few yards north of the bridge so that, when traffic travelling along the temporary road wishes to turn right into Tapley Hill Road, drivers do not have a clear view of traffic on their right. Already, several accidents (none of which has, fortunately, been serious) have occurred there. I assure the House that the moment there is a serious accident and someone loses his life honourable members will hear all about it, and the appropriate Minister will have his knuckles rapped, because this should never have been permitted.

Mr. Groth: Don't you rap yourself up!

Mr. BECKER: If the honourable member is not careful, I will take him on. We are becoming accustomed to this sort of treatment of people by the present Government.

Mr. Payne: We haven't become accustomed to your face yet.

Mr. BECKER: We are becoming accustomed to your arrogance and treatment of us. It is about time you got the message, because you will not be here—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. Clark: Why don't you get on to the council about it?

Mr. BECKER: I have done that; I have approached everyone. This could have been prevented in Parliament years ago when this whole thing started—this pipedream that will now cost \$10,500,000. You have no consideration for the people. It is about time you listened and learnt. People put you in Parliament, and you should do something for them.

Mr. Clark: You would prefer them to be flooded out.

Mr. BECKER: It is not a matter of being flooded out: I am talking about giving people access to their homes. Why should they be denied that? How would the honourable member like his children to walk an extra 1½ miles merely because some construction authority says, "Chop this bridge up. The children, the incapacitated and the aged can hobble an extra 1½ miles." We are getting sick and tired of this and, although it has been going on for only two weeks, it will continue for another 12 to 18 months. I assure members opposite that, if anything happens to any pedestrians using this alternative access, this House will hear of it. It was known by the Government that these problems would be created and it is high time that something was done about it.

I wish also to refer to Government tendering. Two Government tenders have been let in my district, one being for the construction of a high school assembly hall. I have found that, before the foundations were even laid, the contractor had to call a meeting of creditors. Tenders will have to be recalled and a new contractor found, all at an additional cost to the State. What is wrong with the present tendering system? How far are tenderers checked on? What sort of system is used when calling for Government tenders? Another contractor is working on the North Esplanade, Glenelg North, and his tender will be revoked because he cannot carry on with the work and he has been delaying the job. That is not good enough. There is not sufficient research into the standing of people accepted to carry out Government tenders. I have said before and I will say again that certain Ministers in this Government are not competent to supervise the handling of public moneys, and this has caused these problems. Anyone with any business experience or business understanding knows of the necessity to ensure that the contractors do their job properly and do not let us down. The current situation will involve the State in additional costs regarding these two projects. All members should have received a letter from Monahan Neate & Associates which states:

In the period from 1962 to 1971, turnover of foreign owned advertising agencies rose from \$25,000,000 to \$162,000,000 throughout Australia, giving the American interests the opportunity to remit \$1,620,000 to America or England tax free. In this State, all State Government advertising is handled by Hansen Rubensohn-McCann Erickson Pty. Ltd., which is a wholly-owned American company. This appointment was made in the mid-1970's, I understand, and applied to every aspect of State Government advertising. Submissions

were not called from indigenous South Australian agencies to evaluate their capacity to handle it. But it would be ridiculous to suggest the main locally owned operations would not be competent to handle it. It is interesting to note that Hansen Rubensohn-McCann Erickson also handle the Labor Party advertising on a State and Federal level. In view of the Australian Labor Party's policy on foreign ownership, I find it difficult to understand how the two interests could be compatible.

The final paragraph states:

I and others who operate local agencies consider that State Government advertising should be restored to local South Australian agencies and any help which you are capable of giving to achieve this end would be appreciated.

I ask that, when contracts regarding advertising by State Government departments are to be renewed, consideration be given to local advertising agencies.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I wish first to refer to the bungling by the Minister of Education regarding the building of the new Streaky Bay school. During the period of the Walsh-Dunstan Government the then Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday) came to Streaky Bay and endeavouring to make a good fellow out of himself made a promise, which this Government has failed to fulfil. The present Minister of Education wrote to me on May 29 and said:

The present programme provides for a tender call target of June, 1972, and an availability date of about March, 1974.

Yet provision is not made in the Loan Estimates for this project to be completed. I have been informed that a deputation that waited on the Minister was told that it was expected that tenders might be called later this year. This is a most unsatisfactory set of circumstances, because the people, having been promised a new school by a former Minister of Education and having been reassured by the present Minister, would like to see some progress made in this matter (although they are aware that the Minister does make statements from time to time and is not sure what he is going to say next). Having read the recent issue of the magazine published by the South Australian Institute of Teachers, I can see that the Minister failed there, too, to justify the argument he was trying to put forward.

As most members seem to be asking for compensation on behalf of their constituents, I should like to refer to one of my constituents who owns a roadhouse on the Nullarbor Plain.

When the Eyre Highway is sealed (and I am the first to applaud the decision to seal this road), the person to whom I have referred

will lose his business, because the new highway will by-pass this roadhouse by seven miles. This business involves an investment of \$75,000. Is the Government prepared to make 10 acres of land available for this person to build a new roadhouse (which would have to be located at Yalata Aboriginal Reserve)? Has the Government, as a result of its decision to change the route of the highway, considered compensating people affected by the decision? This person has built up a regular business over the years and has made a large investment which, because the buildings cannot be moved, he cannot recoup. Few people can write off an investment of \$75,000 and make a fresh start. I hope that the Minister will be prepared to look at this problem and see whether his department can make land available and provide adequate compensation for this person.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Many Bills came before this House in the last session, and a common feature of many was that power was left to the Minister concerned, and in one field the reason is apparent. Three councils of which I know have had trouble regarding zoning and planning regulations in their area. This matter involves the Minister of Local Government. The rezoning of council areas was claimed as a step in the right direction by councils because it was such an important matter. However, the Mitcham council was obliged, as a result of pressure exerted by the Minister of Local Government, to rezone an area over which the Railways Commissioner had jurisdiction. The council was forced to review its zoning with the threat that, if it did not rezone this land on a commercial basis, its planning regulations would not be passed by this House. The council submitted to pressure. The Brighton council has suffered in a similar manner. Under the existing zoning regulations, the area in which the Brighton station is situated is zoned as R2, which allows for construction of houses and flats.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why did the Brighton council want to knock the railway?

Mr. MATHWIN: The council zoned this area R2, which would enable the railway to have normal working conditions. It would not subject the public to any obstruction to normal business. The big problem at Brighton is that at the moment there is a woodyard—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Surely that could be cut out?

Mr. MATHWIN: Another problem is that the Commissioner sought leave from the Brighton council to have this area rezoned as

commercial. Surely the Commissioner would realize that the erection of a galvanized iron warehouse was undesirable. I am sure that, if he were living in an area adjacent to the railway, the Minister would not wish to see a galvanized iron structure right in front of his house.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am sure representations could be made to the railways on that, and a reasonable response could be expected.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have the proof here. Anyone can buy these minutes from the Brighton council for a fee of 20c. Here is a full record of proceedings, and I would be willing to let the Minister peruse it later.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where is the galvanized iron shed?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is not there, but if the area is zoned as a commercial area, as the Minister well knows, the Railways Commissioner would be entitled to erect a galvanized iron building on that area.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you ask for an assurance from the Minister of Roads and Transport that this would not be done?

Mr. MATHWIN: Many letters have passed between the Brighton council, the Commissioner, and the Minister on this matter. The Minister of Local Government has written to the council stating in no uncertain terms that, unless the area is rezoned from R2 to a commercial area, the council has no chance of getting its zoning regulations through this House. To me, no matter which way one looks at it, that is straight-out blackmail. No matter which side of the House members sit on, it seems so to me when we have reports such as this, in plain writing, informing a council that, unless it changes its zoning regulations, there will be delay in the regulations being approved. Anyone familiar with zoning regulations and local government matters knows that these regulations need to go through as quickly as possible.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why doesn't the Brighton council ask the Minister of Roads and Transport for an assurance about buildings?

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not think for a moment this would be given.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Has the council asked?

Mr. MATHWIN: I have two pages of correspondence between the council, the Commissioner, and the Minister of Local Government. I am quite happy to make the correspondence available to the Minister immediately I have concluded my speech.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you asked for an assurance, most likely you would get the answer you seek.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Woodville council recently passed zoning regulations about building on the esplanade, or thereabouts, in the new West Lakes area. The powers that be decided to build flats and housing accommodation adjacent to the seafront. Here again, a similar thing happened. The council was obliged, through pressure from the Minister, to rezone the area concerned or it would have had no opportunity of getting its zoning regulations through Parliament. I have cited three councils that have been held up in this matter, and I ask the Government to see whether some consideration could be given to the matter, particularly in the instances I have brought forward. Zoning is most important, and it is imperative that this type of regulation should go through Parliament without delay.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think a council should have absolute power to determine zoning, irrespective of what Parliament says?

The SPEAKER: Order! This cross-interjection is out of order. Has the member for Glenelg concluded his speech?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For many years it has been customary for Parliament to approve two Supply Bills so that the current financial commitments of the Government may be met during the period between July 1 and the assent to the Appropriation Bill following the Budget debate. The Supply Act approved by Parliament in March last provided authority to the extent of \$60,000,000 and, given a normal flow of expenditures, it would cover the day-to-day requirements of Government till the end of August. However, this year there is an unusual combination of pay-days for the Public Service, for the Education Department and for the Hospitals Department, which has the effect of increasing expenditures

in July and August above the normal trend. This is just a matter of timing within the year which is superimposed on the steady long-term upward movement in levels of expenditures. The result is that the appropriation given by Supply Act (No. 1) is expected to be exhausted with about one week of August still to go, and accordingly it is desirable that a second Supply Bill should receive assent on Thursday, August 24.

This Bill, for \$60,000,000, is expected to suffice until the end of October, as the flow of expenditures in September and October should be at rather lower levels than in July and August, because of the timing of pay-days. (Honourable members will note that in one period there are five pay-days instead of the normal four.) If the debate on the Appropriation Bill proceeds in accordance with the normal timing, it will receive assent before the end of October, and a third Supply Bill should not be necessary. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of \$60,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries and wages which may be awarded by a wage fixing body. As this Bill is entirely in the normal form of Supply Bills, without any exceptions, I ask the House to agree to it forthwith.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The details given by the Treasurer are clear cut. As we appreciate the purpose for which the Bill is required, we have no desire to delay its passage. There may be one or two questions in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Issue and application of \$60,000,000."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The number of pay-days has been given as one of the reasons for the increase in this sum. As the sum provided seems greater than normal governmental expenditure required for July and August, can the Treasurer give some explanation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): It is the effect of pay increases.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Payments not to exceed last year's Estimates except in certain respects."

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Treasurer intend to bring down the Budget on the last day before the show recess, as has been the practice in previous years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1948-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is one of three measures intended to supplement by 5 per cent certain pensions payable to former members of the judiciary, former members of the Public Service, and former members of Parliament. The pensions increased are those that, as it were, vested before June 30, 1971. The day of effect of the increased pensions will be so far as is possible the same for pensions of all three categories.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 is a formal law revision amendment that has the effect of repealing a provision that ceased to have any effect in 1957 and was inadvertently not repealed at that time. Clause 3 provides for the increase in pensions and further provides that the day of effect of the increase shall be a day fixed by proclamation for the purpose. The purpose of this Bill, of the Judges' Pensions Act Amendment Bill, and of the Superannuation Act Amendment Bill is to make, in effect, a cost of living adjustment to existing pensions.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUDGES' PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Judges' Pensions Act, 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is another of three measures intended to increase rates of certain pensions payable under the laws of this State. This Bill deals with pensions that are payable under the Judges' Pensions Act, 1971. Honourable members will recall that fixed pensions were provided under that Act to the persons whose names were set out in the schedule thereto. In that Act it was provided that, by subsections

(3) and (4) of section 12, those fixed rates could be varied by proclamation, since it was then clear that those pensions would necessarily have to be varied to reflect increases in the cost of living.

This Bill proposes, in effect, an extension of the principle that was then accepted by this House in that it provides that all pensions payable under that Act can be varied in this manner. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 effects a law revision amendment. Clause 4 is the operative clause in the Bill, and provides that variations in rates of pensions that are not otherwise provided for shall be effected by proclamation. It will be noted that no proclamation can be made under this section that will have the effect of reducing the rate of pension payable to a person below the rate at which the pension was originally payable.

It is intended that the power conferred here should be used to provide a 5 per cent increase in pensions on the same basis as that proposed in relation to Public Service pensions under the amendments before you in respect of the Superannuation Act.

Mr. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1969-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill which is in form similar to measures having the same effect that have been enacted previously increases certain pensions under the Superannuation Act, 1969, as amended. The amount of the increase of 5 per cent is derived from the fact that the living costs as shown by the consumer price index for Adelaide increased from 115.4 in the June quarter, 1971, to 121.1 in the June quarter, 1972. The previous adjustment was based upon the June quarter, 1971, figure.

The pensions that will be increased are those pensions that, in a manner of speaking, "vested" before June 30, 1971. This "vesting" may have occurred by the pensions being payable before that day or, in the case of the pension of a widow of a deceased pensioner, being derived from a pension payable to that deceased pensioner before that day. This "vesting" concept is spelt out in the definition of "determination day" that appears in section 100a of the principal Act.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 is the operative provision of the Bill and first repeals section 100c of the principal Act. Section 100c is later by this clause re-enacted in an expanded form as section 100d. The increases are provided for by proposed new section 100c, which (a) at subsection (1) picks up the reference to the determination or vesting day of a pension; (b) at subsection (2) provides for the fixing of a day on and from which the increases shall be payable. This day will probably be some time in October and will be fixed so as to coincide with the commencement of other pension increases. This subsection also delineates the class of pensions that will be increased—that is, all those having a determination day that occurred before June 30, 1971; (c) at subsection (3) makes a formal amendment; (d) at subsection (4) makes it clear that fixed allowances for children are not affected; and (e) at subsection (5) provides for a rounding-off, to the nearest 1c, of pensions.

Proposed new section 100d, as has been mentioned, re-enacts in an expanded form former section 100c, and provides that the increase of pension shall be payable from the Pension Supplementation Account (in respect of which see sections 97, 98 and 99 of the principal Act) as to 30 per cent, and out of the general revenue as to 70 per cent. This continues unchanged the previous arrangements in operation in relation to this matter.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act on a number of different subjects. First, it provides for the determination by the Full Court of questions of law arising in the course of a trial resulting in either the acquittal or the conviction of the accused person. This section follows in substance section 5a (2) of the Criminal Appeal Act (New South Wales). A trial judge often decides important points of criminal law or evidence in the course of a trial. If the decision is wrong, the Crown has at present no means of rectifying the error, which remains a binding precedent on courts of inferior jurisdiction.

Sometimes a later ruling on substantive law appears inconsistent with earlier rulings. This creates uncertainty and the Crown should have means by which an authoritative ruling on disputed legal points can be given without impugning in any way a decision resulting in the acquittal of an accused person.

Secondly, the Bill empowers a criminal court to confiscate firearms and other offensive weapons that are used in or to facilitate the commission of an offence. The superior courts at the moment can impose forfeiture only as a condition to a bond, and cannot impose an order for forfeiture based on facts which emerge from another charge or on any other extraneous circumstances. This section gives them a general flexible power which goes beyond that contained in the Firearms Act and enables the courts to deal with any contingency likely to arise.

Thirdly, the Curator of Prisoner's Property is empowered to institute civil proceedings on behalf of a prisoner or continue, on his behalf, proceedings already begun. This will prevent a prisoner after his release being estopped from initiating an action, because it is statute-barred owing to lapse of time. Finally, the Bill makes amendments to facilitate the payment of witness fees. These amendments are complementary to amendments that have been made to the Justices Act. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 enacts that procedures laid down in the principal Act for the payment of witness fees do not prevent the payment of witness fees under the provisions of the Justices Act in the course, or at the conclusion, of a preliminary hearing.

Clause 5 enacts new section 299a of the principal Act. This section provides that in certain circumstances the court may make an order for the forfeiture of firearms and offensive weapons. It may also prohibit the use or possession of these weapons by any person specified in the order of forfeiture. All orders may be varied or revoked on the application of a person with a proper interest in the matter if the court is satisfied that it is not inimical to the safety of the community to do so. Clause 6 makes amendments to section 331 of the principal Act. The Curator of Prisoner's Property is empowered to institute or continue civil proceedings on behalf of a prisoner. If the action is not completed on the expiration of his sentence, the prisoner may continue the proceedings in his own name and

in all respects as if he himself had originally instituted them.

