

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 18, 1970

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

DEATH OF HON. C. D. ROWE

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I conveyed its motion, passed on August 4, to Mrs. E. Rowe, widow of the late Hon. C. D. Rowe, and have received from her and her family an acknowledgment, which states:

Dear Mr. Speaker, On behalf of my family and myself, I wish to express our sincere thanks to the members of the House of Assembly and yourself for the recognition and appreciation of my late husband's services to the State and country and for your kind expression of sympathy.

QUESTIONS

POLICE POWERS

Mr. HALL: The Chief Secretary is reported as having stated that he is surprised that the Commissioner of Police has seen fit to comment publicly on matters of Government policy. He is also reported as stating:

Policy on law enforcement, including police powers and functions, is for the responsible Ministers and Parliament. It is for the Government to determine its policy, for Parliament to make any alterations of the law, and for the Commissioner to implement those alterations. It is not appropriate for a Minister to enter into public controversy as to Government policy with a public official.

Similar remarks have been attributed to the Attorney-General, and the reaction (I believe supported by tens of thousands of South Australian citizens)—

Mr. Jennings: How would you know?

Mr. HALL:—of alarm from representatives of police interests and also from those in the community who are concerned—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is debating the question.

Mr. HALL: I am stating that there is in the community much concern (and this is the basis of my question) for law and order, and there is much dismay that the Government may remove from the police some of the most useful tools they have to keep law and order. Therefore, will the Attorney-General undertake to seek the views of the Commissioner of Police before he introduces legislation to alter the powers of the Police Force, and will he table the Commissioner's views in this House?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Leader need feel no concern about this Government's stripping the police of any powers that are necessary or helpful in their function of preserving law and order and protecting the community against crime. Nobody is more concerned with having and encouraging an effective Police Force, clothed with all necessary and proper powers, than are I, the Chief Secretary and the Government as a whole. Neither the Leader nor any of the hypothetical members of the public to whom he has referred need have the slightest concern about that matter. I have already indicated in my statement, which was reported in the press, that the question of the appropriate powers and functions of the police is to be considered by a committee that the Government will appoint to inquire into a revision of the criminal law. That committee will hear submissions from all interested parties and all persons who may be able to provide helpful comment, and that will include the Commissioner of Police and, indeed, any other police officers who may have helpful observations and comments to offer. I (and I am sure I speak for the Chief Secretary) shall always be pleased to receive comments on any proposal from the Commissioner of Police or from other police officers through the appropriate superior officers, and on this occasion I should have been most happy to receive the Commissioner's comments communicated to the Minister in the normal and ordinary way for such comments to be passed. As I have said, the comments will presumably be communicated to the committee that will inquire into the revision of the criminal law and, no doubt, the submissions that will be placed before that committee will be reviewed by it in its report. The committee will have the opportunity to consider the question of publishing its proceedings, and doubtless the Government will have the opportunity to consider that when the committee has concluded its deliberations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was, as I am sure other members would have been, reassured by the Attorney's reply concerning the proper weight that will be given to the views of the Commissioner of Police. In the light of what the Attorney has now said, I cannot understand why his reaction was so adverse to the Commissioner's making known his views. Be that as it may, can the Attorney-General say when he will announce the terms of reference that will be given to the committee to which he referred, and can he announce the names of

those who will serve on the committee? If necessary for that purpose. I have expressed the view (and I express it again) that there is a *prima facie* case (if I may use that expression) that certain of the powers that appear on our Statute Book as vested in the police are wider than is necessary for the efficient performance of a policeman's duties and for law enforcement. As I say, that is a *prima facie* attitude that I think takes me as far as saying that it is proper for the whole question to be submitted to a committee that can look into it to see whether what seems to me to be a *prima facie* situation is well founded and whether there is any alternative formulation of police powers which will be just as effective in regard to law enforcement but which will provide a more reasonable basis for the liberty of the citizen.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot at present announce the terms of reference of the committee, but they will be announced at the earliest possible moment. The constitution of the committee will depend on the result of certain communications concerning commitments, and these are still continuing. I cannot set a precise date on which the announcement will be made, but I hope that it will be made within the next month.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government has decided on any policy at all that will modify the powers of the Police Force?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The only policy that the Government has decided on in this connection is that the matter of police powers will be referred to the committee I have mentioned. No further decision has been taken.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Attorney-General has not said why the Government decided to include the matter of police powers in an inquiry into the criminal law; I take it that the reason is in some way connected with the comments that the Attorney-General and the Chief Secretary have made about the various views being expressed, notably by the Commissioner of Police and the Secretary of the South Australian Police Association (Mr. Tremethick) in supporting the maintaining of the present powers exercised by the police. Although the Attorney-General has not yet given the terms of reference of this committee or said how police powers will be involved, will he consider, if these matters are to be dealt with in what was previously understood to be an inquiry into the criminal law alone, adding to the committee of inquiry a representative of the police side?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The reason why the Government will submit the matter of police powers to the committee can be stated very shortly. I think that, whenever any section of the community is the recipient of special powers conferred on it for a specific purpose and for the benefit of the community, inevitably from time to time the community, through its representatives, will want to see whether the extent of the powers is adequate for the purpose for which they are conferred or whether those powers are wider than is

Mr. Millhouse: Why did you object to the Commissioner's giving his opinion?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My objection to the Commissioner's making a statement is not to what he said (that is his affair) but to the fact that a public official saw fit to engage in public controversy, on Government policy, with Ministers of the Government. I repeat that I think that is wrong, and I think it would have been even more wrong for a Minister to engage in public controversy with a public official.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: Regarding the second part of the honourable member's question, I do not expect that the committee will consist of members drawn from any side, to use the expression of the honourable member. I think that a committee is best comprised of independent persons who will look at the whole topic of criminal law reform, including police powers which, to me, are an integral part of any such inquiry. The committee will hear submissions from all interested parties and, indeed, from all people who have any special experience or knowledge that will qualify them to assist the committee. There is no question in mind of putting representatives on the committee drawn from any side and, for that reason, I think it would be inappropriate to appoint representatives of any section, and that applies to the Police Force as well as to other sections of the community.

LIQUOR PRICES

Mr. LANGLEY: Tonight's Commonwealth Government Budget speech probably will contain details of several increases in taxation, and

the liquor industry once again seems to be the likely target. For several days rumours have circulated that the prices of brandy, table wines and beer may be increased. The sales of beer in bars and clubs are controlled by a monopoly, whose prices must be used otherwise supplies will not be delivered. During the last few days extra supplies of liquor have been purchased in order that advantage can be taken immediately of any price increase that is made and so that an extra profit can be obtained. If there is an increase in prices, will the Premier ask the Prices Branch to stop sales at the higher prices of liquor that has been purchased at the lower rates, because prices are controlled by the breweries that are now issuing extra supplies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask the Prices Commissioner for a report.

SUMMER CLOTHING

Mr. RYAN: My question is to you, Mr. Speaker, and I shall read from *Hansard* so that my question will be perfectly clear. On November 27, 1968, the Standing Orders Committee made a report that was ultimately adopted by this House. The member for Mitcham, as the then Attorney-General, moved that the report of the Standing Orders Committee be adopted, and that report stated, in part:

Your committee considers that under the Speaker's general authority to maintain order in the House he should also be the initial arbiter as to dress, his opinion being subject, of course, to the superior wisdom of the House.

Your committee recommends: (a) that a Standing Order to regulate members' dress is not desirable; and (b) that as a general rule the conventional dress for male members, which includes the wearing of a coat, shirt, tie and long trousers in the Chamber, should be retained.

That report was made by the Standing Orders Committee as it was then constituted. However, although the member for Mitcham is still on the Standing Orders Committee, the committee now has four new members, two of whom are new members in the House. Mr. Speaker, as you are now a member of the Standing Orders Committee; as the committee's composition has drastically altered since the House considered the report to which I have referred; as we now have many new members in the House; and as opinions on this matter may be different generally from those held three years ago, will you call the committee together for the purpose of considering members' dress and of bringing back a further report on the matter?

The SPEAKER: It is competent for the Standing Orders Committee to meet and to consider this matter. The member for Price will recall that, although the Standing Orders Committee previously said that this matter was in the hands of the Speaker, it made a recommendation on conventional dress that was adopted by this House. In replying recently to the member for Hanson on this matter, I said that I considered that, having been adopted by the House, the original decision should stand, and I ruled accordingly. However, if it is the desire of members, I will call the Standing Orders Committee together in order to reconsider this matter, and if, after the matter has been reconsidered, the House approves whatever suggestion is made, an amendment can be made accordingly.

ALBERT BRIDGE

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked last week about rebuilding the Albert Bridge, which is in my district?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: During the past year the Adelaide City Council has had discussions with my predecessor and the Commissioner of Highways in relation to class 6 and 7 roads within the city of Adelaide. The Albert Bridge is included in these classes of road and thus qualifies for a grant under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act.

In May this year a five-year programme for class 6 and 7 roads was submitted to the Commissioner of Highways by the Adelaide City Council to indicate the minimum of expenditure believed to be necessary during the period. In this schedule the replacement of Albert Bridge was set down by the council for construction during the period from January, 1972, to December, 1973. However, the council considers that it will be necessary to delay this work owing to the shortage of funds, and it would seem unlikely for work to commence before January, 1974. The problems raised by the honourable member will be solved by the provision of a new bridge but, as has been explained, it is the responsibility of the Adelaide City Council.

IRRIGATION METERS

Mr. CURREN: Before asking my question, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Works on becoming a father again.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr. CURREN: I understand that this is not a new experience for him. When replying to my question of July 22, the Minister

gave details of the proposed installation of meters on pumps of licensed water divertees on the Murray River, and said that the annual rent would vary according to the size and installation cost. As to set an annual rent on this basis will create anomalies, can the Minister say whether any other basis for fixing the rent has been examined and, if it has not, will he consider fixing meter rents either on water usage or on an acreage basis?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, I thank the honourable member for his congratulations. I have ignored the somewhat facetious remarks made by my colleagues about my future intentions concerning a family. I might say that it is still a novelty for me even though it has happened before. Another point I make about my son is that he was not called Thomas after Tom Stott. I shall be pleased to consider the proposition put forward by the honourable member concerning the charges that are to be made to private irrigators for a water supply by meter. As I understand there may be some inequities in the present method, I shall be pleased to consider the suggested proposition.

FAUNA PROTECTION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about protecting fauna?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that the control of vermin on outback properties is a complicated problem. Wild goats, foxes and other unprotected fauna undoubtedly cause damage, and the efforts of landowners to protect their properties from the depredations of vermin is understandable. The rapidly increasing population of wild goats, for instance, in our northern areas is an urgent problem. The point at issue is the method of control, and this matter is being investigated by the Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee. The Minister expects to receive soon a report and recommendations from the committee. Obviously, however, the poisoning of water-holes affects all species of animals and birds, whether they be troublesome or harmless, and in general this practice is objectionable.

WATER SAVING

Mr. McRAE: In 1967, which was one of South Australia's worst drought years, I understand that the then Minister of Works introduced a campaign to obtain public support, on

a voluntary basis, to save water, the catch-cry, as I recall it, being "Save water while there is water to save." As a result of newspaper and radio support, there was a tremendous public awareness of the need to save water in our State, which is the driest in Australia. I note that last summer water consumption increased by about 25 per cent; as a result, various problems involving water rating have arisen. Will the Minister of Works consider using every year a programme similar to the one to which I have referred, bearing in mind the tremendous co-operation that was given last time and also bearing in mind that a voluntary community effort is always better than any system of laws and regulations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy indeed to look at the honourable member's suggestion, which I think is excellent. I believe that all members will recall the great success of the campaign in 1967, in spite of the opposition at that time of the Liberal and Country League Opposition, which criticized the Government for not taking positive action, saying that a voluntary scheme would not work.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We proved in 1967 that the scheme would work: it worked most effectively and successfully, with the public at that time co-operating fully. Water is one of the most valuable commodities in the State. Particularly when people realize how much they are paying for it today, they will also realize that it is a valuable commodity and that steps should be taken where possible to save any water that is now possibly wasted. I am not certain about the cost aspect involved. I certainly agree with the honourable member when he suggests that a voluntary scheme is much better than having regulations and laws, involving the use of inspectors to police such controls. I will certainly look at the matter for the honourable member and bring down a report as soon as possible.

MURRAY STORAGES

Mr. RODDA: As an election was fought on the issue of whether we should have two dams or none, and as the father of the House (the Minister of Works) seemed to emphasize the fact that we should save water (which is commendable), can he say whether his statement is a forerunner to our having no dam at all?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member confidently assumes that, had his Government succeeded in having the Dartmouth agreement ratified, we would have had additional water this year but, of course, that assumption is not correct. As he knows, we would have been fortunate to get a supply of water from that source by 1980, even if construction of the dam had been commenced by now. Perhaps the honourable member thought that by asking this question he might be able to make a little capital from the fact that neither the Premier nor the Government had announced what stage our negotiations with the other States had reached. The honourable member is probably a little disappointed that Sir Henry Bolte has said he is prepared to talk these matters over with us. I am certain that members opposite would be happy indeed if they thought the Government could not achieve its objective in this regard. However, I am confident it can. In spite of my confidence that we will reach our goal in this area, it is still necessary for us to save water wherever possible. I am not saying that the suggestion of the member for Playford will be put into effect: I said we would be happy to examine it. It is imperative, however, that we in this State be conscious at all times of the value of water. The Government will examine the benefit to be derived from and the costs involved in the suggestion of the member for Playford before I reply to his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week when he was questioned in this House, the Premier said that he intended to get in touch with the Victorian Premier this week, apparently to begin or to carry on (he has not made this clear in the past) negotiations for a revision of the Dartmouth dam agreement. I notice in this morning's *Advertiser* that that paper has paved a way for him to do this by itself getting in touch with Sir Henry Bolte. Will the Premier therefore say whether he has availed himself of the opportunity that has thus been created, by speaking to Sir Henry Bolte this morning? If he has not, will he say when he intends to do so and will he inform the House of the results obtained?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been in touch with Sir Henry Bolte this morning, but I intend to get in touch with him as soon as the reply from the Premier of New South Wales, which I have been promised daily for about the last 10 days, comes to hand. I am expecting it at any time and, as soon as it is to hand, I will get in touch with both Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin to arrange talks.

WATER RATING

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Works has said it is only right that the people of the State should be made conscious of the value of water. Has the Minister a reply to a question I asked about water rating, involving a constituent of mine who is aware of the cost of water?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have never tried to hide the fact that the cost of water to the people, particularly those living in the metropolitan area, is high indeed. I have had investigated the water rate account of the constituent referred to by the honourable member, and I find that for 1969-70 the property was assessed as an unfinished house with an assessed annual value of \$280, representing a capital value of \$5,600. For 1970-71 the property was assessed as a six-room house and garage with an assessed annual value of \$800, representing a capital value of \$16,000. The increased valuation was, therefore, as a result of the completion of the house. I think that the honourable member is probably aware of those circumstances.

LITTER

Mrs. STEELE: I believe that a matter of growing concern to civic-minded citizens of South Australia is that our roads are becoming increasingly littered with debris which people have deposited at the sides of roads or which they have thrown out of their cars as they have passed by. I was interested to read in the press the other day that in New South Wales war is being waged against litterbugs, with the introduction of a special Bill in State Parliament that is being pushed through as an urgent measure. It will apply not only to roads and streets but also to every picnic ground and park in New South Wales, and it will provide for on-the-spot fines of \$5. As I am sure it would have the support of most people, will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government intends taking any action of this kind?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It would be most encouraging if a Bill introduced by the Government had the support of the Opposition; that almost encourages me to take this matter to Cabinet. However, the Government does not intend at present to legislate in this regard, and it certainly does not intend to provide for on-the-spot fines, in respect of which all sorts of misdemeanours can occur. Several committees, not the least important of which is the environmental committee, are getting to grips with the problem in South Australia, and any recommendations they make will certainly be considered by Cabinet.

DRUGS

Mr. CLARK: I regard the following matter as a grave one indeed, as it affects the people of the city of Elizabeth. A report under the heading "Pot smoking at Elizabeth" appears in the *News* of August 10, part of which is as follows:

Marihuana was being bought, circulated and smoked at Elizabeth, the South Australian Police Drug Squad head, Sgt. J. Silverblade, said last night.

That statement was made at a seminar on drugs attended by over 500 people at the Shedley Theatre, Elizabeth which, unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to attend. The report later continues:

Sgt. Silverblade said the drug problem in Elizabeth was as high as anywhere else in Australia.

I am not criticizing the officer for saying that, if he did say it. However, these statements have caused much disquiet amongst responsible and reputable people in the city of Elizabeth. Some believe (and I hope they are correct) that the statements are greatly exaggerated; some believe the situation is even worse than has been stated; and others believe that the true picture could lie somewhere between those two views. Although many difficulties may be involved, will the Attorney-General, in order to allay some of the disquiet that exists in the area, obtain from the Minister of Health a report on this matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter with the Minister of Health and, having discussed it with him, obtain a reply for the honourable member.

Dr. TONKIN: Alarming allegations were made in a letter published in yesterday's press concerning the sale, without restriction, of barbiturates in chemist shops. Unfortunately, the letter was not signed other than with a pen name, but it implied that a young person could purchase barbiturates from a chemist without prescription, and also added that the writer believed that this would happen in other pharmacies. Because of this alarming report, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to inquire urgently into the allegation that barbiturates are now obtainable without prescription at some pharmacies in this State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ask my colleague to ascertain whether there is substance in the allegation.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding funds for drought relief?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that money advanced for relief by the Commonwealth Government to South Australia during the last drought period totalled \$2,244,151. The sum of \$158,551 was advanced to primary producers as grants, and \$549,250 was advanced as loans. The grant money was made available for the reimbursement of costs incurred in the transport of stock, and the loan money was provided as carry-on finance and must be refunded to the Commonwealth Government by the State Government.

Money at present owed to the Government by primary producers on these loans totals \$237,171. Money, if any, available for drought assistance in respect of applications made now totals \$363,502. This sum is available in deposits in the Farmers Assistance Fund (being State funds) and is subject to the provision of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967, the Primary Producers Assistance Act, 1943, and the Farmers Assistance Act, 1933-1943.