Clause 7 enacts new section 351a of the principal Act. The Attorney-General may appeal to the Full Court for the determination of a question of law arising in the course of a criminal trial. These proceedings are to be quite independent of the original cause and must have their own separate title. The judge before whom the trial was heard shall transmit to the Full Court all matters relevant to the appeal. The Full Court is invested with power to hear and determine the question of law, but its determination does not affect or invalidate any verdict or decision given at the trial. As the proceedings have no connection with the defendant in the original cause, he does not have the right to be represented at the hearing. Therefore, the Attorney-General is required to instruct counsel to argue the case for both sides. All costs of the appeal are to be paid from funds provided by Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PAROLE)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The two amendments to this Act are based on proposals made by the Parole Board. Under the present Act persons detained because of incapacity to control their sexual instincts by orders made pursuant to sections 77a or who are acquitted on the ground of insanity and detained under section 292 are not subject to the authority of the Parole Board. The only action that the board can take concerning them is to recommend to the Governor that they be released. If the release is granted, it can only be unconditional. As orders made under these sections are usually made on the assumption that the detainee will be a danger to other people if at liberty, the board is naturally hesitant to recommend release unless it has some assurance that the danger no longer exists. This can never be established with any high degree of certainty until the detainee's response to life outside the confines of the institution has been ascertained. To minimize the risk in these recommendations and to give the Parole Board more freedom in dealing with these persons, the amendments enable the

Governor, on the recommendation of the Parole Board, to release on a conditional licence persons detained under these sections. The parole would be under supervision for a definite period, and during this period reports would be submitted to the Parole Board. Any other conditions considered necessary by the Parole Board may also be included in the licence. Where there is a breach of any condition of the licence, the person released may be returned to custody.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes amendments to section 77a of the Principal Act. A person imprisoned under this section is not to be released unless the Governor is satisfied, on the recommendation of the Parole Board, that he is fit to be at liberty, and either terminates his detention or releases him under licence. Terms and conditions of the licence are to be in accordance with the Parole Board's recommendations. When the period of the licence has expired, or the Parole Board has reasonable cause to suspect that there has been failure to comply with any of the terms of the licence, the released person may be apprehended by an authorized person, and either returned to custody or detained for examination by the Parole Board. Clause 4 enacts new section 293a. This section contains provisions similar to those inserted in section 77a and permits the Governor to release under licence persons detained under section 292.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOOK PURCHASERS PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Book Purchasers Protection Act, 1963-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill arises from a submission from the South Australian Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, who is charged with the administration of the principal Act, the Book Purchasers Protection Act, 1963, as amended. The main purposes of the amendments are first, to stop certain practices that are being followed to evade the provisions of the principal Act and, secondly, to ensure that other undesirable practices do not gain currency. Members will recall that a contract under the Book Purchasers Protection Act is unenforceable against the purchaser unless, within the time stated, the purchaser affirms the contract.

There is a requirement already in the Act that a statement to this effect shall be printed conspicuously on the contract. However, cases have been reported where this statement is indeed printed conspicuously on the contract and in the prescribed type face, but it is printed on the back of the contract, which is then stapled into a brochure in such a manner as not to be readily removed. In these circumstances purchasers might be forgiven for assuming that there is nothing of importance on the back of the contract document.

Further, complaints have been received that salesmen are still attempting to gain entrance to homes by concealing the purposes of their visit. For instance, it is not unknown for them to suggest that they are engaged on an educational research project or some such similar purpose. Again, it appears desirable to ensure that it is made as difficult as possible for vendors to secure payment from purchasers under unenforceable contracts by means of letters of demand or by the invocation of other debt collection procedures. Finally, it is felt that steps should be taken to ensure that, as far as is possible under the law of this State, vendors should be prevented from providing that the law of a place other than this State shall be the law to which reference shall be made for the resolution of disputes. Here I would mention that a provision of the kind contemplated cannot of itself affect the ordinary rules of private international law, but it can at least provide some incentive for vendors to comply with the intention of this measure.

To consider the Bill in some detail, clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides that the provisions relating to ratification of contracts will, as far as possible, be brought to the attention of the purchaser who signs the contract by being placed immediately above his signature. Clauses 4 and 5 make decimal currency amendments and do not affect the actual monetary value of the amounts as expressed. They also remove an unnecessary reference to the penalty being a maximum penalty. This reference is rendered unnecessary by the provisions of section 30 of the Acts Interpretation Act.

Clause 6 inserts the following new sections in the principal Act. New section 6a provides that the salesman shall disclose the purpose of his visit immediately on commencing negotiations with the purchaser. New section 6b strikes out the practice of inserting a "foreign law provision" that may work hardship to a purchaser. New section 6c is intended to

prohibit demands being made for payments under contracts that are, in fact, unenforceable against the purchaser. New section 6d provides a defence against a prosecution for an offence against new section 6b or 6c in circumstances where it is reasonable that such an offence should be provided.

Honourable members will no doubt have noted that the three new clauses follow fairly closely analogous provisions in the Door to Door Sales Act, 1971. The circumstances that gave rise to their inclusion in that Act exist in full measure in relation to the principal Act, which is of course concerned with a particular aspect of door to door selling.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 2. Page 508.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the nature of this Bill. It is quite inconceivable to me that the Government could change face so many times and yet come back and say that it is fulfilling the will of the people. This is a complete about-face from the original attitude expressed by the Government. This Bill has been brought forward for base political reasons only, and the Government stands condemned for it. If we have any doubts at all about the nature of this Bill and the Labor Party's promotion of it, we have only to look at the publication entitled "Friday night shopping—a plan to provide a community service and to protect shop workers". This publication has been circulated in many districts in this State, and it has been circulated in several different forms.

In its original form it had a photograph of the Labor Party member for the district, a photograph of each person involved in the Legislative Council in the district, and a photograph of the member for that district of the Commonwealth Parliament. If ever we wanted proof that the decisions of the Labor Party are determined by people other than those involved in this Parliament, we have that proof in this document. In it the member for the district of the Commonwealth Parliament is given pride of place. Later, the same document was handed out in Rundle Street, and it may have been handed out in other places, too. It was handed out by members opposite in an attempt to fool the community.

Mr. Payne: After they were given the document, didn't they have the opportunity to make

up their own minds? Do you call that fooling the people?

Dr. EASTICK: It was an endeavour by members opposite to fool the community, but the Labor Party will find that the community will not be fooled by the document. On page 2 of the document an attempt is made to belittle people in another place.

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

Dr. EASTICK: For the first time, we had an indication of the nature of this measure as a result of the distribution of a pamphlet in certain districts and in Rundle Street, and we also saw the involvement of Commonwealth persons as well as State representatives. I refer to page 2 of the document wherein the Labor Party mentions the involvement of people in another place. The words to which I refer, so that we have no doubt in our minds as to what I mean by this political involvement, is that the Government intends to force a showdown with the Liberals in another place on this issue. Also, there was comment relative to the undemocratically elected Liberals in another place who have always stood in the way of State progress, etc.; this is absolute rot, and the people of the State know that it is false.

The Government believes that it can get away with this kind of foolishness but, if it believes that it can fool the people in the community, it has another think coming. More particularly, I see this as only a follow-on of the type of attitude expressed by the Government. In the first instance, the Government proposed to hold a referendum on the same day as a Legislative Council by-election; if that was not politicking, I will eat my hat.

Mr. Hopgood: It was only economics.

Dr. EASTICK: Economics, nothing: it was a ruse to force people to the poll to exercise what might well have become a compulsory vote in a by-election in which the law of the land gives people the opportunity of making a voluntary vote. The comment I wish to make more particularly now relates to the new page 4, which was placed on the back of the pamphlet distributed in Rundle Street. It is headed "A special message to shop assistants", and it states:

The new legislation the Government will shortly introduce into Parliament is designed to give people the convenience of Friday night shopping, while providing you with real safeguards.

Page 4 of the pamphlet also states:

No. 1. The ordinary situation for hours of work and pay of shop assistants will be

that work will cease at 5.30 p.m. Mondays to Fridays inclusive. Overtime rates will be paid for hours worked after 5.30 p.m. on Fridays until 9 p.m. and for work on Saturday morning. Each day of work will be consecutive and not staggered.

No. 2. However, it will be possible for an employer to apply to the Industrial Court for an order for alternative hours of work and pay, provided the court is satisfied on its own inquiry that the majority of employees in the particular shop concerned want the alternative proposed.

No. 3. There can be two alternatives: (a) an 80-hour fortnight with ordinary hours worked over a five-day week Mondays to Saturdays, with 50 per cent penalty rates payable for work after 5.30 p.m. on Friday and for Saturday work. (This would allow every second Saturday morning and second Monday off) or (b) Ordinary hours of work to terminate at 5.30 p.m. Mondays to Thursdays, at 9.00 p.m. on Fridays, no ordinary hours of work on Saturdays, a penalty loading of 50 per cent on Friday nights, and overtime rates for Saturday. (This would allow a late start on Friday mornings.)

No. 4. Exemptions will be given in relation to existing awards for workers in other than purely shop assistant employment to whom such hours and awards would not appropriately apply.

No. 5. Any union concerned will have a right to be heard on any application by an employer to the courts for one of the alternative systems.

This documents well may have been written from the Minister's second reading explanation, or it may even have been the basis for the Minister's speech. It is interesting to note that that document is authorized by Mr. M. J. Young, Trades Hall, 11 South Terrace, Adelaide, and it is no secret that many persons in the trade union movement are particularly interested to know on what authority trade union money has been spent to distribute this document. Perhaps in due course the member for Florey will tell us where the authority came from and whether the explanation has been acceptable to many members of the organization.

My point is that this message, which was distributed to the shop assistants, did not fool them, either, and they have expressed, by letter to the editor, by telephone, and by personal contact with many members on this side (as, doubtless, they have done with many members opposite), the opinion that they want no part of this system and want to be left entirely as they are now. They, and most other people in the community, believe that the original demand for Friday night shopping has waned and that, although some people in the community would like a return to the situation

that had existed before the Labor Government placed a curfew on Friday night shopping in the fringe areas, the advantages then certainly would not be advantages under the Government's proposal.

I do not consider that the measures introduced by the Minister are advantageous to the community. The community has expressed itself as I have mentioned and, certainly, it expressed itself in a snap poll conducted by the *Adelaide News* on July 18. I do not suggest for a moment that this is a complete poll or a referendum in the true sense, but it gives an extremely interesting picture and understanding of the attitudes of people on a random-sampling basis.

Mr. Hopgood: How random is it?

Dr. EASTICK: Perhaps the member for Mawson has something to chortle about, because he is the only member opposite who gained any benefit from the details published in the *News*. I will read briefly the results of this telephone poll. In Elizabeth the figures were nine to three against. The member for Elizabeth will recall that the voting in that area was about four to one in favour in the original referendum vote.

Mr. Clark: That was when the city shops were not going to open.

Dr. EASTICK: That is right, when they enjoyed a privilege that they will not enjoy under the provisions of this Bill and when they had the privilege of being able to maintain costs at a lower rate because the business conducted was being drawn from a much wider field than would be possible under the measures that the Government has put forward now. In Salisbury the voting was six for and six against, while in Modbury it was nine to three in favour. In Tea Tree Gully and in Para Hills it was 10 to two against. In Port Noarlunga it was seven to five for; in Reynella, also seven to five for; in Christies Beach, eight to four for; in Burnside, 11 to one against; in Henley Beach, nine to three against; in Mitcham, 10 to two against; in Unley seven to five against; in Brighton 11 to one against; in Port Adelaide, eight to four against; in Springfield, nine to three against; in Glenelg, 11 to one against; and in Rose Park, 11 to one against also.

As I have pointed out, I do not assert that this is a complete answer, but I believe it is a useful indication of the attitude of many people in the community at present, compared with the earlier occasion. I pointed out that not only is this measure against the interests

of the community but also definitely against those of the workers involved, and it is obvious from the outcome of any meeting of shop assistants in connection with this matter that they do not desire to return to a situation that will involve them in Friday evening work. We on this side over a long period have said that we believe in an open situation involving supply and demand, whereby the organizations that are willing to trade will remain open, while those that do not wish to trade will close; and that, on the basis of free enterprise, the matter will eventually balance itself out. We have demonstrated that belief earlier, and members will be given the opportunity to demonstrate their support for that principle later this evening. However, I oppose the Bill in its present form. A letter I have received from a person residing at Campbelltown states:

Being myself a public servant, I am not directly concerned in this matter one way or the other but, in the course of discussion with friends and members of the staff in my department, it is quite clear that few indeed among them have any enthusiasm for the Government's Bill. Indeed, the majority are deeply concerned at the cost which all will have to bear in order, it seems, to pander to the desires of a minority of trade unionists who care only that they will be able to work overtime on Saturday and still be able to shop more or less at our expense on Friday night.

A report in the *Sunday Mail* of August 5, headed "Late Trading 'Not Wanted'" states:

A referendum on Friday night shopping would be defeated by a greater majority than in 1970, the Shop Assistants Union State Secretary (Mr. E. J. Goldsworthy) said today. I just don't think there is a public demand for Friday night shopping, he said. He believed the Government felt it was in its political interests to provide late shopping.

Mr. Goldsworthy made other statements on that occasion. Lest the Government thinks that it has a mandate in this matter or that there is a desire for the form of shopping prescribed under the Bill, I refer to a questionnaire which recently sought public opinion on a whole host of subjects. The questionnaire known as a "Public Opinion Survey on Special Issues—Job No. 938" involves a survey conducted in Rostrevor, Elizabeth, Brighton, Norwood and Prospect. The questionnaire covers a large number of subjects and requires information on the beliefs of individual members of the community as to the nature of the community's leaders.

This survey covers 12 pages but contains scant comment regarding late shopping, which is raised only as a late point on the basis of a column one, two or three answer (or of a very important, not so important or no impor-

tance answer), and I cannot believe that the Government should be happy or believes that it has obtained any worthwhile information from that source. I have received a letter from one person who has expressed the desire for late shopping and that comment is pertinent, because it gives another side of the picture; but it is a minority view, and it is the only expression of opinion I have received, from all the people who have seen fit to write to me, with that view. This is the opinion of a person who works a 5½-day week at a centre away from a major shopping area. The writer states:

I am a single woman living alone and working a 5½-day week (Monday to Friday 8.40 a.m. to 5.20 p.m., Saturday 8.50 a.m. till 11.20 a.m.) and my shopping hour is my lunch break. The bus trip to the city takes 15 minutes each way, and five minutes each way is needed to get to shops and the bus stop, and 20 minutes is left for actual shopping, a grand total of 100 minutes each week in which to do all my shopping (clothes, food, household appliances, etc.). As for necessary repairs in the home, I must take an unpaid day off from work.

This is the only person from whom I have received correspondence who would be advantaged by the proposals put forward by members opposite.

Reference has been made to increased cost, and it is fact that the increased cost factor has really caused concern and played a part in moulding the views held by members of the community today. One person who put her views in writing (and this document has been made available to the Premier on an earlier occasion) prefaced her remarks by saying:

Having used and enjoyed the facilities of extended shopping hours, I was in some degree reluctant to see them end. I can completely understand the point of view of the public in wanting this convenience and entertainment, but at what cost? Business is business and must run at a profit. Now most continuous essential services, where outside labour receiving a reasonable wage is employed, are run at a loss. Big business is not going to be able to afford this, so who is going to meet the cost? Yes, Sir, you have guessed all the way—you, Mr. and Mrs. Customer.

This is the opinion expressed by several people. We have seen from the statements made by many people that the additional cost for each unit of four persons is estimated at \$4 a week. I believe that this cost is unreal when applied to a single person or two persons living together. It is impossible for one or two persons to buy as cheaply or as effectively as someone who is purchasing goods for three, four or more people. Anyone who has had anything to do with purchasing foodstuffs that deteriorate in quality knows that it is not uncommon to have to throw away food that has spoiled.

Pensioners and others have given me details of cost to the individual or to two persons, and it is basically greater than the \$1 per head which applies to a \$4 per unit of four. On July 18 the Premier claimed that the increase of \$4 a week for a four-unit family was exaggerated. He said that the legislation had been designed to keep costs at a minimum where possible. He did not say they would be kept at a minimum, but used the words "where possible". He then said:

If the Metropolitan Retailers Consultative Committee feared the cost involved would be too great, the legislation would certainly not compel them to open on Friday nights.