CHRISTIES BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HOPGOOD: The provision of a metalwork shop at Christies Beach High School, which project was commenced two years ago, has been delayed for a long time because the Public Buildings Department has not provided electrical connections and concrete pylons for the heavy metalwork equipment. Much expensive equipment is lying idle on the site. As I understand that the Education Department has done all it can do in the matter, will the Minister of Works take up with the Public Buildings Department the urgency of completing this work?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to do that, to get a report for the honourable member as soon as possible, and to speed the work up.

SCHOOL RESIDENCES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the location of the school residences that the Government was reported in the press to have decided to provide for country teachers in South Australia?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: New houses for teachers in country areas included in the \$450,000 programme announced by me recently are to be erected at Victor Harbour (two), Mypolonga, Marree, Quorn, Yankalilla, Hawker, Koolunga, Koongawa, Paruna, Port Lincoln, Salt Creek, Kingoonya, Mount Compass, Tintinara, Kadina, Murray Bridge, Birdwood, Minlaton, Mannum, Millicent, Jamestown, Whyalla (four), Port Augusta (two), Mount Gambier (two), Port Pirie, Renmark and Mount Barker.

Mr. ALLEN: The member for Rocky River asked a question on August 6 about the houses being built for schoolteachers at country centres. In his reply the Minister said, "As I have not that full list with me at present I will obtain it for the honourable member and let him have it next week." On Thursday last week this information was available, I understand, to the member for Rocky River, but he was not able to get it until today, when the Minister gave a list of centres at which houses were to be built. Last week's edition of the Port Augusta *Transcontinental*, a country newspaper, contained the following article:

Tec. Teachers To Get Homes: Two houses are planned for teachers at Port Augusta Technical College, the Minister of Education, Mr. H. Hudson, disclosed yesterday.

That would be Tuesday of last week. The article continues:

In addition, new houses will replace unsatisfactory accommodation at Quorn Area School, the Hawker Area School and the Marree Primary School.

It seems that this information was given to this newspaper on Tuesday last, but it was not available in this House until last Thursday. Three of the houses are to be built in my district, and it is unfortunate that the member for the district has to read about these matters in the country press. In future, will the Minister of Education reply to questions in this House before giving information to the press?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member's facts are not accurate. I believe that the member for Rocky River was first told last Wednesday that I had a reply to this question, and he was told again last Thursday and again today. I had the information here as soon as I could get it. At the same time this information was disseminated to places in which there was an interest in this matter, for example, in Port Augusta. If the honourable member checks with the mem-

ber for Rocky River he will find that what I have said is correct. The first time the reply was brought down—

Mr. Venning: Was last Thursday.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, it was last Wednesday. I told the member for Rocky River twice before today that I had a reply, but he did not bother to ask me because, I presume, other matters were of greater concern.

Mr. Nankivell: Was it available Tuesday?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot answer that—

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must ask one question at a time. That has completed the Minister's reply. Members must direct their questions through the Chair.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked some time ago regarding the Gladstone High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have had this reply with me for a few days. The proposed new Gladstone High School will be of Samcon construction and will incorporate new kinds of accommodation of the open-space unit type to meet the needs of the new curriculum in secondary schools. It has been necessary for the architects of the Public Buildings Department to develop a type of Samcon building to meet these new needs and so it has not been possible to get plans to the Public Works Standing Committee as early as was previously contemplated. However, it is now hoped that it will go to the committee in October this year. If a favourable report is received, it is expected that tenders for site works will be invited in April, 1971.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. BURDON: During the weekend, at Mount Gambier, I was pleased to attend a safety convention organized by the Labour and Industry Department and a local group, and I congratulate this group on its effort and the manner in which the conference was arranged. The seminar covered an extremely wide field and was a credit to those who organized it. The guest speaker was Sir William Hudson, who is known widely as the architect of the Snowy Mountains scheme. The Minister of Labour and Industry, who opened the conference, gave a summary of figures that would be of much interest to members, particularly as a record of the accident position in South Australia and of the progress being made to avoid

accidents. Therefore, I ask the Minister to give that information to the House.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Having attended this safety conference in Mount Gambier, I agree with the honourable member's comments. This was the first industrial safety conference in South Australia held outside Adelaide and because of that I was extremely pleased at its success and at the assistance that local people gave the department in organizing the campaign. I understand that the honourable member is interested in the figures that I gave regarding accidents. At the convention I pointed out that, in the last four years, the number of industrial accidents involving lost time from work of one week or more has decreased by 16 per cent even though, during this period, our work force has increased by 11 per cent.

Although these figures are encouraging, much remains to be done to promote industrial safety in the State and I think that the reaction we had from the people of Mount Gambier to this conference will do much to reduce the accident rate in the State.

RUN-OFFS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question regarding run-offs to be provided on the Mount Barker road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Existing legislation is sufficient to prevent the parking of vehicles at or near the run-off ramps. I might add that, for the benefit of the honourable member, I personally inspected the two run-offs this morning. They are now in a fairly advanced stage of construction and will, I hope, provide a necessary further safeguard for traffic on the Mount Barker road.

Mr. Nankivell: Did you try them out?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did, but in a car that had very good brakes.

APPRENTICES

Mr. HARRISON: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ascertain whether Government departments and the South Australian Railways Department, in calling for apprentices for the 1971 intake, will be able to fill their complements? If the departments cannot do so, will he ensure that every effort will be made to do so wherever possible?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to investigate the position and provide the honourable member with a report.

COOBER PEDY ROADS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 12 concerning the sealing of streets at Coober Pedy?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Construction of Coober Pedy streets will commence within 12 months and sealing will be undertaken shortly after, depending on the availability of funds.

GLENELG FOOTPATH

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 6 concerning the footpath in front of the Glenelg Infants School?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The department will soon be carrying out road widening at this location and, during this operation, will ensure that adequate pedestrian access is maintained. Until the actual roadworks are commenced, the responsibility for the maintenance of the existing footpath will continue to be the responsibility of the council. The council has been contacted to ensure that it is aware of its responsibilities.

METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. SLATER: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 11 about the introduction of the metric system?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The introduction of the metric system of weights and measures into Australia is the concern of the Commonwealth Government, which recently has passed the Metric Conversion Act, 1970, and set up a Metric Conversion Board. The States have agreed to support conversion, subject to compensations being provided by the Commonwealth to off-set costs incurred. South Australia's representative on the board (comprising 13 members) is Mr. Glastonbury of the Education Department. His function is to represent education throughout Australia. In addition, Mr. Glastonbury is to be Chairman of a special committee to advise the Governments, through the board, on education.

The Government has set up a Metric Measurements Advisory Committee whose main functions are as follows: (1) advise the Government on metric conversion; (2) represent this State, through one of its members, on an interstate committee, which in turn has a representative on the metric board; and (3) co-ordinate conversion within Government departments to the overall time table.

MODBURY WEST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 28 concerning the dispute that has arisen between the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully and the Education Department over the installation of traffic lights at the new Modbury West Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The letter from the Education Department referred to in an article headed "Council and Education Department Quarrelling" which appeared in a newspaper circulating in the Tea Tree Gully district was sent to the Tea Tree Gully council because no reply had been received to previous correspondence on the matter of traffic lights. The honourable member quoted from the report of the Public Works Committee, which recommended the construction of the Modbury West school only on the condition that traffic lights were installed at the intersection of Kelly and Wright Roads before the opening of the school, as suggested by the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board.

The letter was written to the council engineer asking him to bring the matter of installation of the lights before his council at the earliest opportunity, because of the importance of this matter to the school, which is to serve the children of the district. Uncertainty exists whether the Chairman of the board referred to vehicular control signals or an authorized school crossing. To clear this up and to enable some early action to be taken that will enable the school to be opened at the proper time, the Chairman of the board has been asked whether the board would support an application, which is to be made to the Public Works Committee, that an authorized school crossing on Kelly Road be accepted as an interim measure, so that the condition imposed by the committee may be met.

In future, when road development at the intersection has been undertaken and when the volume of traffic warrants it, proper traffic signals could be installed. Also, the board has been asked whether, if it supports the application, it also supports a request from the Tea Tree Gully council for the installation of an authorized school-monitored crossing.

STURT HIGHWAY

Mr. EASTICK: Last week the Minister of Roads and Transport gave me information about the redesigning and other work to be undertaken on the Sturt Highway, and I was grateful for it. Since I received the report,

traffic indicators have been placed on the corner, and information has since been provided that the size of these traffic signs will be enlarged because of the danger that exists there. My question relates to correspondence that started in 1964 between the District Council of Barossa and the Highways Commissioner, wherein it was stated that no building alignment was adjacent to this highway. Information was being sought concerning the roadworks that were to be undertaken so that the necessary by-law could be enacted. The last letter from the Highways Department, dated January 13, 1965, stated that an effort would be made to give an early indication of the reconstruction of the road and therefore provide for a map that could be aligned with the by-law. The answer given last week stated that there would be a delay, subject to finance becoming available, until at least 1975. Can the Minister say whether his department might indicate the alignment to be followed in 1975 or subsequently, so that the necessary by-law covering the building alignment could be arranged?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I understand the honourable member's question, he is referring to correspondence that passed between the District Council of Barossa and the Highways Commissioner, and from his request I take it that he is acting on the authority and with the knowledge of the district council. If this is the case, I imagine, unless the honourable member has left out some facts, that as the council has not seen fit to press this matter since 1965, there is no great urgency for this information. I strongly suggest that the council renew its request to the Highways Department, and I will undertake to ask the department to treat this matter expeditiously when the request is received.

AGED COTTAGE HOMES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going to ask a question of the Premier but, as he is not here, I will ask one of the Attorney-General instead.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will keep the one for the Premier for later.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot enter into conversation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir, I did not. On July 22, which I think was four weeks ago, I asked the Attorney-General a question about the various organizations in South Australia that have broadly similar objects to those of

Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated, and I asked the Attorney-General whether he would find out from his colleague the Chief Secretary whether he, the Chief Secretary, had been informed by any other organization of an intention to increase the charges (rent or otherwise) payable by occupants of dwellings erected by those organizations. The Attorney-General was kind enough to say four weeks ago that he would speak to his colleague and obtain the information and, for his benefit, I point out that this is reported at page 199 of *Hansard*. It may well be that the Attorney-General had the reply for me during the two weeks I was away on military duty and that he has not retained it. However, as four weeks has now passed, will the Attorney-General obtain the reply for me and give it to me tomorrow?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I must apologize to the honourable member: I have not obtained the reply. However, I will follow it up, ascertain whether the Chief Secretary has the information, and obtain the reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE

Mr. PAYNE: An item in the Loan Estimates provides \$1,750,000 for south-western suburbs drainage works, consisting of \$950,000 for "Sturt River continuation work" and \$800,000 for the "construction of various drains". One of the drains included in this large scheme is labelled drain No. 6, which is projected to drain large areas of St. Marys, Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park West, all of these areas being in my district. Mitchell Park West, in particular, sorely needs drainage improvement and, once again this winter flooding has occurred there, causing nuisance to local householders. Can the Minister of Local Government say whether drain No. 6 is scheduled for construction this financial year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am afraid that I cannot give the honourable member the information off the cuff. Although I do not have the details of the matter with me, I shall be delighted to get them and to provide the honourable member with the information.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT VOTING

Mr. CUMBE: In view of the concern that has been expressed recently by local government authorities about the proposed Government legislation on voting and suffrage, will the Minister of Local Government table the Local Government Act Revision Committee's report, or a précis of it, as a Parliamentary

Paper for the benefit of members of this House? I ask this question especially because copies of the report have been made available to local government interests.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, copies of this report have not been made available to local government interests as the honourable member has suggested, and this is due entirely to the fact that only five copies of the report were produced. Although these copies have not been produced in the period that I have been in office, I am informed that only five copies were produced at the time and, as a result, it has not been possible to distribute the report to local government bodies. However, the policy of this Government is to provide copies of the report to all local government bodies, and we are working in this direction at present. Dealing with the other point raised by the honourable member, namely, the tabling of the document in this House, I point out that that matter has already been raised in the Legislative Council by the former Minister of Local Government, and the reply given to him was to the effect that, as soon as copies of this report were available from the printer, a copy would be made available to each and every member of Parliament, as well as free of cost to each and every local government authority. If additional copies are required, they will be on sale at a price, we think at this stage, of about \$10 a copy. I think that, if the honourable member has seen the report in its original typed form, he will realize that it will be a large volume even in printed form. The original typed report comprised 11 volumes, each about 1in. thick, and these volumes consisted of foolscap pages, typed on one side in what I think a competent typiste would call double spacing. Fortunately, as the report will possibly be printed in eight-point, I imagine there will be a considerable reduction in volume. The report is being printed by private enterprise, and I am not saying this in any derogatory way.

Mr. Mathwin: Good idea!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not need any help from the member for Glenelg; I think I am adequately answering the member for Torrens without it. The report is currently being printed by a printer that probably ranks among the best in Adelaide, and it is not in any derogatory sense that I say that printing is behind schedule. The fact was that the Government Printer was just completely unable to handle the job.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you any idea when it will be available?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was telling councils eight weeks ago that it would be available at the end of July, but I have had to amend that. I had my officers inquire yesterday afternoon when it would be available. I know that the docket is on my desk, so I hope it contains a reply (I apologize for not having it here). I hope the report will be available within the next week or two. Perhaps I can give a further assurance to the honourable member by saying that the Bill the Government intends to introduce in relation to the Local Government Act will almost certainly not be brought before the House until members have had adequate time to study the report. The honourable member can rest assured on that point, certainly in regard to the matters of compulsory voting and adult franchise. Also, I may say that I am a little disappointed that the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated is waging a campaign in the way it has been waging it when in fact it does not have all the relevant information. Only one of the many councils has contacted me in what I believe to be the proper way: it has written to me, stating that there is concern in some circles about the matter and asking whether I would be good enough to provide the council with details of the Government's intentions. However, the other councils, as well as the Local Government Association, have tended to jump to conclusions without knowing the facts.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. McKEE: For some time now the member for Mount Gambier and I have been trying to have made available facilities for pensioners to obtain spectacles in certain country areas. During the term of the previous Government, we were informed that the Commonwealth Minister for Health had been considering the matter for some time. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague the Minister of Health what stage negotiations have reached in regard to these proposals?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain the information desired by the honourable member and let him have a reply in due course.

POULTRY FARMING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about possible pollution caused by poultry farms in zone 1?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Waste from laying hens and deep litter waste from layers or broiler chickens represent two types of pollution from poultry sheds. These wastes are highly concentrated sources of pollutants, the nitrogen and phosphorus content of the manure from laying hens being higher than in any other agricultural waste. In modern poultry farms, laying hens are usually housed intensively in cages and concentrated manure accumulates on the floor of a large shed. It is stated that about one ton of manure is produced each week from 1,000 birds, and establishments of 3,000 layers are common in local watersheds. Some poultry farms prefer to use a deep litter system for layers in which the birds move about freely within a restricted area of a shed and droppings mix with a layer of sawdust on the floor. This type of waste has a much lower moisture content than the cage manure, and is easier to handle. This system is also used in broiler chicken establishments, and over two tons of waste can be produced by 1,000 birds every three months. Watershed broiler farms usually accommodate from 10,000 to 60,000 birds.

Modern poultry sheds are designed to prevent the entry of property run-off and consequently, with good housekeeping, pollution of water-courses should be avoidable. However, to prevent the excessive accumulation of waste in zone 1 establishments, regular collection and disposal of this material outside of the restricted area must be undertaken without fail. The manure from layers and the deep litter are in demand for fertilizer, and market gardeners and farmers frequently contract for the removal of this waste. The effectiveness of this form of disposal depends on a balance between supply and demand and on the regularity and efficiency of collections and removal of waste, and the present trend towards increases in poultry farms could well result in an excess of available fertilizer, particularly in local areas of intensive activity.

In addition, while some poultry farmers are content to have the waste removed, others expect some payment for this material, and this attitude has resulted in the accumulation of a large heap of manure on at least one establishment in the Onkaparinga River watershed. It can be also expected that at times, perhaps due to excessively wet weather, sickness or pressure of other business, the contractor will be unable to remove the waste at the required time. Temporary storage would then be required, but this would present the risk that undesirable matter could be leached into or

otherwise gain access to watercourses. Thus, the erection of large poultry sheds in close proximity to reservoirs in zone 1 introduces a source of concentrated pollutant which is proportional to the size of the establishment. All applications for new poultry farms or the extension of existing ones must be individually examined since the departmental policy on poultry-raising activities in the watersheds is based upon their potential rather than demonstrable pollution.

LINWOOD QUARRIES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 6 about noise nuisance at Linwood quarries?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The blast carried out at Linwood quarries on August 5 has been investigated by an Inspector of Mines. It appears that some unusual circumstances converted an otherwise normal blast into one with excessive noise. The circumstances included heavy low-cloud level; reverberation from an opposite quarry face; and the firing of eight holes in the final shot against a normal five holes. The management is concerned at the incident. Firing is normally carried out at midday, and top benches are only fired during northerly winds. A repetition of the circumstances of the particular blast will be avoided.

PIANO SALESMAN

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On July 29, I asked the Attorney-General a question about the activities of a representative of Atlas Piano Services who was operating in the Barossa Valley and who, I believed, was defrauding people. Since then, I have received further information that confirms my statement. As I believe there is a need for urgency, can the Attorney-General say what progress, if any, has been made in the investigations into this matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will draw the Chief Secretary's attention to the matter in order to see what progress has been made and what further can be done.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. KENEALLY: Yesterday's *Australian* contains the first of three articles on nuclear power, this article being headed "Going Nuclear" and stating that the Chairman of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission (Sir Philip Baxter) has said that, within the next 30 years, or within this century, \$5,000,000,000 will be spent on nuclear power stations in

Australia. Can the Premier say what plans have been made for South Australia to fit into this overall scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage all South Australia can do is keep a close watch on developments and make representations whenever the Commonwealth Government decides to act in this area. South Australia should be considered in a national scheme for the reticulation of electricity throughout Australia. One of the problems facing this State (or, indeed, any part of Australia) arising from the provision of power from nuclear sources is that there must be a power station large enough to justify the cost involved. The cost of generating power from a nuclear base at the smallest level of undertaking remains above the cost of competitive power generation that we are now using: it costs more than generating power from coal, fuel oil or natural gas. What is more, it is not possible for South Australia alone to provide the necessary economic demand for the electricity that would be generated even by a smaller power plant than that being considered for Jervis Bay. Also, natural gas does not have the pollutional effects that are causing concern elsewhere.