Mr. Harrison: They are not compelled to open. The word "may" is important.

Dr. EASTICK: So is the word "possible". People in other States have been involved in this late night trading. I believe that members have had circulated to them a document entitled *Retail World*, volume 25, No. 2, of Wednesday, January 19, 1972. One of the stories is headed "Many Stores Refuse to Stay Open" and states:

Disillusionment with night trading, voiced here by Mr. Vincent Dowell, general manager of the Food Retailers' Association of N.S.W., is endorsed by trade leaders in both Sydney and Melbourne.

The article then indicates several problems associated with this type of trading, and the increased costs that follow. An article in the *Australian* of July 12 states that retailers will be affected by late trading five days a week, and highlights the fact that food prices in New South Wales and Victoria will increase by about 10 per cent or up to 200 grocery chain stores will go out of business in the next 12 months.

Mr. Crimes: This is all assumption; there's no statistical basis for it.

Dr. EASTICK: Just wait. The article then states:

On Monday, Permewan Wright, which operates about 320 groceries and other shops in Victoria and New South Wales, said that trading was one of the main reasons its yearly profit fell from \$1,390,000 to \$718,000. The company closed 20 of its shops during the year, including three in New South Wales country centres.

This is the effect this type of trading has had. This is a large organization, but during 12 months it has closed 20 of its shops, including three New South Wales country stores. But what does the Premier have to say on this additional cost? It is as well to go back to his statements made in this very House on August 18, 1970, when we were dealing with

the referendum Bill and when it had been argued from this side (let us not deny where it came from: it came from this side) that the measures being promoted would not increase costs. The Premier made this statement:

Obviously, the Leader has not done his homework on costs. True, in unrestricted shopping areas in the present metropolitan area, it is possible to operate economically because custom comes to those areas from areas where trading is restricted, and shop trade in those unrestricted areas can be spread over a large market. However, if the whole area is opened up to uniform trading hours that same concentration of customers from, say, my district or from Port Adelaide will be shopping locally and, therefore, the costs will be spread over a much wider area, with not a very much larger market. Business in Australia has taken a careful count of what increases in costs will occur because of the penalty rates paid in this country.

Would we deny that people in charge of businesses and responsible for management would not have the correct figures and would not have researched this completely so that the facts they were giving and the statements they were making were correct? Yet here we have a situation where there is no doubt about increased costs, that there is no need for the people responsible for management (and this has been expressed from the benches opposite) to increase costs. "Let them take it up in their profits; there is no need to increase costs." The Premier told us not two years ago that it was important to realize that the people putting forward these arguments had done their homework well; they knew exactly what it cost to run a business and increased costs would prevail. Now we are led to believe that the situation is not as the Premier painted it on that occasion.

I want now to speak of something which is extremely important in this connection—red meat sales. It has been said there will be no butcher shops open on Friday evenings if this measure goes through, that only red meat that is deep frozen will be available to the public. We find the situation where a supermarket is given the opportunity (and this is spelt out by the Minister) to continue trading in all respects except in respect of red meats, and the red meats must either be locked away or removed from the area where they can be purchased. It has been stated (again, I believe the statements made by several managers are completely correct because they, after all, are in a position to know the problems of management) that the easiest and best way is to present their other wares on a Friday night

in the refrigerated space that red meat normally occupied until 5.30 p.m., that is to make that refrigerated space available to other products that could legally be on display to the community. It has been stated, too, that it would not be economic to rehandle the meat on the Saturday morning before the store opened to put the red meats on display again; in other words, there would be a denial in many instances of the opportunity to purchase red meat from 5.30 p.m. on Fridays until 9 a.m. on Mondays.

It has been said (and this is on information from New South Wales and Victoria, where this type of trading prevails) that red meat sales have declined by about 9 per cent as a result of the provisions in those States. Although this 9 per cent might not be of much significance to members opposite, it is of great importance to the producers of the meat. Any reduction, or anything that erodes the market they currently enjoy, is a disadvantage to the producers of South Australia.

Mr. Burdon: They can't supply enough for the American market at present.

Dr. EASTICK: And we have a fair idea why: because we have not got the abattoir facilities to allow greater killing and thus permit entry to overseas markets. The abattoir facilities are working to maximum capacity, but producers are denied the opportunity of increasing their percentage of the American market, in great part because of that deficiency. The reason is not one of which we can be proud; it is not one for which I damn the Government, but I am stating a fact.

Mr. Burdon: No steps were taken in earlier years to provide additional abattoirs.

Dr. EASTICK: That is interesting. I recommend that the honourable member should do a little homework on the increased beef numbers in South Australia. Two or three years ago we did not have the number of stock to build up to the type of market available today, but now we have. Between 1969 and 1971, beef cattle numbers in South Australia increased by 107 per cent and, on figures released to members in this House a short time ago, the period between March, 1971, and March, 1972, saw a further 32 per cent increase.

This is getting away from the measure we are discussing at the moment. However, anything that reduces the ability of the farming community, the beef producers, to achieve maximum sales of their product (also of sheep and pigs) is a disadvantage to our rural community. Whilst they accept that the percentage of white meat from fish and chicken will rise,

it is upsetting a balance that has existed in the past, and I suggest to every member here that it is a balance that cannot be upset without disadvantage to this State.

Mr. Payne: You're only interested in the cattle breeders.

Dr. EASTICK: I am interested in all things, but I am not so blind as to agree to a measure that will reduce by 9 per cent the sales of a commodity so important to the State. Frozen meats would be available, but evidence will show that people will not accept frozen meats. The housewife will not, except in the greatest emergency, accept frozen meats. This will have an effect on producers, but more particularly I want to raise one further matter. If the measures provided in this Bill are passed, there is every possibility that the leeway will be made up with synthetic meat. Synthetic meat is already trying to make inroads into the food market in this country today.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's hypothetical.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not hypothetical, and it is important that the Minister take note of all the possibilities and the consequences involved. It is possible that this measure, which is being promoted by the Government, will permit an increase in the quantity of synthetic meat imported into this State. At page 754 of *Hansard* for August 18, 1970, the Premier is reported as saying:

Let me return from that minor digression to retail butchering. The Government took the view that there should be a 5½-day week for butchering throughout the State, but its view on that is modified by the question of getting uniform trading hours in the metropolitan planning area. We believe that it would be quite anomalous to have general retail trading on Friday night as well as Saturday morning and to have butchering closed at that time, because an intolerable anomaly would then occur in that people would be doing general shopping on Friday night but would not be able to go to the butcher shop.

Even the Premier thought that the referendum would be carried, although perhaps not as positively as the Deputy Premier, who expected a 70 per cent vote. The *Hansard* record of the Premier's speech continues:

Therefore, if the referendum is carried (and I say that I believe it will be carried) to open up Friday night shopping in the whole of the metropolitan planning area and the municipality of Gawler, then the uniform hours for butcher shops would include Friday night trading as well as Saturday morning trading.

What change has taken place between August, 1970 and August, 1972? There has been a complete about-face!

The next comment I wish to make is in regard to the attempt in the measure to give directions to the Industrial Commission. We see in the measure before us a situation whereby persons who undertake judicial or executive power in the commission will have removed from them the opportunity to make a decision dependent on all the information placed before them, whether by employers, employees or by other persons. We have the situation where we are to write into a Bill, for what I believe is the first time in any legislation in Australia, a series of directions that would virtually put the executive in the position of rubber-stamping something written into the legislation. The Chamber of Manufacturers had something to say about this matter. A report in the *Australian* of August 4, 1972, states:

The General Secretary of the chamber (Mr. C. W. Branson) said yesterday the Bill took over functions normally left to the Industrial Commission. It is recognized in industrial fields that Governments should limit their activities to setting up broad guidelines. These should not exceed the determination of hours a business should stay open, determination of public holidays, matters associated with workers compensation and the like. The setting of working hours, conditions of employment and penalty rates should be the responsibility of the Industrial Commission.

I believe that that situation should prevail. There seems to be a fairly deep division of opinion amongst members of the union hierarchy about what should take place in a shopping measure. Mr. Goldsworthy says one thing and other members of the union hierarchy in the Trades and Labor Council say another thing.

Mr. Crimes: Don't you have any differences on your side?

Dr. EASTICK: We have, and we have been congratulated on bringing them into the open, so we may offer congratulations in reverse on the fact that Mr. Goldsworthy also has seen fit to bring his differences into the open. A report in the *News* of Saturday, August 4, states:

Premier Dunstan said today Adelaide would not lose Saturday morning shopping.

In the same newspaper Mr. Goldsworthy stated that there was every chance that it would. That part of the report states:

Mr. Goldsworthy said, "I feel that, if our members decide to ban Saturday morning work, shop assistants who are not members of the union will back us."

Mr. Goldsworthy makes a statement and members opposite immediately deny that he

has anything like enough numbers to carry it out. We have the suggestion that he has only few members and, therefore, would have little effect. I wonder just what effect it would have at Arndale or in Rundle Street, or perhaps at Elizabeth, where Mr. Goldsworthy may have many more members and a far bigger percentage of those in the organization than members opposite think he has.

What is the situation in respect of other people in the trade who are not members of Mr. Goldsworthy's union? Would they follow the example? Would the people who today are flocking to sign the petitions that Mr. Goldsworthy has organized and distributed not do as Mr. Goldsworthy is suggesting, or has the member for Florey so sorted out the matter in the Trades and Labor Council that Mr. Goldsworthy would not dare shift from the direction that the Trades and Labor Council has decreed?

The meeting there last Thursday must have been extremely interesting, but I will not go into detail about exactly what happened in that 12 to 11 vote. The discussion afterwards indicated that by far the majority of persons present did not want this measure to be introduced and were waiting for members of another place to get them off the hook. However, as I see it, they could be waiting for a long time, because they may not get from another place the degree of support or assistance for which they are looking. A report in the *Advertiser* of August 5 states:

The Shop Assistants Union State Secretary (Mr. E. J. Goldsworthy) said yesterday that, if members decided to ban Saturday work because of the introduction of Friday night shopping, he believed non-members would back them.

Certainly, many people in that category have expressed that view to me. Again, a report in the *Advertiser* of August 9 states:

The proposal to ban Saturday morning shopping in protest at the Government's Friday night shopping Bill was shelved by the Shop Assistants Union last night. The Union's five-day working week committee has decided it would be impracticable to seek a poll of the union members before the legislation is passed. They did not say what they would do after the legislation was passed. The report goes on:

But the union State Secretary (Mr. E. J. Goldsworthy) warned that consideration had been given to a stoppage on one Saturday morning before the Bill became law.

Will he do it? Has he the numbers? It will be interesting to find out. He would have had a sympathetic attitude last Thursday at the

debate on the motion carried at the Trades and Labor Council meeting on June 30 last, especially in relation to an agreement being reached in respect of any application by an association of the employees. However, the Bill denies the association of employees the type of representation guaranteed them on June 30. One wonders whether the member for Florey was, again, able to improve the situation and to overcome the difficulties and blunders loaded by the Minister and the Premier on to members opposite on many occasions.

The Minister rests his case heavily on conditions for workers, which have always been the concern of members on this side. Conditions for workers are best left in the hands of the Industrial Commission. It was subsequently spelt out how the Industrial Commission would determine conditions and wages. The Minister showed scant regard for loss of employment and added cost to all sectors of the community. No less than the Premier has said that, if the people involved in management had done their sums, they would know the working conditions and the costs of their operations. However, although I do not need to refer to any statistical detail on this matter (it has already been dealt with fully), the people concerned have stated that, under the Bill, permanent employment in this industry will be reduced and there could well be an increase in casual employment. I will deal with that matter in more detail when discussing clause 5. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said, dealing with clause 2 (we accept that clause 1 is merely formal):

Clause 2 provides for the Act proposed by the Bill to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. It is clearly desirable that some time should elapse between the passing of this measure and the formal introduction of the extended hours. This period will enable shopkeepers to make the appropriate arrangements for late night shopping and also, should they desire to do so, to make applications to the Industrial Commission as provided by the new sections enacted by clause 5.

It is indicated here that there will be a time delay between the passage of this Bill, if it does pass, and when it is proclaimed. Is it to be, as the Premier has indicated, a Christmas present? A newspaper report on July 18 states:

Despite a looming battle over night shopping, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) today predicted that Friday night shopping would be operating in Adelaide before Christmas.

Is this delay so that people can be given a Christmas present, or is it a booby prize that

will come into force if it does go forward? I cannot argue with the provisions of clause 3, because this clause tidies up an area of indecision regarding some trading practices relating to the definition of shop trading and, of the Bill before us, this is the only clause I can support without argument. Clause 4, as I have already indicated, denies access to red meat and I am sure the time will come when members opposite will be giving their support to an amendment to alter that provision.

Mr. Payne: Don't hang your hat on that.

Dr. EASTICK: Why not? Members opposite were giving me so much help while I was speaking, I thought they would be giving me help in that regard, too. This clause also provides for 12.30 p.m. closing on Saturdays. Members on this side indicated earlier that, although it is not likely that persons employed as shop assistants would be called on to work until 12.30 p.m. on Saturday, provision was written into the legislation and the opportunity existed for employees to be worked until 12.30 p.m.; therefore, I believe that the retention of this provision is completely unacceptable.

Clause 5 recognizes that there are regular part-time employees but, regarding the comments from members opposite that there will be no loss of employment or retrenchment, although the Minister knows that the number of persons employed in part-time employment can be greatly increased he includes the word "regular" part-time employment as an acknowledgment that there will be a number of regular part-time employees.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: There is now.

Dr. EASTICK: But many of those are on a non-regular basis. The inclusion of the word "regular" means an acknowledgment by members opposite that the situation will arise where there will be an increased number of regular part-time employees.

Mr. McRae: That is in the award now.

Dr. EASTICK: We could have a situation where there would be a considerably decreased number of permanent employees. I refer to new sections 221 (c) and 221 (d). These sections take the initiative from an owner and put the onus on the employees to determine the way the shop will remain open. This is an area in which there was considerable conflict among members of the Shop Assistants Union in their discussions with the Trades and Labour Council on June 30 last. Provision is made for the employer to make application on behalf of his employees to determine an alternative

method of employment. This is entirely wrong, because no-one is better able to determine the way he should conduct his business than the employer. He provides the opportunity for employment to people who know, before they enter his employment, what hours they will work. This provision takes from the manager the opportunity to make that decision.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Where does it say that?

Dr. EASTICK: The employer will determine the genuine desire of employees. One could not be so naive as to believe that employees will not make their thoughts known to the employer.

Mr. McRae: They can't make an application.

Dr. EASTICK: They can certainly indicate their desire. I point out that it would be a difficult situation for an employer, having had the point made to him that the employees want certain working conditions, not to give them the opportunity to be heard or to have a ballot conducted on their behalf.

Mr. Coumbe: Quite impossible.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. The point I make is that those with managerial skill and knowledge should determine the type of business and the conduct of the business that they are conducting. An employee should know this. If he wishes, he can move from that employment and choose employment with working hours that best suit him.

In introducing the Bill, the Government has not properly considered the cost factor that will obviously be involved in this matter. This might well be called a forced political levy Bill. It will increase costs of people in the community for the benefit (so they believe) of members of the Labor Party. It could be described as the "keep the members for Mawson, Playford and Tea Tree Gully in their seats Bill".

Mr. McRae: Most unkind.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, but very true. Statements attributed to the members for Playford and Mawson appear in the *News* of July 18. The report states:

Mr. Don Hopgood, Mawson, said a recent national survey showed that four out of five people favoured night shopping.

It would be interesting to see where this national survey appeared.

Mr. Hopgood: You'll find out.

Dr. EASTICK: The report continues:

"My area would have a greater demand than this for Friday night trading," he said.

This corresponds with the poll.

Mr. Hopgood: The same as yours.

Dr. EASTICK: I assure the honourable member it is not the same as mine. In his case the poll was conducted by telephone and he did not think much of it, although it did confirm his opinion. The report continues to quote the member for Mawson as follows:

"I think people still want Friday night shopping. I am still keen to see it come in."

The report continues:

Mr. Terry McRae, Playford, said: "I have no doubt that in my electorate there is still a very strong demand for Friday night shopping."

I have not seen any evidence of this in my movements through his district, nor have I heard of it from people there to whom I have spoken.

Mr. Hopgood: On your way home every night.

Dr. EASTICK: Not every night. The article continues to quote the member for Playford as follows:

I do not believe the strength of this demand has dropped.