The Government is keeping a constant watch on this matter, and the Commonwealth Government has been asked to see whether, in nuclear power development, there should not be agreement amongst the States for a national grid in electricity. Without our getting into a national growth, it would be difficult to justify the erection in South Australia of a nuclear power station having a capacity well beyond the foreseeable economic demand in this State. On the other hand, with foreseeable developments in the nuclear generation area, South Australia would be the most obvious and natural place to erect a power plant that would feed into a national growth. This matter has been kept before the Commonwealth Government.

PARKING STICKERS

Mr. RYAN: In your company, Sir, and that of the member for Unley, last Saturday afternoon I had the pleasure of watching a football match at the Alberton Oval, the result of which is now history.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who won?

Mr. RYAN: Ports won: they toppled Sturt.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who won the fight?

Mr. RYAN: The Speaker and I defeated the member for Unley. As a result of that match, a report under the heading "Stickers at Port" appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser*, part of which is as follows:

Criticism levelled at the Port Adelaide council over the handing out of parking stickers on Saturday to cars parked along the median strip of Port road near Alberton Oval was totally unjust, Councillor W. A. L. Kilpatrick said yesterday. The Port Adelaide council had no authority over the strip, and the stickers were handed out by police and not by council workers, he said. More than 800 cars received the stickers.

Councillor Kilpatrick said: "About eight months ago the council asked the Highways Department if football patrons could park their cars on the strip. The department said "No", and instructed us to erect signs warning people against parking there. The police were obviously instructed by the department to carry out their blitz, and the council knew nothing about it."

Yesterday I received many telephone calls from Port Adelaide supporters and Sturt supporters, the latter being irate not only because their team had lost the match but also because they had been charged with parking on the median strip. They were concerned about receiving stickers from the police as a result of their parking on the median strip. It was stated in the press that the Port Adelaide council knew nothing about the matter and that the stickers were placed on the vehicles not on its instructions but on those of the Highways Department. Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the report in the *Advertiser* is factual and whether the stickers were issued by the Police Department on behalf of the Highways Department or on instructions received from the Port Adelaide council?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I sympathize with the Sturt supporters whose team lost the match and who received a parking sticker. The press report is not correct. The median strip referred to is under the control of the Port Adelaide council, although I understand that the area in which the cars were parked extended beyond its boundary into that of the Woodville council. Having inquired, I am informed that the police action was sparked off by a request from the Port Adelaide council to blitz the area on Saturday afternoon. Although I do not wish to criticize the Police Department, I think the police officers could have been far better employed in the maintenance of law and order than by acting as traffic inspectors. However, that is a matter the Police Commissioner can examine and determine.

I am pleased that the action was taken by the council rather than by a department of this Government, because had it been the action of a Government department the police would have been smartly told to desist from taking further action, as the Government desires to get vehicles off the road and not to have our roads cluttered up even further by indiscriminate parking. Where such areas are available, they ought to be used. I think the classic example of this is Pinky Flat, where thousands of cars are parked safely every Saturday afternoon. I do not consider that such parking harms the lawns, shrubs or trees when it is controlled, and I should have thought that a live-wire council would see the possibility of getting easy revenue, even if the charge were about 20c. It is quite untrue to say that the Highways Department was involved in the affair in any way: that department had nothing to do with it. In fact, the council controls the whole plantation.

ARDROSSAN ENGINEERS

Mr. EVANS: I have been told that Ardrossan Engineers Proprietary Limited is to export a stone-gathering machine to Cuba but that there has been concern about whether Cuba would recognize the patent rights to the machine. If we gain trade in this way, much credit should be given to the Government and the Premier, as Minister of Development, for assisting the programme. However, can the Premier say whether we have any guarantee that these machines will not be used as a template for manufacturing similar machines in Cuba, without any rights being held by Ardrossan Engineers Proprietary Limited? In other words, will Cuba recognize the patent rights to the machine, if the report to which I have referred is correct?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When we took office, Ardrossan Engineers Pty. Ltd. had requested the Government to finance a trip to Cuba by Mr. and Mrs. Eckersley, representing the company, to demonstrate a stone-picking machine. The Cuban Government's agent in Glasgow had suggested that, if the machine was demonstrated satisfactorily, the Cuban Government might order as many as 300. The recommendation previously had been that the venture was too risky for the Government to do anything about it. However, I was concerned to see that orders were obtained for the engineering works at Ardrossan because I considered that from time to time those works had produced machines of extremely good design, but unfortunately

the company had lacked capital. Therefore, I said that I would recommend that, out of the special fund that existed to assist country industry, money be provided to send the foreman of the works to Cuba to demonstrate the machine, provided we had some guarantee of the kind that the honourable member had mentioned. The Agent-General has been asked to examine the position with the agent in Glasgow, who had forwarded the proposals to the Ardrossan works, to see that proper safeguards are provided regarding the rights to the design of the machine and ensuring that, if an order is placed and exports are made, payment will be made. We are awaiting word on the Agent-General's investigations before proceeding further.

BOAT OPERATORS

Mr. CURREN: As much confusion exists about the licence requirements for pleasure boats and other craft operating on the Murray River, will the Minister of Marine say what action his department has taken and intends to take on this matter and also on licensing of drivers of house boats?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, confusion has occurred in the honourable member's district about the department's requirements in connection with launch operators on the Murray River, but I think this is because people have thought that the operators are required to hold the old master mariner's certificate. The first requirement is that the craft must be surveyed and established as seaworthy. Most people accept that, if the craft did not float, its occupants would be in trouble. The operator must be found to be a fit and proper person, having an adequate knowledge of the rules regarding lights, etc. Once the operator satisfies the department of his experience in this field, there is no difficulty in his having licensed a passenger craft under his control. I think the honourable member appreciates that safety is the first concern in matters of this kind and, although it is necessary for the operator to have a certificate, the requirements for obtaining that certificate are not nearly as strict as persons in the Murray River districts have been led to believe, and I hope the honourable member conveys this information to the persons interested so that they will be able to come forward and obtain a certificate that they are competent to control these craft.

SPENCER GULF BRIDGE

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 5 about the bridge at Port Augusta?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Upon completion of the new bridge at Port Augusta, the existing bridge will continue to be used for local access to Port Augusta West and for recreation purposes. The care and responsibility of the old bridge will revert to the Corporation of Port Augusta, and it should provide good service, for the purpose required, for many years. The Corporation of Port Augusta has requested this action, and is well aware of the situation.

SUBCONTRACTORS

Mr. WARDLE: I can give a few details to the Minister of Roads and Transport concerning the payment of subcontractors, particularly fencing contractors and, in doing so, I ask the Minister whether he would review the method of payment for contractors to the Railways Department. It seems, and it is only natural to expect, that there would have—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not comment: he can explain the question but he must not comment.

Mr. WARDLE: It seems inevitable that people in the system will have to check on work that has been done, but from my information it seems that an unnecessary number of people have to approve of what has been done and to peruse the docket. Can this system be shortened? In the circumstances to which I refer, two to three months elapses before the subcontractor receives payment, and this delay can cause hardship. Will the Minister investigate the matter of approval of payments?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the only satisfactory way in which I can handle this matter (and I shall be pleased to do so) will be for the honourable member to set out all the details for me. He has confused me completely by speaking about contractors and subcontractors. I am not sure whether he means contractors to the Railways Department or subcontractors to those contractors, or to whom he is referring. If he sends me a letter setting out the details, I shall be pleased to consider it.

SOLOMONTOWN OVER-PASS

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 6 about a handrail on the Solomontown over-pass?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Solomontown over-pass was opened in a proper and dignified way by the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Highways Department does not intend to erect a form of fencing to separate the footpath from the carriageway, as it believes that the existing kerbing is adequate. However, the position will be kept under review.

BED SHORTAGE

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question of July 28 concerning the shortage of nurses and hospital beds?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Serious consideration has not been given to the recruitment of married trained nurses who would be available on an on-call basis to meet an emergency. The experience of the Royal Adelaide Hospital has been that in an emergency, such as a disaster, off-duty staff of all categories report for duty promptly. A nucleus of additional nursing assistance is always available in the nurses' homes at any given time, and there is always a substantial number of off-duty nurses actually in the homes.

In addition, it has been found in practice that non-resident staff are very quick to react to news of an emergency situation if this is broadcast over the radio. Naturally, off-duty staff are more valuable in such a situation than would be casual staff who would not be so familiar with hospital procedures. It is more practicable to recall staff from off duty in an emergency than to try to maintain a list of married nurses who may be available on an on-call basis.

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful to the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, for replying to the question I asked on July 28. However, I point out that only half of the question I asked has been answered. Part of my question was as follows:

... because of the current shortage of vacant beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether consideration has been given to employing on a short-time basis ... married trained nurses, who could be called on to help in times of difficulty ... ?