I assure the member for Elizabeth that, in the opinion of many people in his district, the demand has dropped. The article continues to quote the member for Playford, as follows:

"On the question of possible cost increases . . . when Friday night shopping was removed at Elizabeth, costs did not drop."

I agree, because these stores were parasitic, relying on the inner area, and they are the first to admit it. If the Bill is passed, they will not be able to be parasitic and to rely on the inner area: that is the big difference.

Mr. Clark: They didn't want to lose it.

Dr. EASTICK: They are big enough and capable enough, as are members on this side, to accept the changing circumstances and to decide on the situation as it is today.

Mr. Clark: I saw this crowd in action, as you did. I was there, as you were..

Dr. EASTICK: I have seen other crowds in action, too. In due course, I shall offer the House an opportunity of amending this Bill.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I am surprised that it is the same person, in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition, speaking to us this evening who spoke to us two years ago in his then capacity as the member for Gawler.

Dr. Eastick: No, definitely not.

Mr. McRAE: I beg his pardon—the member for Light. On October 21, 1970, the then member for Light (the present Leader of the Opposition) said:

I will take no part in a curfew on Friday nights in the districts of. Playford, Salisbury,

Elizabeth, Gawler, Christies Beach and elsewhere; yet a curfew is specifically what the Bill aims to provide.

He said "I will take no part in a curfew." What a change of attitude he has had in the meantime! About the same time a famous meeting was held at the Octagon Theatre.

Mr. Clark: A non-political meeting!

Mr. McRAE: It was a non-political meeting, as described by some people, but I recall my political opponent then, the Mayor of Elizabeth (Mr. Duffield), was involved in that meeting. I recall that by coincidence he happened to be my opponent and that the member for Light said, "I will take no part in a curfew in the area." As an empire builder, he did not stop in his own district: he had a particular interest in Elizabeth and Playford. I was most interested to hear his analysis this evening. However, I will return to that later. The main point this evening, after a discussion of the principles I have adopted consistently throughout, unlike the Leader of the Opposition and unlike his brethren, that I shall be putting to the House is that there has been a monstrous conspiracy between the Retail Traders Association, the Shop Assistants Union and the newspapers, hand in hand, odd bedfellows though they may be, to mislead the public. As a part of this conspiracy, which involves also the wellknown Adelaide public relations firm of Holden, Jennings and Associates, considerable pressure has been put on the Leader. I will deal with that later in more detail and demonstrate with some particularity how I can back that up. I see that the Leader has left the Chamber.

Mr. Clark: The meeting was packed with Liberal and Country League members.

Mr. McRAE: I must correct the member for Gawler: the first eight rows, luckily for us, were packed with waterside workers; it was the next four rows that were packed with Liberal and Country League members. I recall that the member for Florey on one occasion was forced to approach the rostrum during this allegedly non-political debate to protect the member for Tea Tree Gully. Throughout all this affair, I have adopted the same fundamental principle that I shall continue to apply—that in solving a problem of this kind we must balance the interests of three groups—the community as a whole, the employers, and the employees. This has been the basis of my conclusions throughout, and it continues to be so.

In 1970 my own Party, by a majority decision of Caucus, decided to change its

election policy and introduce a Bill which, in effect, provided a curfew in this area. I told my electors at the Octagon Theatre, above the howls provoked by Mr. Duffield (and I say publicly in this House) that the reason for that was that I had signed a pledge, which I was determined to honour, to uphold the policy of the Labor Party and a majority decision of Caucus. I had nothing to hide at that stage, nor have I anything to hide now.

Following that, exercising my right as a member of the Labor Party and as a member of Caucus, I did everything in my power, as did other members in those areas, including in particular the member for Tea Tree Gully, the member for Mawson, the member for Elizabeth and the member for Salisbury, to change the Party's policy, on the basis that we believed that the people in our electoral districts wanted Friday night shopping. We were pleased to be able to report to our constituents that we had succeeded in that endeavour, and in making that endeavour we were not unconscious of either the cost factor to the public or the position of the shop assistant. I shall have much pleasure in a moment in returning to the position of the shop assistant, because herein lies a very interesting tale.

However, earlier this year, following the efforts of the members I have mentioned and others, our Party's policy was changed, and at that point, in all conscience, we could support the Bill that was introduced by our Government, and that we did. It was defeated in shameful circumstances in the Legislative Council, mainly as a result of the evidence of one Glowrey, to whom I shall refer later, this Glowrey being the manager of Myer S.A. Stores Limited. Again this measure has been introduced, and again I support it. I do so for three reasons: first, because it is my Party's policy, which has been ironed out, taking into account all the changing circumstances to which the Leader referred; secondly, because I believe that it is right and that it has balanced the interests I have referred to; thirdly, because I believe it is still the wish of my electorate.

On the last point, I wish to turn to an informal survey conducted in the Elizabeth area by a friend of mine. This person had two qualifications only: honesty and intelligence. He was not a professional surveyor. He was not someone from the *News* or the *Advertiser*, which are largely financed by the retail traders who are opposing this Bill, or anyone hand in hand with the Shop Assistants Union.

Mr. Clark: And he didn't do it on the telephone, either.

Mr. McRAE: Therein lies a very interesting story. It will not be printed, however, because it will be embargoed by the Retail Traders Association as soon as I have stopped, but it will be in *Hansard* for anyone to refer to. The member for Mawson will be referring to a national survey that was conducted, but I shall refer to that conducted in my district. This honest and intelligent person, to whom I have referred, interviewed 56 people aged between 20 years and 60 years, and the result of the survey showed that 37 persons said they wanted a return of Friday night shopping, 14 said they did not, and five were undecided. As honourable members will find out, that is very close to the percentage result obtained in the national survey. I agree that it is not a scientific survey and that it does not carry the weight of a referendum or of a Gallup poll, but aligned with the national survey to which my colleague will refer it is, to say the least, somewhat interesting.

Not for the first time, I am reminding members of the disgraceful propaganda put out at the time of the referendum. Not for the first time, people are being misled about the contents of this Bill. Of course, nothing of what I say will be permitted to be made public but those who are listening should understand that only two years ago the Shop Assistants Union had virtually no membership in the retail trade (there was a potential membership of 50,000 and an actual membership of perhaps 1,500), but what was the reason for this? It was that the retail traders were then, and still are, the most primitive employers known in this country. That is saying something, because I have acted as an advocate against the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and the Chamber of Manufactures, and, when I refer to an employer as being primitive, I mean primitive; after all, I have seen some of these people in action. These primitive employers stand over their employees and they have deliberately prevented the union from gaining any access to membership.

Then two years ago an interesting thing happened. Suddenly, a secret agreement was entered into between the Retail Traders Association nationally and the Shop Assistants Union nationally. I have not seen the contents of the secret agreement made under the auspices of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, but I suspect that two elements were involved. I

am not referring only to suspicion: I am talking about the facts as well. I will start with suspicions. I suspect that two elements were involved. First, the union is a moderate union, and I support and congratulate it. As a result of the infiltration of certain militant and extremist elements in other parts of the industry, the retail traders saw the writing on the wall and, as many employers have done, particularly in the service industries, they thought it better to have a compulsory union agreement to keep the militants out and the moderate union in rather than take the chance that, because of the primitive industrial conditions, the extremists could get in.

The second point was that Bob Hawke had taken over as President of the A.C.T.U., and the retail traders had plenty to hide then and now. Among other things they had to hide was the disgraceful retail price maintenance agreement. Various stores in Melbourne were only too pleased to have the heat taken off by Mr. Hawke in return for entering into the agreement. Instead of a union with only 1,500 members out of a potential 50,000 members, suddenly we have a union with 10,000 members, and it is still growing. I am sure I will be forgiven, because he is a good friend of mine, notwithstanding his recent scurrilous statement about me, but, instead of referring to the Secretary of the union as "little Teddy of Grote Street," he is now referred to as "Lord Teddy of South Terrace". That is because, within a couple of years, he might be by far the biggest union boss in the State.

That is not the end of the matter, however. It is a peculiar situation. I have acted for the union for many years, and I have also acted for big unions in the service industries. I recall these primitive (I might almost say barbarian) employers such as Myers, Woolworths and Coles and the way they used to treat the union when it was a less powerful organization. The members I always pity, and I admire Mr. Goldsworthy's courage displayed against tremendous odds in trying to help them. Their wages were disgracefully low, and still are. Their conditions of work were very bad, and still are, and they were being disgracefully exploited, particularly by some of the nabobs in the American-owned Rundle Street stores of Woolworths and Coles, about 90 per cent of whose employees are young girls of 15, 16 or 17 years of age, perhaps even younger.

Do honourable members think that Mr. Goldsworthy, having put up with 15 years of victimization by these people, remembers? He has a small membership union, a limited budget, and a group of primitive employers determined to keep him out. Do honourable members think that he will suddenly become friendly with them unless there is some kind of deal? No, I do not believe that. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, do you really think that these same primitive barbarian employers who have hated and exploited that union for so many years suddenly will become buddy buddy with Mr. Goldsworthy? No, I do not believe that. The real reason is the secret agreement, which has never been disclosed to the public, between the Shop Assistants Union nationally and the Retail Traders Federation.

It works in the way I shall explain. The Shop Assistants Union promises to help the Retail Traders Federation as and when it can in relation to shopping hours. For example, in New South Wales the Shop Assistants Union will help the retailers in that State to get late-night shopping because that is the deal for that State, but in South Australia the Retailers do not want late-night shopping, so the union helps in that respect here. There is more to it than that: it goes deeper. Enshrined in the retail trade in this State is the Vice-President of the Liberal Party (Mr. Ian Hayward), and also enshrined in the Retail Traders Federation is a coterie of gentlemen involved in Adelaide's banking and commercial interests who happen to inhabit a place down the aisle, so we have a curious collection of bedfellows. We have the Shop Assistants Union, the Retail Traders Federation, the Vice-President of the Liberal Party, and Adelaide's commercial and banking interests tucked away down the corridor.

I ask honourable members to check that. We have representatives from both sides sitting in the gallery, and I doubt that they will deny this. They know it is true. The way the deal works is that the two groups get together, each one having done a deal but each one being completely suspicious of the other. Let us not have any doubt of that. It is like the Russian Ambassador and the American Ambassador taking up quarters in the same place for the night. Each one may rest his head on the pillow, but each one has a gun under the pillow.

The Shop Assistants Union wants a five-day week: that is the union's objective. Mr. Goldsworthy sees that the great breakthrough in South Australia would be a five-day week,

and that is what he has been aiming at all along. The Retail Traders Federation in South Australia does not want Friday night shopping, because it sees that it is not a tremendously economic proposition for it. The community comes third in all this. The Shop Assistants Union and the Retail Traders Federation have much to say in their own interests, but the community has no say.

I have set the background to the sort of situation with which we are dealing, and now I brand it as a monstrous conspiracy designed to mislead the South Australian public. I shall go further and give examples. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that at the time of the referendum the Government said and even back-benchers on this side said that it and they (in which I had no part) supported the "Yes" case, but the "No" case was handled by Holden, Jennings and Associates, who are public relation officers, and that firm was employed and paid by the Retail Traders Federation. They presented a monstrously misleading advertisement in the *Advertiser* on the Saturday of the referendum, suggesting to the people in the inner metropolitan area that, if they voted "Yes" in the referendum, they would lose Saturday morning shopping. That suggestion was not true, as the union, the Retail Traders Federation, and Holden, Jennings and Associates knew.

That is one feature that has been perpetuated since, and I have it on fairly reliable authority that the same firm has been retained throughout by the Retail Traders Federation. I presume the cost will be added on to the prices we will be paying for the goods. The price question, with which I shall deal in a minute, is significant, too. The significant facts there have been kept well away from the public. One may ask why is it that so few people are in possession of information such as I have given and why is this not known to the public. The reason is obvious, if we pick up today's *News* or *Advertiser* and look at the space taken up by the retail stores in their advertising. It is obvious that many pages of our daily newspapers are taken up by the advertising of retail traders.

Also, I might add, because of the network of commercial interests, involving the Upper House, the Treasurer of the Liberal Party, the Retail Traders Association, etc., the boards of the various establishments tend to comprise the same people. Therefore, if they want to gag something, they do so; but, if they want to highlight something, they make sure it is made public. That is what has been going on, and

I challenge anyone to dispute that. Now, we have a cunning new campaign under way, and the first point deals with cost. Now we come to another tactical move worked out between the Shop Assistants Union and the Retail Traders Association. Let me not be inconsistent: the wages for shop assistants were, and still are, disgracefully low. I have maintained that over a period of years; I maintained that with the union long before it was in its present position of power; and no official of that union will deny it.

But how interesting it was that a wage increase, due to come into operation on September 1, should be announced about two days before Parliament met to consider this Bill. There are two interesting things about that: first, it is most unusual for employers and employees to make a joint announcement about wages. Obviously, because the Secretary of the union is proud of his achievement, he and his executive (and rightly so) ask for the kudos associated with it. But, no, on this occasion the Retail Traders Association and the Shop Assistants Union got together with Holden, Jennings and Associates and arranged for the *Sunday Mail* to cover this. They made the announcement two months in advance, with the deliberate intention of embarrassing the Government. That was the first thing that happened. Secondly, people were meant to think that this wage rise was in some way related to shopping hours. Of course it was not; that wage rise was merely an attempt by the Retail Traders Association to buy off the inevitable equal pay situation that will come in. They know that, and anyone can ask their representatives here this evening what was the truth. The fact of the matter was that each side had to take a gamble, and the retail traders knew that there was more than a 50-50 chance that they could get equal pay. Equal pay will come, and increased wages will come, regardless of an increase or decrease in shopping hours, because the situation in the industry has been disgraceful, not through the fault of the union (because of the history I gave previously) but because of primitive and barbarian employers. Although I do not refer to employers generally in that way, I must single out as one of the most primitive and most barbarian of them Mr. Glowrey, who is the Manager or ex-Manager of Myer S.A. Stores Limited. That person, allegedly a democrat, once put the proposition to his employees: if you vote for me, you keep your jobs; if you vote against me, you lose them; which way would you like to vote? That

gentleman, who as a manager of Myers has a vested interest, especially in the *News* but also in the *Advertiser*, carefully sabotaged the discussions that were going on in the other place. We have reached a disgraceful situation in this State about which most of us in this House have known about for some years, although many people outside do not know that, whatever the truth may be and whatever is put to this House, it means nothing, because the people of another place who have a vested interest and have dirty hidden secret deals, who conspire with different companies and have secret documents, can sabotage it anyway. I know what happened on that night. There was almost complete agreement until Mr. Democracy Glowrey arrived on the scene and said, "If you put that through there will be less funds for the Liberal Party".

Members interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: I have made many serious allegations, and I challenge any member to deny them. However, they will not be able to deny them. I happen to be in a unique position to know the truth: I have worked for each side one way or the other in this service industry over a long period of years, and I know what their attitudes are towards each other. I know what is the attitude of the Shop Assistants Union to Myers: it hates that firm's guts, and rightly so, because that is an extremely primitive company. Is it feasible that, suddenly, the same people who publicly announced year after year what they thought of Myers (or Woolworths or Coles) in not very polite terms, as being non-union standover shops in the American tradition, will suddenly become friends with them? Am I to understand that this has happened because they decided to be friendly? I cannot accept that.

Regarding the question of cost, which is more important, the Retail Traders Federation is in a hell of a mess, because it has even more to hide in this area. It does not dare disclose to the public its true cost situation. I ask any member to look at the balance sheet for any large store (John Martins, Myers, or any other store) over the past five or 10 years and see the profits that have been made. I defy any member opposite to suggest that these people cannot absorb the cost of 2½ hours trading on the Friday night (not the whole wage increase, because that would come anyway) if the employees decide to vote that way. Those companies have much to hide because, when the pressure was put on them by Mr. Hawke during the Dunlop case, they were the first to back out. True, they had much to hide and

they did not want to see it come out into the open.

I am currently acting for a small retail electrical organization in this city which is attempting, against massive opposition from commercial interests (including the Retail Traders Federation), to try and obtain a hearing before a Commissioner on Restrictive Trade Practices regarding the non-supply of goods. This company will not agree to charge the scandalously high and overpriced rate required by restrictive trade and price agreements. These stores and the manufacturers have been robbing the South Australian public blind for years and they have been getting away with it because they have such a vested interest in the *News*. But for the deal made between the Shops Assistants Union and the Retail Traders Federation, the union would have been saying exactly the same thing as I am saying. In fact, it was always part of the union's case that the scandalous profits made by these organizations demonstrated the need for an elevation in the position of the shop assistant. As a result of these circumstances these myths are perpetuated on the public. Members opposite are saying that costs will go up. Let the Retail Traders Federation justify that. How can they go up? Let them tell the public what their mark-up profit is from cost to sale price on these goods. I went to a number of retail stores, attempting to buy a washing machine. I was fair. I went to all the major Rundle Street stores, Myers South Australia Stores Limited, David Jones (Adelaide) Limited, John Martin and Company Limited—the lot. On each occasion, going to the appropriate place, I nominated a number of brands and the style and detail that were required to be on the machine.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you working for *Choice*?

Mr. McRAE: No, I was conducting a purely scientific test survey. On each occasion I asked the sales person, "What is the price of the machine?" On each occasion the sales person replied, "We cannot tell you that; we first have to know what trade-in you have." I said, "I have not got one. All I want to know is how much it costs." I was told, "We are sorry, but we cannot tell you. If, for instance, you bring in an old shaver we can give you a discount, and then we can give you a price, but we cannot give you a price now."

As can be imagined, I was not put off by that. I stood my ground and said to the Manager (by this stage I had gone past the individual sales person). "There is such a

thing as consumer protection legislation in South Australia and the restrictive trade practices legislation, and I still want to know the price of the machine." In each case, I was told, "Go easy on us. The fact is there is a deal going on between us and the manufacturer, but we cannot say anything, because if we do our jobs will be in jeopardy." Then they produced a book from their pockets (and I swear this is the truth) and said, "The true price to us is \$X." If a pensioner or a person who was not prepared to stand their ground had gone into the shop and asked to buy a washing machine, what scandalous price would they have been asked to pay for it? The answer is any price at all. In fact, I suggest the stores would have gone further, saying to that wretched person, "Bring in an old shaver worth nothing." They would then have given a fictitious price of \$10 for it, increasing the price of the machine by \$20 to make that up. Then they would have sold it on hire-purchase through their subsidiary finance company, getting a mark-up there as well.

I suggest that is true, and I challenge representatives of the Retail Traders Association to deny it. They know damn well it is true. One of the reasons they can do this is that they have the newspapers in their pockets. The so-called proud journalists of South Australia would like to tell the truth, but they would lose their jobs if they did. They are told what to do. This is a disgraceful situation. What can the ordinary citizen do about the daylight robbery by the oil companies and the retail traders? Can he go to the court under the restrictive trade practices legislation? I have a client who is doing this. Although he is wealthy, even he has been placed in extreme difficulties because in every way the interests to which I refer have made damn sure that throughout the proceedings legal technicalities and difficulties have been placed in our way. The venue of the trial is constantly being shifted from State to State in order to ensure the maximum cost to my client as the attempt is made to jackboot him down.

Jackboot Glowrey and his associates of the Retail Traders Association have been deceiving the members of this community for far too long. I assure members that they have never deceived me and do not now deceive me, and I am sure that they do not deceive shop assistants and their representatives. In this case, we have an example of strange bedfellows holding hands to try to get something through. Long last on the list comes the poor

old member of the community who is being misled and swindled all along the line. I am not frightened of a word of what I have said.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: I say it here under absolute privilege.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Will you say it outside the House?

Mr. McRAE: I will say it outside; in fact, I have said it outside, and some of the people sitting in the gallery at the moment know that very well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to the people in the gallery.

Mr. McRAE: The Government has done the best it can to deal with a very difficult situation. This issue is one that the previous Government tossed around from hand to hand like a hot potato. I do not blame it for doing nothing. If it could get away with it, good luck to it. Both the member for Torrens and the member for Mitcham (former Ministers of Labour and Industry) know that what I say is true: the previous Government tossed it from one Minister to another to try to get out of it. However, this Government has done something about it. I do not say it has solved the problem, but the only argument that can be put up against us is that in some way the shop assistants are not getting a fair deal under this Bill. I say they are getting a very reasonable deal. In fact, they are getting what many of them specifically asked for on the last occasion and what some of our friends among the retail traders also asked for on the last occasion. There is provision in the Bill for a ballot. That is one valid argument that the shop assistants are in some way being let down. The only other valid argument is that costs will rise. If that happens it will be scandalous. This community has been robbed for so long. I am disgusted at the way costs have risen over the past two years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: I am disgusted when I sit in this House and hear the trade unions condemned for their wage claims and at the same time hear the same people who are condemning them for an alleged imposition on the community, letting the retail traders and the manufacturers get in on this disgusting racket, an imposition on the public for many years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: If costs rise this time, it will not be the fault of the Government: it will be

the fault of the retailers' ring, and of no-one else.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker—

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As you know, Sir, I am fairly shy and retiring. I am easily put off by interjections.

Mr. Ryan: Then let's give you a few.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That ill behoves the Deputy Speaker. I was going to congratulate the Government on so manoeuvring this debate as to bring it on on Commonwealth Budget night, thus minimizing the publicity it will get outside. That is the only matter for congratulation that I can see in this debate, and I certainly do not congratulate the member for Playford on the things he has said. I found most of what he said irrelevant to the Bill and most offensive to those involved in the retail industry, both on the side of the employers and of the employees. I felt that he added little to the debate on this subject.

I do not intend to speak for very long in this debate, because this is the third time we have been over the same ground during the life of this Parliament. I simply remind members that on March 21, when I spoke in the second reading debate on a similar Bill, I said that the then Bill (and I can say it of this Bill) was a monument to three things: first of all, the bungling and ineptitude of the Government; secondly, its political opportunism; and thirdly, its domination by the trade union movement. The Bill of which I originally said these things failed, and the Government is consequently still on the hook. It is amusing now to remember the patronizing attitude of the then new Government in 1970, soon after it came into office. The member for Torrens and I, as members of the previous Government, were reproved for not taking any action while we were in office and the Government was busy in the first flush of office congratulating itself on the courage and foresight it was showing in tackling this difficult problem which it was going to solve after taking a referendum to test the opinion of the State.

That was what we heard soon after the Government came into office, and yet on July 1 last we saw in the *Advertiser*, that much maligned journal to which the member for Playford has referred in his speech, the report of a speech by the Premier at a meeting of the Trades and Labor Council. He was discussing this matter; indeed, the news article is headed "T.L.C. switches policy on shopping". The

member for Playford has talked about consistency in this matter. He has suggested that he and other members on his side of the House have been consistent, but the only consistency I can see in their attitude has been, "My Party, right or wrong; whatever the Party decides, I will follow". That is about as consistent as any of them have been.

This was just one of the switches of policy on shopping. It is rather revealing in the reasons given by the Premier, because the switch took place, according to this report, following a speech by him. The vote followed an address by the Premier. The article states:

Mr. Dunstan said that, despite the referendum against Friday night shopping, it was evident the situation in the outer metropolitan area had not settled down.

I do not know what is meant by the phrase "settled down"; it is not explained here. What he meant, I suppose, was that there were still people who wanted Friday night shopping. The article continues:

"We now propose," he said, "two alternatives on late night shopping, with adequate safeguards."

He then went on to explain that. But (and this is a significant part of the report, and I invite any honourable member opposite, or perhaps the Minister, to say whether or not this is an accurate report) the report goes on:

"If we don't break through in this issue—and remember, this was his third attempt to break through—

we will be in dire trouble in March," Mr. Dunstan said. "We can't afford to endanger the Labor movement. If we put the whole weight behind this, we can settle it and provide legislation to protect the working people in this State."

In other words, the Government believes that it will lose the three seats, namely, Tea Tree Gully, Mawson and Playford, if it does not restore what it took away from the people of those areas, namely, late night shopping on Fridays. Here we have the Premier beseeching the Trades and Labor Council to change its policy so that it can have another go to restore what had been taken away. The member for Playford can try to tip the bucket over Mr. Glowrey and other retailers in Adelaide as hard as he likes, but it will not make the slightest difference, because we know the real reason behind the Bill and the persistence of the Government in trying to do something about this issue.

So we have this third attempt before us. My own view (and I believe and hope I have

been consistent; indeed, I think I have more reason to have more confidence in my consistency than have Government members) is that there should be freedom in trading and that shopkeepers, large or small, should be able to open to trade when they like and to close when they like. We still have a long way to go before we reach that situation. It would mean the complete repeal of the early closing provisions in the Industrial Code, but at least, Friday night shopping is one small step in that direction.

Much has been said by my Leader and by Government members about public opinion on this matter, but one could argue this back and forth. We have heard of surveys, telephone polls, etc. The latest I know, if my view is at all reliable, is the Gallup Poll of December, 1971, an Australian-wide poll, which states:

In every State most people approve Victoria's new law for around-the-clock shopping from Monday morning until 1 p.m. Saturday. . . . Young people are most keen on around-the-clock shopping. The favorable majority included 72 per cent of those aged 16-20, 68 per cent of those 21-29 and 60 per cent of those 30-49, compared with 51 per cent of those aged 50-69 and only 48 per cent of those over 70. The usual comment was, "More convenient, particularly for working mothers and shift workers". Others said, "Shopkeepers should be allowed to open when they like" or, "Provided the staff are rostered and have time off".

Another report to much the same effect was published last March in the *Advertiser*. In my view, there is no doubt whatever that, overall, people want longer hours of trading, but what are the arguments against this? First, there is the question of costs, and the retail traders and the Shop Assistants Union have concentrated on this argument. The member for Playford referred to the increases in wages under the new award but, in my view, this is not an argument that can sustain opposition to late night trading. We know that, unfortunately, wages are constantly rising and that there is constant inflation in the economy. Although this may provide ammunition in the short run, the situation created by the new award will disappear within a comparatively short time, say, a year or two. In my view, that is not an argument, except for those who are looking for arguments to oppose late night shopping.

The other argument that has been advanced is that the experience in New South Wales and Victoria does not justify our providing for late-night trading and that that trading has been a failure there. Well, I do not know. In the *Advertiser* of July 28 there

are reports of the position in New South Wales and Victoria, and to my mind neither of those reports justifies the argument against introducing late-night trading here. For example, in Victoria the feeling is that late-night shopping is there to stay, despite the opinion in many quarters that it is not needed and has not improved business. Much the same comment is made about New South Wales. There we have it. My view is that there should be Friday night trading as well as Saturday morning trading.

Mr. Langley: Shopkeepers do not have to stay open.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right, and for once I am pleased that the member for Unley has interjected, because I have nearly missed making the point that, if traders do not want to stay open, they are not obliged to do so. If they consider that it is not in their interests economically to stay open, it is not necessary for them to do so, and they will be able to shut their premises. If this is happening in New South Wales and Victoria in some instances, in my view that reinforces the argument in favour of late-night shopping rather than goes against it.

I shall deal briefly with the clauses of the Bill. I must say that I do not like the measure. I do not even like it as much as I liked the condition of earlier Bills that have been brought into this place.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't tell me they're getting worse!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is possible, they are. I do not like clause 5. That is the cause by which Parliament pretends to lay down the working conditions of those employed in shops, who are defined as shop assistants. I have said before and I repeat that this matter should be regulated and determined by industrial tribunals, not by Parliament. That is not our job. Parliament has established an Industrial Commission and an Industrial Court and these bodies should have the responsibility on industrial matters.

Quite apart from the effect on shops assistants, the implications of this sort of legislation for the community are immense. Whenever we are unfortunate enough to have a Labor Government in this State, any union that cannot get what it wants through the industrial tribunals will simply lean on the Trades and Labor Council to bring pressure on the Government to get, by legislation, what the union has failed to get through the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Hopgood: How is the Law Society going?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This principle is extremely bad, and the interjection by the member for Mawson shows that he knows the force of what I have said. He tries to divert me and to cloud the point by mentioning the Law Society. I hope that, if the member for Mawson speaks in this debate (and, after all, in the Premier's words, the Bill has been introduced to save him) he will deal with this point. I am sure that, if he does, he will have much difficulty about not agreeing with what I have said. This legislation is an extremely bad precedent and I utterly oppose it.

We had a little by-play a short time ago about whether this Bill is worse than its predecessors. In my view, it is. Clause 5 is most complex. As I read it, three systems of working are laid down. It is not easy to follow through, with great deference to the draftsman, who no doubt has carried out his instructions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not referring to public servants in the debate. It is grossly unfair, and any reflections on any of the officers of Parliament should be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Under new section 22le, we have provision for a postal ballot, which is to be held to ascertain the genuine desire of the shop assistants concerned, but there is no suggestion as to the form of question to be put. Presumably, this matter will be decided by the Industrial Commission in due course. I just give one word of warning to the Government and to its supporters: much of the trouble into which they have fallen regarding this matter was because of the inept wording of the question in the referendum they imposed on the people of this State in 1970.

What is to be the form of the question in this case? We know what we have to do, and we know that the views expressed by a simple majority of the votes cast in the ballot will be decisive, but whether or not those views are worth anything depends on the form of the question put in the ballot. We do not know this, and Parliament apparently is to give no guidance on it. For these reasons, I intend, when the time comes, vigorously to oppose clause 5. I intend to support the second reading because, if that clause is left out, subject to one other matter of amendment to which we will come in due course, I believe that the Bill is a step in the right direction.

But it is not a step in the right direction with clause 5 included.

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): I speak in this debate, simply because I represent an area in South Australia that retains Friday night shopping. I would probably be one of the few members in this House at present in whose district Friday night shopping is still conducted. I believe that the last time I spoke on this matter I said that the retail industry in my district had problems regarding Friday night shopping, and I believe it still has those problems, although I say this with perhaps less vigour than that displayed by my colleague the member for Playford, who outlined the problems confronting the industry. One of the major problems involved in relation to Friday night shopping concerns the small retailer, who is remote from the consumer.

Friday night shopping came about as a result of the activities of the big retailers who, by design, established enterprises in areas where the number of consumers was rapidly growing and so captured the consumer market. Whether or not the Bill is passed at this stage, I wonder what will happen in my district when the proposed new award increase is introduced. It seems to me that there may then be further problems in the industry. The Bill, in my opinion, is a simple measure.

Mr. Mathwin: We had a referendum to fix it.

Mr. BROWN: We can talk about a referendum if we wish, but let us see what the Bill is all about. It simply provides for a 40-hour week for shop assistants, to be worked in five days. Is this not a terrible step forward! Yet it is something that every major industry has, and the retail industry is a large industry and one of the last, if not the last, to provide a 40-hour week spread over five days. That this is not the case is unheard of in any other situation: some industries are already providing a 35-hour week. This is a shocking thing that this Government is bringing forward! It should have been done years ago, but then members opposite were the worst offenders.

Mr. Mathwin: What about overtime?

Mr. BROWN: The member for Glenelg should remember that overtime is worked in every industry. Indeed, it always appals me that, every time the trade union movement or those representing the working class people of this country advocate an increase in workers' wages or, as in this instance, a decrease in the hours to be worked, some people (and we know those people are supporting the Opposition in this House) make a public outcry.

This happened when a similar Bill was before the House on the last occasion, and it is happening now.

Those retailers currently opening on Friday evening do not have to do so under this Bill, nor do they have to open on a Saturday morning. This whole problem is a matter of overtime. Indeed, I do not believe that the matter of Friday night shopping comes under this Bill as far as the economics of shopping are concerned. Friday night shopping previously involved the payment of overtime and, in my district, it still does. It has always been paid under the award at time and a half and always will be so paid. The major problem regarding Saturday morning shopping and the wages to be paid for that time is, even though I am not an authority on economics—

Mr. Gunn: That is obvious from listening to you.

Mr. BROWN: Nor is the member for Eyre, either. However, I have had much experience in dealing with industrial awards. Regarding the award of the Shop Assistants Union, Saturday morning work draws a penalty rate. The only difference under this Bill is that, instead of Saturday morning being paid at time and a quarter for 21 hours, it will be paid at time and a half. The matter is as simple as that. The ordinary shop assistant receives \$55.20 a week, or 1.38 an hour. If he works a 37½-hour week at ordinary time he would receive \$51.75, and Saturday morning at time and a quarter for 2½ hours would yield about \$4.31. In Whyalla, where shop assistants work 40 hours in 5½ days, this would mean that they would be paid about \$56.

Under the Bill, with a 40-hour five-day week, the same shop assistants would receive \$55.20 for working 40 hours from Monday to Friday. Because he would not receive the penalty rate for Saturday morning, he would get a decrease in wages for working the same number of hours. Assuming he still works 2½ hours on the Saturday morning at the rate of time and a half (which the rate would have to be), this would increase his wages by \$5.17 a week to a total of \$60.30 a week. I believe that works out at an extra \$4 or \$5 a week. That is not a huge financial burden to be placed on a retail organization, bearing in mind that the shop assistant is working for more than 40 hours. In any other industry, if a worker were required to work the extra hours, he would receive additional wages.