This is a little different from nurses being called on to assist in times of emergency or disaster. Will the Attorney-General obtain a reply on this point?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter again with my colleague and see what further information can be obtained.

PERSONNEL RECORDS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question

of July 28 about personnel records kept by certain employers?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Industrial Code requires an employer to keep time and wages records for three years from the dates of the last entries therein. It also provides that, when a business, or part thereof, is transferred, conveyed, or assigned to another employer, the former employer must transfer all such records to the new employer. Although industrial inspectors are continually making inspections, and have done so for many years now, they have no knowledge of record cards being made available to other employers, except as required by the Industrial Code. No complaints of records being made available to other employers have been received.

OPAL MINING

Mr. GUNN: At the weekend I had the pleasure of meeting opal miners at Coober Pedy and Andamooka who expressed grave concern at the amendments to the Mines and Works Inspection Act that have been introduced. Will the Premier, as Minister of Mines, give an assurance that before these amendments are proceeded with the views of the miners at Andamooka and Coober Pedy will be considered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that the honourable member is talking about the Mines and Works Inspection Act, not the Mining Act.

Mr. Gunn: Yes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have undertaken that I will take into account the views of opal miners at Andamooka and Coober Pedy on all matters relating to mining. In fact, I think it highly improbable that any of the miners at Coober Pedy or Andamooka are likely to be affected by the provisions of the proposed amendment to the Mines and Works Inspection Act.

Mr. Coumbe: They could be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be most unlikely. In fact, matters that appear to be of most concern to these people are matters contained in the general revision of the Mining Act, and the Government's proposals relating to that revision, particularly as far as it concerns opal mining, have been communicated to members of the Opal Miners Association in both Andamooka and Coober Pedy. I have been constantly in touch with the Opal Miners Association in both towns,

and I have made it clear to the people concerned that at all times I am prepared to accept and examine their submissions.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS COMMITTEE

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education overlooked the desirability of including a member of the Association of Headmistresses of Girls Independent Schools on the committee, under the chairmanship of the Reverend R. A. Cook, which has been appointed recently to determine the needs of independent schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No member of the committee is currently a member of the Association of Headmistresses of Girls Independent Schools, although I imagine that Mrs. Diana Medlin would be a member of that association at the end of the year and also that Sister Mary Cyril would be a member of that association if it were extended to include convent schools. I have not overlooked this point.

MOTOR CYCLES

Mr. CARNIE: I noticed a week or two ago a newspaper report that the New South Wales Government either intended to legislate or had legislated against what is known as the ape-hanger handlebar being used on a motor cycle. The reason for the term "ape-hanger" escapes me, but perhaps I am not with it! However, I understand that this refers to the particularly high handlebar fitted to a motor cycle, which has an extended front wheel and which seems to be in popular use in certain films that have been shown recently in Adelaide. As a motor cyclist in my youth, I recognize that the motor cycle is not the safest form of transport, and this type of handlebar certainly would not make it any safer. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government will, in the interests of road safety, undertake to prevent adapting this particularly dangerous type of handlebar for use on what is already a dangerous vehicle?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am afraid that I am a little in the dark regarding the New South Wales move. I think the safest thing to do would be to seek information from the New South Wales Government in order to see whether this requirement could or should be adapted to South Australian requirements.

SUPERANNUATION

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered introducing legislation enabling Superannuation

Fund contributors to transfer benefits from one fund to another when they change jobs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are some transfer rights at present, but there are considerable difficulties in some areas of transfer. There is reciprocity with the Commonwealth Government but not with some Commonwealth instrumentalities. The Government's aim is to ensure the maximum transfer possible, because it is an advantage to us to be able to attract people to our Public Service by enabling them to transfer their superannuation benefits, but this cannot be disposed of simply by legislation. We have to get agreement with the other superannuation funds regarding arrangements to transfer officers to our fund, and this is something that we are keeping under constant review.

Having discussed this matter with the Superannuation Fund Board, I suggest that this is something we shall be able to achieve more quickly as our fund alters. We hope to alter the whole basis of our fund in about two to three years so that there is a much more satisfactory and equitable superannuation scheme than the one we now have. When that has taken place, I think it will be easier to establish reciprocity than it is at present.

GROUP LAUNDRY

Mr. CURREN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on July 29 about rumours in connection with establishing a group laundry in the Upper Murray?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague reports that although preliminary investigations have been carried out to assess the necessity for a group laundry and central linen service in the Upper Murray district, and the various hospitals in the area have been canvassed for their views, further investigations will be necessary before a decision can be made.

ANDAMOOKA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN: No doubt the Minister of Works is aware of the current shortage of water at Andamooka. It was put to me over the weekend that it might be practicable to have water piped to Andamooka from the storages at Woomera. Will the Minister of Works ask his department to investigate this matter to see whether the suggestion is practicable?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I will refer this matter to the department, I point out that at present much difficulty is also being experienced at Coober Pedy, as the

honourable member knows. As the solar plant there is not operating at present because of difficulty in repairing pipes, the department is involved in having to cart water for I think about 100 miles at a cost of \$34 a thousand gallons. The honourable member will appreciate that we are trying to do everything possible to relieve the department of this cost. However, I will examine the matter concerning Andamooka.

RAILWAY ACCOUNTS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about Railways Department revenue and expenditure?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The figures relating to railway finance quoted by the honourable member are cash figures for July, 1970. Particularly for revenues over such a short period as a month cash receipts can vary widely from actual earnings, depending on the precise date of collection of moneys due. For July, 1970, the Railways Department collected revenues of \$2,476,000, whereas during July, 1969, the department collected \$3,229,000. The collections for July, 1969, were greater than actual earnings by about \$225,000 mainly because the carry-over from June, 1969, was higher than normal. In July, 1970, collections fell short of actual earnings by about \$703,000 partly because the June, 1970, carry-over was lower than normal, and partly because the July, 1970, temporarily unpaid accounts were rather higher than normal. Actual earnings of the railways, as distinct from actual cash receipts, in July, 1970, were \$3,179,000, or almost 6 per cent higher than the \$3,004,000 for July, 1969, so it will be seen that traffic is still proceeding quite satisfactorily. The movements in interstate general merchandise and in grains continue at encouragingly high levels, although the outlook for grain merchants is becoming dimmer, as the honourable member will realize. Railways cash expenditure at \$3,312,000 during July, 1970, was higher by \$401,000 than during the previous year. Over so short a period as a month this figure, too, may show rather wide variations, depending particularly upon how many pay-days may fall in the month. However the greater proportion of the disclosed increase has been due to the higher level of wages and salaries now operating as compared with the level a year earlier.

PENOLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to the Penola Primary School, part of which is of

old wooden-frame construction that is showing signs of wear. Other sections of the school, of solid construction, are still useful. The committee has approached me from time to time about the erection of a new school at Penola. I would not expect the Minister of Education, in the short time he has been in office, to have looked at all the details of schools such as the one of which I speak, but I bring to his notice that the senior part of this school needs up-grading. Will the Minister therefore consult with his officers so that some improvements can be effected at this school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pleased to tell the honourable member that I act with as much haste as possible in this regard. If the Commonwealth Treasurer behaves tonight as I hope he will, the department will be able to proceed within the foreseeable future with the construction of the six-teacher open-space unit that is planned for the Penola Primary School. This open-space unit was part of the \$3,000,000 programme I announced last week. Had he bothered to question me about it last week, the honourable member could have found that out then. I do not know whether any of the newspapers printed the list that was given to them, but Penola was one of the schools referred to therein. I ask the honourable member to listen with me with bated breath tonight to see how mean or how generous the Commonwealth Government intends to be.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPPLY BILL NO. 2

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

REFERENDUM (METROPOLITAN AREA SHOP TRADING HOURS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 708.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to read a letter which refers to the matter contained in the Bill and which was sent to me recently. It states:

I would like to see you do your utmost to stop the Labor Party put through the legislation on late night shopping. I live in an area in which late shopping is a way of life and, were it not so, I would get precious little of my major purchasing done. I am a working wife, as are so very many nowadays, and so the only time I have available to shop is for an hour or less after work, and no time to shop in Adelaide except on very rushed and infrequent visits to Adelaide. Surely the step Mr. Dunstan is contemplating is retrogressive and worthy only of the horse and carriage days?

I agree entirely with the last statement in that letter, as do many other people in South Australia. The increasing population on the periphery of Adelaide want to retain the freedoms and privileges that they now have in regard to shopping hours. This afternoon I was given a petition containing 10,000 signatures of people in this area. I am not allowed to exhibit those signatures in the House, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and other members that I have the signatures in my desk. Voluntarily, 10,000 persons signed those petitions, and the only notice they were given was when they saw the petitions on tables in the business premises in which they were trading. The heading of the petition states:

We, the undersigned, request the Leader of the Opposition to preserve the privileges of extended shopping hours available at present to families in this district.

We know very well that, if 10,000 people have signed those petitions, many more thousands must support the sentiments in the petitions.

Mr. Jennings: And 10,000 will sign the opposite!