The proposed new award to apply in about six months entails an increase of possibly \$9 a week. Under this award, the shop assistant's

rate would increase from \$55.20 to \$64.20. If 37½ hours were worked in a 5½-day week, as is worked at present in the metropolitan area, this would mean a weekly rate of about \$60. If we add 2½ hours to make a 40-hour week, with this extra time being paid at the rate of time and a quarter, that amounts to about \$2 an hour, thus increasing the wage by about \$5 and making the total \$65. Under the new award, which provides for a maximum of \$9 a week, the total wage rate of shop assistants working 5½ days a week would be \$65 a week. This would mean an additional 69c for the Saturday morning. For the 40 hours worked from Monday to Friday, the rate would be \$65, with no overtime. For 2½ hours work on Saturday morning the rate would be time and a half, working out at \$2.40 an hour and bringing an extra \$6, the total being \$71. I point out that, in comparison with the old award, despite the extra \$9 a week, the increase would be only about 83c. It does not add up for the Retail Traders Association to say that economically it cannot afford to have a 40-hour week worked in five days.

Opposition members are great gamblers, as they always seem to want to bet 20c each way. In this case I think there are only two horses racing. On August 3 (the day after the Bill was introduced), the *News* reported the Leader of the Opposition as saying that he might oppose the Bill; he did not know whether he would oppose it or support it. The article states:

Opposition Leader, Dr. Eastick, indicated today he could oppose the Government's legislation for Friday night shopping. He said there was still no clear indication from the public as to whether it supported the reintroduction of Friday night shopping. "Open support for Friday night shopping has always been on the condition that it would not increase costs," he said.

I do not think that the provisions of the Bill would mean increased costs, because shop assistants were always paid at the rate of time and a half when Friday night shopping operated in the past. So there will be no increase. The shopkeeper pays the award rate and opens his shop only because he has captured the consumer market. That is the only reason, so there is no increase. The Leader of the Opposition says in this article that Friday night shopping would increase costs: of what? What about the last occasion when the same thing occurred? Let us face it.

Dr. Eastick: Where will it occur? It will be right across the metropolitan area, not just in the fringe areas?

Mr. BROWN: I do not know what the Leader is getting on to with costs.

Dr. Eastick: It is important.

Mr. BROWN: Friday night shopping does not alter it at all; the only thing that alters it is Saturday morning shopping.

Dr. Eastick: You had better go back to Whyalla and talk to people there.

Mr. BROWN: I do not know whether or not the Leader of the Opposition knows it, but the large retail monopoly businesses in my area came out into the open and said they were prepared to meet the costs of Friday night shopping. That was on the front page, so I do not know what the Leader is talking about. The Leader of the Opposition suggested, amongst many other things, that the shop assistants did not want any change.

Mr. Hopgood: That is very suggestive.

Mr. BROWN: I believe it is. I have never met a group of workers in my career that did not want to accept a reduction in hours, and I do not believe that the shop assistants and workers in that industry are any different from any other kind of worker.

Mr. Mathwin: What about a 35-hour week? Many of them are opposed to it.

Mr. BROWN: I am sure they will accept a 35-hour week. I cannot believe that shop assistants working 40 hours in 5½ days would not accept an offer of working 40 hours in five days. To me, that does not add up.

Previously, when a similar Bill to this was before this House, I was interested to read the speech the Leader made, because he started by saying, "This Bill involves a most vexed question that has no simple answer." Those few words are correct. The Leader will be pleased that I am agreeing with him: it is a vexed question with no simple answer, and I do not think this Government has ever denied that. It was always a problem.

The other point that intrigued me was a previous speech of the Leader, similar to the one he made this evening, in which he continually went after members on this side and the Government itself, saying where we were wrong and what we should and should not do; but he does not put up any counter suggestion in answer to the problem. He spoke and sat down; he supported the Bill except for a minor amendment that he foreshadowed. The member for Gouger, I think it was (the previous Leader of the Opposition who is now the Leader of the Opposition within the Opposition), said in this House, when presenting a Bill, perhaps not in so many words, that we should have open slather for the retail industry. That would

mean trading on seven days a week, 24 hours a day. He then said that we must not increase costs. What a lot of bunkum! How do we solve a problem in the retail industry by that method? The member who has just sat down, the Deputy Leader of the opposition within the Opposition—

Mr. Clark: I understand that is not going to last long.

Mr. BROWN: I have advocated, if the member for Elizabeth recalls, that he should not have had it anyway. I do not believe in one man having two jobs. I am intrigued by the Deputy Leader because he said, among other things, that he did not believe Parliament should set itself up as an arbitration court. When he visited my area some time ago he suggested quite clearly what his Party would have done in relation to shopping hours. I cannot explain what he was getting at, because I do not believe that he knew. It went along these lines: he would divide the week into about 18 parts. I do not know whether he would divide or multiply, but it added up, obviously, to broken shifts, which would not be the answer.

He says that Parliament should not set itself up as an arbitration court, but I remind him that the people I suppose would be called his colleagues in Canberra have set themselves up as an arbitration court in interfering in every industrial dispute we could name in the country.

Mr. Hopgood: And what is the result of that?

Mr. BROWN: That is a good question. We all know the result: it all amounts to industrial unrest. If we study the facts put up by Opposition members, there has not been one occasion I can think of when they have said, "We think you should look at this rather vexed problem. We all admit there is no real solution to it." They have not come forward with any solution. All they have done is oppose us. They have not done anything constructive. If they have no positive objection to what we are doing, I think they should support the Bill and let us see where we go from there.

I turn now to the leader of the Shop Assistants Union (Mr. Goldsworthy), about whom I want to say only one or two things. When a similar Bill was before the House, and again now, Mr. Goldsworthy has done something similar to what Opposition members have done: he has had a couple of bob each way, because he has not got the answer either. As a past trade union advocate, I

would give Mr. Goldsworthy a word of advice, for what it is worth. I believe that he should face up to what the Bill, if passed, will give his members, namely, a 40-hour week in five days, which is something I cannot remember shop assistants ever having the likelihood of getting. Surely, in all common sense and decency, a trade union leader should say, "If we can get something at this time, let us support it."

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you sack him, then?

Mr. Clark: Don't be childish.

Mr. BROWN: I do not know who the member for Glenelg thinks I am.

Mr. Evans: The members believe he's right.

Mr. BROWN: I believe that the union secretary should take stock of the position, because I believe he is misleading his members. Surely workers who have the opportunity of obtaining a 40-hour week in five days should grab at it. I believe the Bill has one prime purpose: to protect the worker in the industry in which he works, and the Bill gives that protection. The Bill also provides that a worker may have to work overtime on Friday night and Saturday morning, but I do not know of any other industry whose workers are not required to work overtime. Most awards, particularly Commonwealth awards, contain a clause which spells out that an employee must work a reasonable amount of overtime.

Mr. Evans: Does Parliament decide awards?

Mr. BROWN: No, but an overtime provision is written into every award. Secondly, the consumer should be protected. I say, "secondly", because the worker is the prime person to be considered. Demand exists for Friday night shopping by the consumer, and the Bill provides for it in the best and most economical way. Thirdly, I agree that certain retailers, particularly small retailers, should also be protected. The Bill provides this protection, because no retailer is compelled to open on Friday night or Saturday morning. He can open his shop for 40 hours spread over five days; surely, this is sufficient protection for any retailer. No doubt the big monopoly retailers will still open on Friday night if the Bill is passed and still capture the market. For those reasons, I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I have listened with interest to the three Government members who have spoken, namely, the Minister giving his second reading explanation and the two members who have spoken this evening.

Earlier this evening, we heard a diatribe from the member for Playford. I waited in vain for the honourable member to speak about the Bill. All I heard was a tirade of abuse about certain people, mainly the shopkeepers.

It was extremely strange to hear that honourable member first extolling Mr. Goldsworthy, the secretary of the Shop Assistants Union, whom I know very well, and almost bringing us to tears, whereas we all know that the Trades and Labor Council and other unions have been feuding with the Shop Assistants Union during the last few weeks. Only a few days ago the Premier, as reported in the newspaper (I think it was the *Advertiser*), stated that Saturday morning trading would continue, despite Mr. Goldsworthy's views. The member for Playford was talking about his buddy, Mr. Goldsworthy, and almost had us in tears.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I think the qualification "almost" is relevant.

Mr. COUMBE: Since I have been in this House, the Minister has bored me to tears many times. The member for Playford implied that Mr. Goldsworthy and the Retail Traders Association have acted in collusion because of the wage increases that will operate from September 1, and he said that they were buddies. He is having 20c each way, playing one side against the other. He set up a furore and I congratulate him on his rhetoric. He attacked large employers and other people in the Retail Traders Association. I should like to know whether the member for Playford is saying that small traders in his own district are primitive.

Mr. McRae: Yes.

Mr. COUMBE: That is interesting, because this Bill could drive the small shopkeeper out of business. I should like to know how the small shopkeepers in the District of Playford would react to hearing their representative calling them primitive.

Mr. McRae: They have always worked against me and will continue to do so.

Mr. COUMBE: We need these small shopkeepers, who are the real strength of the community. The member for Playford is trying desperately to square himself with his electors and make himself popular in this election year before it is too late. The member for Whyalla gave us another display of fine thinking in his lucid dissertation. I frankly agree wholeheartedly with the honourable member. I noted what he said: "I'm no economist", and I agree with him. He implied that Friday night shopping would in no way increase costs,

but a schoolboy would understand the principles of this. The honourable member was saying that the penalty rates of time and a half in respect of Friday night shopping would not lead in any way to increased costs to the housewife. All I can say in kindness is that the honourable member has shown an abysmal ignorance of economics and of the principles of the economic life of this community. In my opinion, the Bill is just another example of this Government's ineptitude and bungling in regard to the whole subject of shopping hours.

Mr. Payne: You never touched it when you were in office.

Mr. COUMBE: I explained this when speaking on the subject last session, and the honourable member can read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Payne: It was too hot to handle, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: I was going to repeat an expletive that the member for Playford used, but I will restrain myself. I did much more work on this subject than the honourable member is ever likely to do on it. The Government would really wish, if it could, to brush this matter conveniently under the carpet, hoping that the people of the State would forget about it. But the matter of shopping hours somehow keeps on cropping up year after year; the Government itself brings up the matter, but it keeps banging its head against the wall of public opinion. Surely it realizes that the people in the metropolitan area are becoming heartily sick of the subject. Why has the Government introduced the Bill, having conducted an expensive referendum and lost it, despite its confident prediction before the referendum that it would be carried overwhelmingly and despite its having unsuccessfully introduced two Bills since? Why has it introduced the measure again? I distinctly recall Government members saying that they would abide by the result of that referendum.

Mr. Mathwin: How much did it cost?

Mr. COUMBE: It was very expensive, quite apart from those who were not fined for not voting. The Government said it would abide by the result of the referendum, yet once again it is trying to reverse the voice of the people. I looked up what the Minister in charge of this Bill (the Minister of Labor and Industry) had to say last year in explaining this Bill. I quote from *Hansard*, page 3902 of March 15, 1972, as follows:

It seems hardly necessary for me to explain this Bill, because shop trading hours have been the subject of discussion in recent years in this House and in the press to a much greater extent than most public issues.

That was all he said regarding his introduction of this Bill. I then looked up what he had to say this session, and I refer to page 506 of *Hansard*, as follows:

There is perhaps little need for me to enlarge on the reasons why this Bill concerning shop trading hours is introduced, as the subject has been discussed exhaustively in each of the first two sessions of this Parliament.

That is his reason for introducing the Bill, and that is not good enough. I now quote what the Premier had to say on this matter because the word "consistency" has been bandied about. The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, said on November 25, 1969:

If we open up the Early Closing Act within that part of the effective metropolitan area to which it now applies, the result will be a significant increase in costs to the consumer, and there is no way out of that. In addition, traders and workmen alike do not want hours of that kind applicable within the metropolitan area to which the Act now applies.

The member for Salisbury, in whose district the matter of shopping hours is most contentious said (on October 22, 1970):

Maintaining the present position, in which some shops open and others in the adjoining areas close, would not solve the problem. It would only mean that no solution would be reached to correct an out-dated Act. Also, 9 p.m. closing on Friday evening would be unsatisfactory, as it would be a direct contradiction of the overall result of the referendum. The member for Mawson also had something to say on this topic and I quote this to show further "consistency". On October 27, 1970, he said:

The people were asked to vote in respect of the whole of this particular area that we are trying to make uniform. They have voted, and we are bound by this result.

Yet we find the Government is trying to change this situation. The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, said in his 1970 policy speech there would be no extension of Friday night shopping beyond those areas where it presently obtains. Although I have paraphrased what he said, that was the effect of his words. This Bill will give effect to that extension, and will completely negate the statement made by the Premier on that occasion.

My constituents voted solidly against extension of shopping hours, and in the last month, since the Government announced that it was

going to bring this matter up, my constituents have shown no support whatsoever for the extension of hours. Having talked to shopkeepers, shop assistants, and consumers, I can find no support for Friday night shopping. In fact, small shopkeepers believe that they could be forced out of business because of some of the provisions of the Bill. I believe that, as a whole, the public has lost much interest in the matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you resigning from the Liberal Movement?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What's the member for Gouger doing on this one?

Mr. CUMBE: I am saying what I think of the Bill, and I am speaking on behalf of the people I represent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you mean to say that you are disobeying the instructions of the member for Gouger?

Mr. CUMBE: How petty can the Minister become? I believe that the whole question of shopping hours has taken on a different aspect since the matter was last considered in this place because of cost factors which are about to operate and to which some other members have referred. Consequently, many people, especially consumers, are taking a different view. The first part of the new award will operate from September 1, with an increase to shop assistants eventually of \$9.50 a week. This increase is quite apart from the 50 per cent penalty rate that will apply for work on Friday nights, if that work is performed. These increases must lead to heavier costs. Previously the Premier said that there would be increased costs. The Premier has also said that Saturday morning trading will be retained.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's right.

Mr. CUMBE: In his absence, I referred to the Premier's comments about Mr. Goldsworthy in this connection. What is now happening is that there is a little battle going on between Mr. Goldsworthy and the rest of the trade union movement. I vividly remember the result of that infamous referendum, which some members opposite wish they could forget. I remember how people in the various districts voted on that occasion. In my district, most people voted "No". I would not mind betting that, if a referendum on the same question were held now, an even greater majority would vote "No". Some clauses in the Bill seem to have been altered since we last considered this legislation. I believe that the provisions of clause 4

really deal with matters that concern the Industrial Court. Let us consider clause 5.

Members interjecting:

Mr. COUMBE: Who is making this speech, anyway?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: Clause 5 is important because it deals with the alternative that can be used in respect of Friday night shopping. The Minister and the Government have been trying to work out this alternative system, which means in effect that the shop proprietor would have the right to apply to the court if most of his employees showed a genuine desire to work or not work on a Friday night. We must look at the facts of life fairly and squarely. Despite all the fair words that the Minister has put into this clause, it really means that the shop assistants will be telling the shop proprietor whether or not to open on Friday nights. I defy any reputable shop owner to go against the wishes of his shop assistants. If the assistants in the shop of a man down the street do not want the shop to remain open, they will go to the court and he will be forced to close. If, on the other hand, Bill Smith farther down the street in the same trade has employees who express a different view, he will open. This is all getting out of hand. One man may be disadvantaged compared to another. That is complete anathema to me. It means we are going against all principles of industrial practice when the shop assistant can say whether or not a shop shall open. This is a matter entirely for the Industrial Court, not for Parliament. In the alternatives that the Minister has so adroitly put before the House, he has failed to observe the real facts of life. He knows as well as I do that, if most shop assistants in a shop that he owned declared that they would not work on Friday nights, he would have to close his shop; but, if the Minister of Education had a similar shop farther down the street and his assistants wanted it to remain open, he would not be game enough to stop them; he would not be game enough to go against the wishes of his assistants. This will not work out, although we are trying to clear this impasse.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You made the same speech last year and then voted for the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE: I was waiting for a member to say that. If the Minister will recall accurately, there was a different set of circumstances on that occasion; we were faced with a measure that we said plainly at the time was a wretched Bill and we were trying to improve

it. The situation is compounded on this occasion because of the cost factor to which I have just alluded. The cost factor was not present on that occasion. I ask members to consider this question: who does the Government believe will benefit from this Bill? Will the consumer benefit? Will the families and the average housewife benefit? I do not believe they will. Will the shop assistants benefit? I do not believe they will. Will the shopkeeper benefit? Certainly he will not. So who will benefit from this Bill?

I pose that question because the principle of all legislation should be remedial and I believe the measure before us tonight is not remedial in this respect. The Government is trying to get over the problem with which it was faced last year and the impasse that occurred at the conference. I say again that the Government has put up rather an ingenious scheme about the two alternatives, but the facts of life are that these things will not work out. Clause 5 particularly does not appeal to me in the slightest, so although I will support the second reading stage of the Bill, I will certainly try to improve it in Committee.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): It is extraordinary, having heard the cries of tender solicitude for shoppers which have emanated from members opposite on various occasions and, on one famous occasion in my district, from the member for Gouger, to sit in this House and to hear what they are saying now. The member for Torrens has just experienced difficulty in trying to discern what the Government has been trying to do over the past two or three years. I think I can best assist the House by reiterating for his benefit (and for that of any other members opposite who have had some difficulty in following us) exactly what our line has been. It has been a consistent line, and it is this: we have tried, within two limitations (one being the necessary limitation of having uniform trading hours throughout the metropolitan area, and the other that shop assistants should not be put in a position less advantageous than other employees in industry) to give the public what it wants, to embody in legislation what the public at the time was demanding. The Government has acted on three occasions. The first was following a referendum. It was made clear that the public at that time opposed the extension of trading hours to include Friday night.

We, therefore, within the framework of the two things I have indicated, legislated to give effect to the desire of the public. I supported the measure at that time, and the member for

Torrens has recently done me the honour of reminding me what I said on that occasion. I remind members that what I was saying was in line with the principles I have just laid down: we were giving effect to the expressed wish of the people at the time. However, it is clear that the wishes of the people on this matter have changed since that legislation was passed and I now believe (and I will indicate in a moment that I have documentary evidence in front of me) that the majority of the shopping public now favours at least a modest extension of trading hours.

Mr. Evans: What about another referendum to find out?

Mr. HOPGOOD: That is not necessary, because we have other documentary evidence now which we did not have at that time. The member for Fisher will have his opportunity to address himself to the same documentary evidence if he seeks to come in on this debate, as I imagine he probably will. I turn to the documentary evidence, because the Leader of the Opposition brought up what I regard as an extremely shonky telephone poll which the *News* conducted recently. It was not conducted on any scientific basis, and any kind of result could have been expected from it. I remind the Leader that, about a month prior to the conduct of that referendum, a similar poll was conducted by the *Sunday Mail*, and it showed a considerable majority in favour of Friday night shopping at that time. It was on that basis that the Deputy Premier made the statement which was referred to earlier in the debate, I think by the Leader. The validity of the unscientific poll conducted by the *Sunday Mail* was put to the test soon after in a referendum, which showed it to be completely invalid.

Similarly, the unscientific telephone poll conducted by the *News* recently is rendered invalid by the scientific polls conducted by Mr. Roy Morgan, of Gallup polls, and it is to those that I now wish to turn. There has been a reference to this poll by the member for Mitcham who, I thought, rather contradicted some of the evidence his Leader tendered in evidence for some weakening of support for Friday night shopping, but I will leave that as it is.

Mr. Clark: Have those been published in the press?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Yes, in the *Advertiser*, and the first is dated July, 1971. At that time, the Australian Gallup poll said:

Two Australia-wide Gallup polls on shopping hours show that nine out of 10 people

want shops open on either Saturday morning or Friday evening, preferably Saturday morning. Opening on both Saturday morning and Friday evening lacks majority support, except in perhaps South Australia and Victoria, and then only if shops close on either Monday morning or Wednesday afternoon.

If one looks at the breakdown of the figures for South Australia at that time, one sees the following percentage support for the various questions asked. The first question asked was as follows:

Do you favour shops opening Saturday morning and Friday night until 8 p.m.?

A total of 34 per cent of those asked in South Australia answered "Yes". The second question was as follows:

Do you favour shops opening Saturday morning and Friday night until 8 p.m. but closed Monday morning?

A total of 6 per cent supported that proposition. The third question asked was as follows:

Do you favour shops opening Saturday morning and Friday night until 8 p.m. but closed Wednesday afternoon?

A total of 10 per cent answered "Yes". The total for these three propositions, which amounted to opening both Saturday morning and Friday evening, was 50 per cent of those questioned. A total of 34 per cent favoured opening Saturday morning but not Friday night; this 34 per cent, together with the 50 per cent, makes 84 per cent. Another 11 per cent said that shops should close Saturday morning but open Friday night until 8 p.m.; 3 per cent said that shops should close Saturday morning for a five-day week; and 2 per cent had no opinion.

At that time (that is, in July, 1971) clearly there was not a majority for both Friday night and Saturday morning shopping, but there was a plurality. A series of questions was asked and there was a plurality for this proposition (34 per cent) and the proposition closest to it was simply to open Saturday morning but not Friday evening. That, again, was 34 per cent; so I suppose that, technically, there was not a plurality.

I turn now to a later poll conducted in December, 1971, the results of which I will hurry through, because it is the one to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has referred. An account of the results states:

In every State most people approve Victoria's new law for around-the-clock shopping from Monday morning until 1 p.m. Saturday. Of 2,338 people aged 16 and over, 60 per cent said they favoured it. Only 29 per cent said they opposed it. The other 11 per cent were undecided. The favourable majority was about

60 per cent in all States except Tasmania, where it was 53 per cent.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred only in passing to the Gallup poll taken in March, 1972. He may not have had sufficient time to do research on it, but that poll was reported in the *Advertiser* of March 30, 1972. I have both documents, but I shall quote from the Gallup poll's print. It states:

In every State about eight out of 10 people want night shopping. Most of them, however, want only one night a week. Friday night is the overwhelming preference, except in New South Wales, where almost as many want Thursday night. Shops should also be open on Saturday morning. These are the findings of a comprehensive Gallup poll of 2,192 people conducted in March on night shopping. They were first asked whether shops should be allowed to open every night from Monday to Friday, or only one night a week, or not any night. The Australia-wide vote for one night a week was 58 per cent. Another 22 per cent want shops open every night. So altogether 80 per cent want shops open at least one night a week. The vote of 80 per cent for night shopping came from: 81 per cent of the women and 79 per cent of the men, 80 per cent of Liberal-Country Party voters and 79 per cent of Labor voters, and at least 73 per cent in every State.

This was only in March this year.

Mr. Evans: How many did they interview in South Australia?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Obviously, the number interviewed in specific States does not amount to many. The fraction of the total of 2,192 interviewed would be fairly small. Nonetheless, the pattern seems consistent, and the poll taken in December, 1971, is extremely suggestive. The report continues:

Only 12 per cent said shops should not open at night. More than half of those questioned were over 50.

That is neither here nor there. The report continues:

Only eight per cent had no opinion on this subject.

Through this series of three Gallup polls we see a gradual movement of public opinion throughout Australia away from the position that obtained when the Government legislated after the referendum to a position that, in March this year, four out of five over the whole of Australia, and at least 73 per cent in each State, favoured the introduction of Friday night shopping. The vast majority of these people favoured a limited expansion simply to Friday night rather than a complete open slather. I challenge members opposite to show any inconsistency on the Government's part or my part in our attitude. I repeat my main

point that our basic concern was to introduce uniform trading throughout the metropolitan area. No Government, including any future Government, will deny the benefits and fairness of uniform trading in that area where people are within shopping distance of each other.

Mr. Evans: Why leave the butchers out?

Mr. HOPGOOD: The spread of hours in relation to butchers is extremely well known to the member for Fisher and I do not have to go into that. The hours to which he would condemn butchers if Friday night trading were introduced would be scandalous.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They would be working about 16 hours on the Friday.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Yes. Our basic concern was to introduce uniform trading, because this had to come. Secondly, we have always sought to protect the interests of the employees in this industry, and I believe that this Bill does that. Thirdly, we have sought on each occasion to embody in the legislation the majority of opinion which existed in this State at the time.

Mr. Evans: Did the polls ask when butcher shops should remain open?

Mr. HOPGOOD: No, this was not asked. At the time of the referendum, it was clear that there was a "No" majority. The best evidence I have been able to uncover is that at present there is a "Yes" majority. It is for that reason that this legislation has been introduced, and I support it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I consider this to be an interesting debate. The rather intemperate speech of the member for Playford involved a fantastic story of intrigue and collusion between what seemed to me to be the most unlikely bedfellows. However, I found the speech entertaining by virtue of its intemperance. Among the rather vindictive references the honourable member made to various people, he said that three sections of the community had to be considered in this matter, namely, the shop proprietors, the shop assistants, and the general public. I do not believe the member for Playford was successful in convincing anyone in this House that this Bill would satisfy these three sections of the community.

It is abundantly clear that the shop proprietors and the shop assistants, if we can take any notice of their union Secretary, are not satisfied with this legislation, so that leaves the only other group to which the honourable member referred, namely, the shopping community, and he scarcely convinced us that this Bill would satisfy that group. Although the

honourable member did make an attempt in this direction, I point out that, in all of his accusations of collusion and intrigue between the employers and the employees, he did not attempt to indicate that this Bill satisfied even those two groups. The referendum, which was designed to help the Government in its dilemma, did just the opposite, and compounded the dilemma.

The only valid conclusion I think one can draw is that the public voted to maintain the *status quo*. In other words, those who did not have Friday night shopping in their area did not desire it, and those who did have it thought they would like it to continue. Therefore, I do not see how one can conclude that this Bill will satisfy the whole section of the shopping public, namely, those in the majority who voted at the time for the shops to be closed. Despite the tremendously high informal vote, there was a marginal majority in favour of closing shops, and the Government interpreted it as being a vote in favour of closing shops on Friday night.

The discomfiture of the members for Tea Tree Gully, Playford, Mawson and Elizabeth was readily apparent at the time, and I recall the completely different type of speech that the member for Playford made on that occasion. We thought he would almost need physical support as a result of the tremendous turmoil and battle he was having with his conscience then. He had signed the pledge despite his conviction and belief that the majority of his constituents desired Friday night shopping. That pledge and his loyalty to the Labor Party, which had got him into this place, was pre-eminent, yet we had a different performance this evening. The honourable member and other members who represent districts which voted in favour of Friday night shopping feel they are able to satisfy the public in their districts. However, I do not believe he can be as confident about those people in his area as can the members whose constituents did not vote in favour of Friday night shopping, although the member for Mawson claims they have now changed their minds.

The member for Playford has not convinced me that these three groups, the shop proprietors, the shop assistants (if we are to take any cognizance of their union secretary), or the public at large, will be satisfied. The argument that the public will be satisfied is rather tenuous. When the matter of the 35-hour week was canvassed in the Commonwealth sphere, the Leader of the Labor Party (Mr. Whitlam) was questioned on his attitude

about industrial conditions being written into legislation, and he said that the Government was attempting to turn this into a political question to confuse the issue. He said that the matter of working hours was not in the realm of the Government or even of his Party to make pronouncements about, because it was an industrial court matter.

We have here a Government of the same political complexion writing into the legislation industrial matters regarding rates of pay and overtime rates of pay, and I see conflict in the thinking of this Government compared to its Commonwealth colleagues on this matter. Indeed, I agree with the statement made by Mr. Whitlam on that occasion, that it is not the proper function of Parliament to write into legislation the exact conditions, rates of pay and overtime rates, as these should be dealt with by the courts.

Regarding the matter of prices, the member for Playford said that he believed the public was being mercilessly fooled by the moguls who run the Rundle Street stores. However, his remarks were a vote of no confidence in the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. It seems from what the honourable member says that the Commissioner is not doing his job properly and that he is completely incompetent to give a reasonable judgment regarding matters of price control and items sold to the public by these major retailers. Does the honourable member suggest that the Commissioner has no idea about what is going on in these stores? In my view, the Government will not satisfy the first two categories to which the member for Playford referred, and many people doubt whether it will satisfy the general public.

It is all very well for the member for Mawson to quote Gallup poll figures for the whole of Australia, but the sample taken in South Australia did not give the sort of information, in relation to the referendum, that we would seek to see whether members of the public have changed their opinion. The sample taken would be a coarse sample throughout the State. In other words, we have no idea of how people voted in areas that previously did not have Friday night shopping, and no indication whether people in the areas represented by the members for Elizabeth and Tea Tree Gully, for example, have changed their minds. The sample taken was of the whole State.

The whole message of the referendum was that the situation was confused. The only valid explanation of the "No" vote was that people were voting to maintain the *status quo*.

This characteristic has shown up in many cases, where people have voted for the *status quo*. This is one reason why it has always been difficult to carry referendums, whether in the State or Commonwealth sphere. People tend to get used to the *status quo*, and they vote to maintain it. If the Government really wanted to find out what people desired (and I do not advocate this as what I believe should be done), it would probably have to have another referendum. When the Government has no evidence of what the people want, that is usually what it does. However, on this occasion the Government is prepared to put its faith in and rest its political judgment on a Gallup poll taken throughout the whole of Australia that gives no breakdown that would disclose trends in certain parts of the metropolitan area so that any fine conclusions could be drawn with regard to metropolitan Adelaide.

I do not object in principle to the idea of late night shopping. However, certain things written into this Bill are not contained in the legislation of other States. The Government writes into this legislation industrial conditions, which should be determined by the appropriate industrial tribunal. In that opinion I am supported by no lesser figure than the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition. Two clauses of this Bill are unusual. After reading the Bill several times, I believe that these clauses simply indicate the Government's confusion in the matter. The Bill includes three alternatives, and it seems to me that the Government is now having 20c on each of three courses. I believe that it is a rather strange proposal that the employer should seek a poll to see whether his employees want to work or not to work at a certain time. I think it would be far more logical for a businessman to see what hours of business met the public demand and whether it is profitable to open at certain hours.

Government members do not seem to consider important the idea that a business enterprise should be profitable. If enterprises do not remain profitable they do not stay in business long. The Opposition subscribes to the principle that competition can lead to efficiency in this field. I find the alternatives in the Bill strange indeed. The member for Mawson attempted to show that the Government followed an unswerving straight line in its thinking on this occasion, as it had always done in other matters. I think back to the back-flips it has done over a whole range of issues, and this is another instance since it has been in power where it has not

acted firmly: it hopes it has taken the right punt on this occasion.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How are you going to vote?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister had taken the trouble to think about the clauses of this Bill and follow what I said, it would be simple for him to understand. I await his contribution to this debate. I have made my remarks simple, for they must be simple if the Minister is to be able to seize on anything to which he can reply. From past experience, I am trying to make my argument as simple as possible, but it seems I shall have to spell it out more simply for the Minister's benefit.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister has several times told a heart-rending story of when he used to go train-jumping. The best thing he ever did, from an economic point of view, was to enter this House. No doubt, the Minister will have something more specific to say when he closes the debate. The Government hopes that it will, by introducing this Bill, be satisfying the public. It is not satisfying the shop assistants or the shop proprietors, and it is doubtful whether it is satisfying the public. I do not oppose late night shopping but I do oppose some clauses of this Bill. If the Government is not prepared to accept some amendments, I intend to oppose the Bill at its third reading.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I have listened with interest to the speeches of members on both sides, and particularly to those of members opposite, as I wanted to discover their attitude to the Bill. Although I have listened to much criticism of the Bill from members opposite, I have not heard any constructive suggestions about what they would do in this situation, and I have not heard any worthwhile propositions put forward. When members opposite were in Government, they did not legislate at all. I support the Bill, because I consider that it is still the wish of most of my electors that shops should be open for Friday night trading. The Bill endeavours to protect the interests of the shop assistants, and this is, of course, of prime importance to me, as it is to other members on this side. One significant gain will be the provision of a 40-hour week in five days.

The member for Whyalla said that shops in his area were trading at present on Friday nights. This applies to other areas, such as Port Pirie and Port Augusta, and perhaps to others of which I am not aware. What has

not been mentioned is that, in the area where we are now considering extending the trading hours to include Friday night shopping, some shops are already trading on Friday nights, Saturdays and Sundays. I refer to the shops known as convenience stores. One in the Tea Tree Gully District is open on Fridays until 9 p.m., on Saturdays from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., and on Sundays from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. This, of course, is quite lawful because the goods sold are exempt goods, and it is surprising to see the large range of goods that can be sold during these hours. These stores are not confined to my electorate: I know they operate elsewhere.