Mr. HALL: The honourable member can ignore the people in the community, if he likes, and tread on their freedoms, but I do not do that. The Minister's explanation of the Bill is interesting. Indeed, the Minister looked wan and forlorn last Thursday when he introduced the Bill. He had been under considerable pressure, and was showing it. I noticed that the Bill was printed on the date on which it was introduced. Apparently, the Bill was obtained by the extremely efficient news media in this State on the previous afternoon and the people were told about it before it was introduced. I imagine that there was much concern expressed in the Minister's office and by the Minister himself about this happening. The first sentence of the Minister's second reading explanation states:

The Government intends to introduce legislation into Parliament during the current session to make a complete revision of the present laws which restrict shopping hours.

The big implication is that the Government will be generous, because it will completely review restrictions and the laws that restrict shopping hours. However, the Government will ask a single question at the referendum! The statement that the Government will completely revise existing shopping laws is extremely wide. If we were to have a referendum on the question, one would expect that the Government would ask the people whether they favoured unrestricted trading, or unrestricted trading in staggered hours. One would expect a consultation by referendum to be of some depth and width. Will it be that? Will we ask the people what they think of the complete revision of shopping hours? No, not on your life. We are going to ask a single question as follows:

Are you in favour of shops in the Metropolitan Planning Area and the municipality of Gawler being permitted to remain open for trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays?

What about the complete revision? Of course, the Government has been more explicit than it cares to make known, because it has said that it will have this complete revision of the restricting laws and, at the same time, it has told the people who have signed this petition that it will take away their Saturday afternoon and Sunday shopping facilities and their Friday night and weekend butcher trading facilities and it will ask the rest of the metropolitan area whether it should take away their Friday night trading. The Government is asking the people whether it should take the next thing away, not whether it should let the people retain what they have.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You've got a good imagination.

Mr. HALL: The Minister has been a constant interjector when in opposition, but he will need a better interjection than that to prove to these 10,000 people that that is not so. I remind the Minister that he must pilot the Bill through Committee and that every interjection he makes will be taken into account and he will be questioned on it. He is accountable to the people for, in the name of relaxation, bringing far-reaching restrictions to the State. Last session the Labor Party talked out the exempted goods legislation by long, lengthy—

Mr. Jennings: Tedious!

Mr. HALL: —tedious addresses and filibustering type of debate. That prevented the people from having the benefits of that legislation. Apparently, the Premier does not remember that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have it right here.

Mr. HALL: We know what the Premier is giving the people.

Mr. Clark: You weren't game to do anything about it.

Mr. HALL: The member for Elizabeth should have more sense. He was here and he knows that the Bill contained an extremely wide list of exemptions. Further, the previous Government stated definitely that it would not further restrict trading hours in this State. Let the honourable member tell the people of Elizabeth about that.

Mr. McKee: Who's doing that?

Mr. HALL: The member for Pirie is and he can laugh if he likes at the interests of those people. Let him, in his clever way, campaign on this matter at the by-election for the Midland District in the Legislative Council. Doubtless, he will be there. The Government has shown that it will take away the additional freedoms that the people in this area have now and that it will ask the people to take away the remaining freedoms they have and a referendum is to be the basis of Government action. One may ask why a referendum is needed to institute Friday night shopping in the metropolitan area if the people desire it. We find the reason for the Government's action in the Labor Party's policy speech, an interesting paragraph of which states:

To ensure the health of the industries involved and to restrain prices a Labor Government will amend the Early Closing Act to provide: five-day week baking throughout the State; 5½-day week retail butchering throughout the State; revision of the list of exempt goods and shops; and no extension of Friday night shopping beyond areas where it now obtains.

There we find the reason for the referendum. The climate was not good when the Government put its hand out of the door and started to act on shopping hours. There was constant revulsion against restrictions and the Government had to change its policy within two and a half months of the election.

Instead of maintaining a policy of "no extension", it is now planning to ask the people whether they want a change. So the Government is unloading the responsibility on to the people.

Mr. Ryan: The proper way to do it.

Mr. HALL: This appears to be a move for which the Government has no mandate—an interesting subject for conjecture in relation to other matters that have been discussed here. The Government has no mandate for an extension of Friday night shopping because it campaigned against it. Of course, one may rightly ask, "Where is the mandate to abolish Saturday afternoon and Sunday afternoon shopping?" It does not exist! The Government has no mandate for such a move, nor has it a mandate to ask the people, by way of referendum, whether that is what they want. The Minister knows these things, yet he often talks of a mandate. That is the running cry of the Government. Whenever it is criticized on any point it says, "We have a mandate for a Government insurance office and for other things." What about the things that are not mentioned in the Labor Party's policy speech? Does it have a mandate for them? No! The Minister knows very well that, within three months of the election, he is changing one of the planks of the Labor Party's election policy by asking the people whether they want something that the Labor Party then said should not be provided.

The Government is asking the people whether privileges they now have should be abolished. The whole thing comes down to a piece of political trickery. It has thrown in a reference to revision of restrictions, thrown in a limited referendum (a trick question!) and wants to take away some of the major shopping freedoms enjoyed by so many South Australians, including many immigrants. Of course, the Government does not intend to ask what people in country areas think, because they do not count. The Government intends to alter the way in which country people attempt to change their shopping hours, but it does not plan to seek their opinion by way of a referendum. Many country people do their shopping in the city and, in the areas that may be restricted. In fact, many country people living north of Adelaide would shop at Elizabeth at least as frequently as would many people at Port Adelaide, but this means nothing to the Government. In this absurd way the Government is once again ignoring the country's traditional support for the Labor Government to do this, and it is another example of its contempt for the country. Yet the Government talks about decentralization! So the country areas are to be put under the overlordship of the Minister. The Government plans to do away

with the system of petitions and counter-petitions, difficult as it may have been to apply. It is intended that councils may make recommendations to the Minister, and the Minister will act on them. In his second reading explanation the Minister of Labour and Industry said:

In making such an application the local government authority will have to report to the Minister of Labour and Industry on the inquiries that have been made to ascertain the wishes of the public in its district, as well as indicating the view of the municipal or district council concerned. The Minister will be empowered to make further inquiries (if he wishes to do so) and if, after such application has been made, he is satisfied that the Act should or should not be applied in any country district, then he would recommend to the Governor that a country shopping district be created or abolished.

So, the Minister will be the overlord of country conditions, and country people will be unable to petition or counter-petition against what is done. Their one approach will be through councils. This question of a referendum will not apply to butchers at all. We are not asking the people whether they think that butchers should provide shopping facilities on Friday nights: they are to be excluded before we start. Of course, the Minister said:

. . . in order that the public may have all the facts before voting at the referendum.

What facts? What guarantee is there that the Government will not move in on Saturday morning trading at any minute? Are we relying on the word of the Premier? On August 5 he said:

As for the rest—

he was referring to the general conditions on which these 10,000 people have petitioned—we said we believed the present position should be held. The Government has made no statement threatening a further restriction of trading hours.

Here we are, on August 18, discussing this Bill after an announcement like that has already been made. I submit that the Premier gave no guarantee; he said:

If there are any rumours floating around at present of the kind that the Leader has mentioned, he has contributed to them in marked degree. The only statement that the Government has made concerning alterations to trading hours relates to butchery and baking. In both of these trades the specific proposals that we had for altering trading hours were set out in detail in the policy speech and outlined at the time of the State election, namely, that there would be a 5½-day week for butchering over the whole State and a five-day week for baking. This was the only way we could see

of achieving satisfactory rationalization of both these industries. As for the rest, we said we believed the present position should be held.

Anyone listening to that would have immediately inferred that there was to be no attack on weekend shopping. But, 13 days after that statement, weekend shopping is to be abolished on Saturday afternoons and Sundays. I warn the Government that, since August 5, 10,000 people have protested. Undoubtedly the Government's aim in the referendum is entirely political. South Australia is fast becoming the plaything of the Labor Party. This referendum is to be manipulated to win the Midland seat in the Legislative Council. How on earth the Government thinks it can do that when 10,000 people have protested, I do not know. No wonder the Minister looked uncomfortable when he introduced the Bill. I think the President of the Labor Party, who sits on his left, must have given him a few warnings. I do not know why, for the Minister's political salvation, he did not put a rein on the Minister. However, the Minister got away and, probably at the behest of the Premier, he brought out this political trick to try to win the Midland by-election. We are going to have a compulsory vote, in effect, in parts of the Midland District but not in all of it. The referendum will be restricted to the area defined in the Bill, essentially the metropolitan area plus Gawler. It will mean that to all intents and purposes there will be a voluntary vote in country areas and a compulsory vote in the metropolitan areas of Midland.

So, the scene is set to have a change of representation in Midland. Well, we will see about that: it will be the subject of another fight at another time. I believe that the Government must give a solemn undertaking to the House and to the public that it will not tamper with Saturday morning trading. I know of the union pressures that are being applied to the Government, which is union dominated, to remove Saturday trading in this State. Before the public are asked to vote on the single question of Friday night shopping they should be assured, following the Ministers statement that the public should have all the facts, that the Government will on no account tamper with Saturday morning trading, at least not before the next State election. Unless that undertaking is given I believe that this referendum should include that question, in order to give the public the opportunity to fully confirm its belief in that important part of trading hours in this State.