I will not reiterate what I have said on previous occasions. I have already mentioned, as has been said in this debate, that there are three sections in the industry: the public, the retail traders, and the shop assistants. Unfortunately, we find that the three groups cannot agree, and agreement cannot be reached even within the group. For this reason, even if this legislation is passed I am convinced that it will not solve the problem, because it is insoluble.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I am afraid I have not been able to listen to all of the debate this evening, but it seems that in many cases the essential ingredient is missing from the subject matter presented to the House by members who have addressed themselves to the Bill. After all, we are talking in the main about the convenience of the public, a subject often left out of the discussion, which tends to centre on the reaction of management to longer trading hours and the reaction of employees to working within the stores for those hours.

I have listened with much amusement over the past several years to the inconsistencies of members opposite, inconsistencies which have been evident in a number of attitudes, some of which have been diametrically opposed to one another. The history of this matter is pretty well known from debates in this House over the years and the public discussions which have taken place. The most famous of those public discussions and expressions of opinion was, of course, the referendum which brought disgrace on the Government, a referendum held on a question deliberately framed to confuse those who had to answer it, and a referendum influenced by a campaign which was enjoined by the retail traders and the Shop Assistants Union to mislead, and to mislead deliberately, the public of South Australia, so that members of the public thought they had a choice between Saturday morning shopping and Friday night shopping, when in fact that had nothing whatsoever to do with the question,

This question has had a very sorry history, one in which politics has been far more important to the Government than has the welfare of the community. The Government has acted disgracefully in this matter. I agree with the principle embodied in the Bill of extending trading hours. Frequently I have said that I do not believe there should be trading hours at all. The Government has no business interfering with trading hours, with people who might want to buy goods, or the hours in which traders might want to sell goods. Obviously, the market should provide a meeting place of the interests of the employee and the retailer together, and the hours of trading in a free system should be those that operate throughout most of the world. The Government is caught between the arguments of the retailers and the union on the one hand, and the demand of the public on the other hand. As the member for Tea Tree Gully said, there is no satisfactory solution for the Government.

Mrs. Byrne: Your Government couldn't find one when you were in power.

Mr. HALL: For the benefit of the member for Tea Tree Gully, I shall refer to the situation as I know it and as at the time of my involvement in this question.

Mr. Harrison: You were well involved!

Mr. HALL: If the member for Albert Park will listen to my information, I am willing to provide it.

Mr. Harrison: You couldn't give us any advice.

Mr. HALL: In the latter months of my Government between 1968 and 1970, the decision was made to introduce extended trading hours throughout the metropolitan area; in fact, throughout the State, but it was bitterly contested by Adelaide retailers. The decision was made to introduce the legislation, the Bill was printed, and a date was set for its introduction. However, the Retail Traders Association was able to mount such an efficient campaign that sufficient Government members decided that the legislation should not be introduced. At that time the situation was such that, had the legislation been introduced, the retail traders would have operated under conditions which, in effect, would be implemented by the Industrial Commission. The employees would have had every industrial condition they could properly obtain from the Industrial Commission, as they so desired. However, the retailers are now in a different position. They refused to accept extended trading hours in 1969 under

conditions they generally would have approved. Now they are faced with accepting extended trading hours under conditions of which they do not improve. I have little sympathy with them in their self-inflicted predicament.

Following the successful campaign by the retailers in 1969 to negate the legislation that we had had printed and were ready to introduce, the Government opposite came into office. It has a shameful record of saying, in answer to questioning, that it would have nothing to do with extending trading hours. Then traders exerted pressure. I understand that the butchering trade, in particular, thought it was getting an unfair deal because of the artificial demarcation on hours of trading in the newly-developed metropolitan area, and the Government decided to extend the hours, not to reduce them. The Retail Traders Association, the Shop Assistants Union, and the Government have a sorry record.

I will support the Bill, on the basis that the Retail Traders have had their chance and have missed it. As much as I may dislike this, I consider that hours should be extended if the public and the traders desire to extend them. I do not believe that the increase in costs will be as great as the retail trade claims, or as great as the Premier has said previously that it will. Whilst there may be some pressure on prices, those traders who do not want to open for long hours will be able to take advantage of the situation.

I do not favour the provision that implement industrial conditions that the Industrial Commission should fix. It does little to the traders to bring into question the old furphy about Saturday morning trading, with which they defeated the referendum. Doubtless they think that one successful campaign of misleading may work again. They have won so far and I wonder whether they will win this time.

Mr. Payne: You want to take a quinella, do you?

Mr. HALL: I have been consistent since I first gave attention to this matter, and the honourable member has not been listening. If he tries to improve the Bill he may satisfy many more members of the public than he will do otherwise. I support the Bill and hope to be able to support it on the third reading.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I shall not be long in replying to the debate, but at the outset, having heard the member for Gouger talking about predicaments, I point out that, as Leader of the Liberal Movement, he would know plenty

about predicaments. Concerning the ex-school-teacher, the member for Kavel—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is replying to this debate, which involves an important matter of public interest, and I warn honourable members that interjections are going to cease and that I am not going to tolerate them. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I was about to say that whatever the member for Kavel had to say completely escaped me and members on this side. I can well understand why parents of the schoolchildren in his district voted him into this House—to get rid of him. Certain members opposite have tried to have a bob each way on this matter, because they think that the political atmosphere has altered somewhat. They can recall the approaches made to them when they were in Government, at which stage, of course, they were fearful to touch this issue. However, as soon as the people dumped them because of their incompetence to govern, and as soon as they took their places on the Opposition benches, members opposite decided that they might gain some political favour through the Friday night shopping issue. The then Leader (now the Leader of the Liberal Movement) decided to launch a campaign on Friday night shopping and advocated open slather, as he still does.

Mr. Harrison: Seven days a week.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes.

Mr. Venning: And all night.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have not worked for any farmers lately, but I should not like to work for the member for Rocky River, because I think a few nights would be involved. The present Leader of the Opposition was not very convincing either way—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Nor are you.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: —and he tried to go either way. If the member for Kavel thinks he is going to provoke me—

Mr. Gunn: He did.

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members do not cease, I will do a little provoking. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. I should appreciate it if you would keep the member for Kavel in check. I may have to take some action against the gentleman, and I assure him that I am capable of doing so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must reply to the debate.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Leader of the Opposition and members opposite who have spoken to the debate are suffering from a severe attack of political confusion. They thought that the support they gave previously in the matter created for them some political benefit, and they said that political benefit was derived also by some of our members, including the member for Mawson and the member for Playford. The Leader is confused and does not know which way to turn, and the issue he raised in order to try to get out of his predicament involved the matter of increased costs. He said that Friday extended shopping hours would increase costs enormously. I know where he obtained that information and to whom he has been talking.

Regarding costs, I now refer to recent statements from New South Wales and Victoria where extended hours have recently been introduced. The Managing Director of the Safeway Chain Stores is reported on August 2, 1972, as having said:

Mr. Pratt told the Australian Grocery Industry Association late night shopping has been a great success for his stores in Melbourne and Sydney. He said: "We are very happy indeed with late night shopping.

When you read statements that the price of food is going up because of late night shopping, those statements are just ridiculous—as far as we are concerned, anyway. This is despite having to pay penalty rates." He said: "Look at all the pluses. We get a lot more utilization out of our car parks, out of our checkstands, out of our shopping trolleys, so I can't see how anyone can claim—in my industry, self-service food—that prices go up.

Look at it this way: The bulk of the price, at least 80 per cent of the cost of your goods, is what the manufacturer charges you. The only part to be affected by selling in later hours is the labour cost. Your rent doesn't change. Nothing else changes except the labour cost. And that increase is infinitesimal when compared with the overall price of the product. I'm not going to give away trade secrets, so let's say we or someone else has a wage percentage of 7 per cent—and in our business you would cut your throat if it was that high.

But let's say it's 7 per cent. Then all you're talking about is a percentage increase of that 7 per cent. You're not talking about a lot of money. When you offset it against the advantages, you can't say it will force prices up. That's completely wrong."

Mr. Pratt said an incidental advantage of late trading is that better juniors are attracted to the work. He said: "If a kid wants to surf or play football on Saturday he just doesn't want to work on Saturday morning. So we roster them so they have Saturday mornings free. The people who work Saturday mornings now are the people who want to work Saturday mornings." But, he added, "Saturday morning is the most inefficient three hours you can pos-

sibly open your doors in a supermarket. It's different if you have only dry groceries or hardware, and you can just turn the key and be back on Monday."

That is the latest information regarding late night shopping in Victoria. Turning to New South Wales, I have information dated July 17, 1972, which states:

New South Wales late shopping lifts trade—Sydney, Sun: An executive officer of one of Sydney's biggest grocery chains said yesterday that late-night shopping had been mainly responsible for a 30 per cent increase in his company's trade.

Mr. Norman Tieck, Joint Managing Director of Franklins Food Stores, said that his company had been "staggered" at shoppers' response to late trading. "We must conclude that it is here to stay," he said.

Mr. Tieck was commenting on a decision by the Food Retailers' Association to seek the abolition of Thursday night trading when it came under review by the State Government. He said that 14 per cent of Franklins' total weekly turnover was achieved between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m. on Thursdays—more than the entire day's trading on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday.

The breakdown of last week's business was: Monday, 9 per cent; Tuesday, 9 per cent; Wednesday, 11 per cent; Thursday, 32 per cent; Friday, 26 per cent; Saturday, 13 per cent.

We have heard so much about what late night trading would cause to happen in those States. We were told that the result here would be similar. However, no-one can convince me that this sort of thing will happen in South Australia. Let us deal with what members opposite said when this matter first arose. On October 21, 1970, the Leader of the Opposition is reported as saying:

I will take no part in a curfew on Friday nights in the Districts of Playford, Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler, Christies Beach and elsewhere ... I represent the people of the District of Light; they will tell me which way I will vote, and I will vote as the majority of them tell me. . . . Those people who were given the chance to vote on the question in the referendum voted two to one for late closing.

The Leader is now shaking his head. Does he deny saying this?

Dr. Eastick: I am shaking my head to my Deputy.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I can understand that. On October 27, 1970, the Leader is reported as saying:

I am seeking for the people of Gawler an opportunity to continue to enjoy the freedoms they now have. . . . Friday night shopping means that money goes around. If fewer people are employed as casuals in these fringe areas, less money will circulate.

On October 27, 1971, he is reported as saying:

At Elizabeth, people enjoyed the family atmosphere that prevailed. They enjoyed the

opportunity of taking their toddler children, dressed in pyjamas and dressing gowns, around the stores.

Dr. Eastick: While it didn't cost them anything.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Leader was talking about what he described as "the carnival atmosphere" of shopping on Friday evenings at Elizabeth and Christies Beach, and places nearby. What a difference we have observed this evening. On February 29, 1972, the Leader asked me whether the people of South Australia had any assurance that the Government would make available to them extended shopping hours. He concluded, "They wish to know whether the Government will act as I am asking it to act in this question." Does the Leader deny asking that question?

Dr. Eastick: No.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: On March 15, the headline stated that Mr. Hall had resigned as Leader. That was a day to remember. The present Leader was then placed in the hot seat in which he now sits, and it is getting hotter. If the Leader does not believe me, he can ask the member for Gouger. On March 21, we saw the new Leader, looking very pale, stagger into his seat. He must have wondered what had happened to him. All the deputies and ex-leaders were running about behind him. I can recall this as if it were yesterday. Our Premier was so kind and generous that day that he walked across the floor to the Leader and said, "I realize what it is like to have this dropped on you without any notice whatever. We will adjourn the House." And that is what we did. As the new Leader, Dr. Eastick said this on March 21:

This Bill involves a most vexed question that has no simple answer . . .

His speech did not state whether he was in favour of Friday night shopping but canvassed the idea of a roster plan for shop workers. He has admitted there was some public confusion on the matter and much emotionalism. Then on August 2 the Government reintroduced the Bill. The Leader thought, "I had better fire a volley somewhere," and the press caught up with him. He told the press that he did not know what the public wanted but suspected a "widespread drop in support" for Friday night shopping. He did not say whether it was for him or for whom it was.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, is it in order for the Minister to make members physically ill with laughter with these statements of this?

The SPEAKER: The Minister is replying to the debate. Because of conversations between members, I cannot hear what is going on. I ask honourable members to refrain from indulging in private conversations.

Dr. Tonkin: I was thinking entirely of the member for Unley, Sir.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am firmly convinced that members opposite do not know exactly what they want. They have admitted they do not know what the public wants, but this Bill is designed to benefit everyone concerned in the industry, including members of the public. Remarks have been made opposing applications to the court. It is probably the fairest way in which it can be done. The unions believe they have not been given a fair deal in this respect, and the Opposition says that the employers are not getting a fair deal. I can think of nothing fairer than an application to the court and postal ballots to decide the issue. This is a fair piece of legislation for all involved in the industry. I hope members opposite will have second thoughts about the Bill and support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Closing times."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move to insert the following new paragraph:

(aa) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "12.30 p.m." and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "11.30 a.m."

The legislation at present provides that a shop assistant can be required to work until 12.30 p.m., although most employees cease work at 11.30 a.m. I think the amendment would be in the best interests of shop assistants, and I do not think it is opposed by any section of the industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I cannot accept the amendment. We hear much from members opposite about protection of free trade, but they want to take trade away from the small people mentioned by the member for Torrens as being the important people in the trade. They often want to stay open until 12.30 p.m.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark,

Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Ferguson. No—Mr. King.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Dr. EASTICK: I shall not persist with the next amendment standing in my name, but I move:

To strike out new subsection (1b).

It has been said that the situation offered to honourable members and, therefore, to the community at large is that people may shop on Friday nights until 9 p.m. for all commodities other than red meat. I believe that this is not in the best interests of the community, which might wish to shop if given the opportunity, or of meat producers, who may suffer a loss of red meat demand. If Friday night shopping is to be permitted, people should also be able to purchase red meat. I ask the Committee to support my amendment.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I cannot accept the amendment, for the same reasons as were advanced when this matter was discussed previously. We are offering the opportunity of fair trade to butchers and supermarkets. We are allowing butcher shops to open on Saturday but not on Friday night, because otherwise butchers would be working longer hours than shop assistants.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Ferguson. No—Mr. King.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because of the earlier decision of the Committee, I am afraid that my amendment is still-born.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Limitation on meaning of expression 'shop assistant'."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I vigorously oppose this clause. I do not believe that it is the province of Parliament to interfere in industrial matters, yet that is what we are doing under this clause. We are doing it by giving three alternatives to those engaged in retailing concerning their conditions. This Parliament has set up industrial machinery to do just this, and it is wrong of Parliament to usurp that power and to legislate directly in these matters. This could be and will be a bad precedent, and any union which does not get its way in future before the Industrial Commission will simply go to the Trades and Labor Council and try to exert influence on it.

If a Labor Government is in office, that will automatically mean that, following the group's success with the Trades and Labor Council, we will see legislation in this Chamber in other fields to provide for conditions of work. As I think that would be most regrettable, I hope that the Committee will reject this clause. The effect of rejecting it will simply be to leave to the proper body the determination of the hours and conditions of work, and that is as it should be.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The reason for this clause was fully outlined in my second reading explanation. The matters raised by the honourable member are completely hypothetical, and he is trying to play politics. If he is ruled by the capitalist system and thinks the same thing will happen in the Labor Party, he is right off the path.

Mr. BECKER: I think the Minister should tell the Committee the real reason for his introducing this clause, because this is the first time that Parliament has interfered with the Industrial Commission in setting down industrial conditions. Under this clause a union can apply for a ballot. However, the cost will be borne not by the union or the employers, but by the State. I refer to what happened regarding Kangaroo Island.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Discussion about Kangaroo Island is out of order.

Mr. BECKER: I think that the Minister should explain his reason for setting this precedent. He should say what has transpired between the employers and the employees, and what decision the Trades and Labor Council has made.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally.

Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. King. No—Mr. Ferguson.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: Those in favour say "Aye"; those against "No".

Mr. Mathwin: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, it will be necessary to divide. Ring the bells.

While the bells were ringing:

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw my call.

Leave granted; motion carried.

[Midnight]

The Hon. D. H. McKEE moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (26)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Carnie, Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, and Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. King. No—Mr. Ferguson.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.5 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 16, at 2 p.m.