I will be asking that question, and I will look to the Premier or the Minister (whoever is to speak for the Government on this matter) to give this full assurance to the public before the Bill passes the Committee stages. It would be interesting to ascertain whether the Government really considered that this referendum was necessary. The Minister of Works, the Deputy Premier, said that it would pass with the support of 70 per cent of the voters. I am sure that all members read that report in the *Sunday Mail*, I think it was.

Mr. Millhouse: In the *Advertiser*.

Mr. HALL: One of the newspapers recently published the statement by the Deputy Premier that the referendum would pass with 70 per cent support. Why is the Government conducting the referendum, when it considers that the result is a foregone conclusion? Members on this side have always maintained that Governments are elected to govern. Why, therefore, is the Government conducting a referendum when the Deputy Premier believes that there is only a 30 per cent opposition? Why put the public to the expense and, to some, the personal inconvenience of a compulsory vote? These questions need to be answered, and perhaps the Premier will try to answer them. He owes it to the public to say why, if he thinks this is a foregone conclusion, he needs to ask them, when he has the right to govern anyhow.

I believe that this is a completely unnecessary referendum. I do not need to be told that people should have some basic freedoms, freedoms that are enjoyed by people in many parts of the world. In a recent survey a newspaper report indicated that there was a widespread movement towards freedom and not towards the restrictions that the present Government is contemplating. The newspaper report states:

While Adelaide shop workers intend to campaign against any extension of shopping hours, their British counterparts prepare to fight moves to introduce seven-days-a-week trading. In most major world cities late night shopping, Saturday shopping, and staggered trading hours are already a way of life.

Already a way of life! It is interesting to observe, at this stage, that we have aimed (or we pretend to aim) at becoming a city of distinction and at raising ourselves to world standards of attractiveness with tourism being so important. Yet we are turning our back on freedoms that other people want when they come here because that was normal in the countries from which they came. Also, we are

to reduce the question of this complete revision to the single one of, "Do you want Friday night shopping?"

The newspaper article sets out what happens in other parts of the world and describes the facilities that are provided in a much greater quantity than we provide here at present. We should not have further restrictions on trading hours in South Australia and we should have available throughout the State, if required by traders, Friday night shopping. Last year, this subject was widely discussed by members of the previous Government and we introduced a list of exemptions. The then Minister, when introducing the Bill, said that the Government would give further attention to trading hours in the coming session. We also gave the undertaking clearly that we would not restrict further the existing trading hours.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: To whom did you give those undertakings?

Mr. HALL: The Minister has not been following carefully the matters concerning his portfolio, for he would have been able to read many times what the Minister had said. When introducing the Bill last year the Minister said that, unfortunately, the time available to the Government during the session—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That is all he did say.

Mr. HALL: The Minister knows that an undertaking was given that no further restrictions would apply.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where?

Mr. HALL: If I do not have that information with me I will get it for the Minister during the Committee discussion. I read it only in the last day or so. I do not have it now, but I will get it for him.

Mr. Clark: I have the second reading explanation here—

Mr. HALL: The honourable member has many things but he rarely reveals them to the House.

Mr. Clark: Can you imagine a sillier statement than that?

Mr. HALL: It is a statement in answer to a silly interjection.

Mr. Clark: It wasn't a silly interjection: I have the speech in front of me. I can read, even if you can't.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader must speak to the Bill and not reply to interjections.

Mr. HALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Clark: I have the speech here.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: We will find for the doubting members opposite the statements we made that there would be no further restriction on trading hours in this State.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's like the statements on sales tax.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and I thought it was very revealing.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It wasn't like the one you used.

Mr. HALL: The undertaking was given, and my Party stands by its policy. It will support, by vote in this House, that policy, and will advocate the policy that there should be no further restrictions, that there should be 9 o'clock closing across the State on Friday night, if required by the various traders concerned, and that there should be a local option poll, in probably two years, in those areas now enjoying unrestricted trading hours to ascertain whether those conditions were wanted in two years' time. That is a policy not of restriction but of relaxation, and it contrasts greatly with the present Government's attitude of taking away what, as I said, 10,000 people and their many colleagues so ardently want in this State. I believe the question must be widened to include all the citizens of this State. I have said, and repeat, that I think this is an unnecessary referendum. But, if the Government is not willing to govern, it must widen this matter to all citizens of the State. Secondly, it must give an undertaking that before the next election it will not tamper with Saturday morning trading. It must widen the matter to ask whether people are in favour of unrestricted trading. There is no reason why any Government should not ask that question. Of course, if the Government is not willing to give an undertaking on Saturday morning trading, it should include that, too, in the list of questions.

I conclude by saying that this is an unnecessary measure; it is a measure of Government reaction to public demand that it not proceed. It is an action forced on the Government because three months ago it said that it did not believe in Friday night shopping and that there should be no further development of that. It is an action that is coinciding with the removal of many of the basic shopping freedoms now enjoyed north and south of the city. For that reason, I will oppose this Bill if it is not amended; but, if it is amended, it may be presentable to us. The fact that it

is unnecessary does not mean that if the right questions are asked it is harmful or undemocratic. It is certainly unnecessary, but I will vote for the second reading on the understanding that I shall be moving some amendments and seeking some assurances from the Government during the Bill's passage through Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened to the Leader with great attention. To be fair to him, I think I have not heard him to worse advantage in this House than I did this afternoon. I endeavour to give credit where credit is due. I tried to distil from what the Leader had to say what it was that he wanted, and one thing came out quite clearly: he wanted the Government to be in difficulty for political purposes; that is all he wanted. Let me turn to the question immediately of the courage and forthrightness of honourable members opposite on trading hours and the way in which in their period in office in intrepid fashion they seized this nettle and dealt with it effectively!

Mr. Clark: And accused us of holding it up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, members opposite do not remember what they did. After two years of approaches from various trading interests in South Australia, the Leader's Government introduced a measure into this House. It was a Bill for an Act to amend the Early Closing Act, and it was before us earlier this year, so it is within living memory that we have had this. It was introduced on November 19, 1969. That provided for some alteration in the list of exempt goods. As has been pointed out by the Minister, not only is it intended by this Government that we increase the list of exempt goods but also we intend to go further than the honourable members opposite did on that score and open up exempt shops and the list of exempt goods. So, so far as restrictions on the exemptions are concerned, we intend to go significantly further than the Leader did only a few months ago.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about hours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As regards hours, let me read to honourable members the only clause of the Bill placed before this House by members opposite only a short time ago that referred to any extension in hours. It was then said:

The provisions of this Act do not apply to or affect the sale, supply or consumption of liquor upon premises in respect of which a licence is in force under the Licensing Act.

Mr. Hall: Where are the restrictions on hours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The principal Act already provides for considerable restrictions, and honourable members opposite carefully did nothing about opening up trading hours in the already existing extensive areas where restrictions exist.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They didn't do a thing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not one thing. Most people in the metropolitan area were not to be allowed the privilege of having extended trading hours close to home: they would have to get into their motor cars and take off on a journey to get the same advantages that people in other areas had.

Mr. Hall: What was your election policy on that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We had a look at the situation and considered that the line should be held at that.

Mr. Hall: It was identical with the policy you said we had.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Quite so; I am not suggesting anything to the contrary. I believed that at that stage of the proceedings we should hold the line, because there were some difficulties about opening up hours within the metropolitan area. I said that to people at election time. Now, because of events that have transpired since then, I believe people should have the right to say what they believe should be the case. The events that have transpired since that time are these: it has become quite clear to the Government, since it has taken office, that a number of unfair conditions are being created by having non-uniform hours. Once we get a lack of uniformity in trading hours within an area so that some people are compulsorily restricted while others are not restricted (and those others are only a short distance away), the effect upon the restricted traders is very severe indeed. In the past two months the pressure in this matter grew to such an extent that the Government became convinced that it could not in the long run continue effectively to enforce the present provisions of the Early Closing Act and that they would not be supported publicly. It thought there would be widespread defiance of the provisions of the Act and, therefore, any attempt to enforce observance of the Act

without social support for its enforcement would result in chaos in trading conditions.

When we had seen that and it was made evident to us that this was the case (and, indeed, trading organizations within the city of Adelaide changed their submissions from what they had made to us before the announced policy at the election) we believed that the question of uniform trading hours for the whole of the metropolitan area should be put directly to the people. I cannot see what is wrong with that; that is a fair and proper means of determining what the public wants.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was the Opposition's election policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On that score at election time it was significantly silent; it did not say anything at all.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It has never known what to do about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me turn immediately to one matter which the Leader has apparently misunderstood and which I wish to clear up at once with him and the House. The Government, in its election policy, said it believed that there should be State-wide trading hours for retail butchering. The provisions relating to the butchering trade are quite unique to that particular trade and, without uniform hours for retail butchering throughout the State, the conditions about which the Master Butchers Association, the butchers union and everybody engaged in the organizations concerned in the industry have been protesting for a long time will get worse. Therefore, we believe that there should be uniform butchering hours.

The hours that we suggested were not those which originally the union had submitted or which the Master Butchers Association had submitted but those that we believed most nearly accorded with the general practice and demand of the public; that is, that there should be a 5½-day week for butchering, whereas both the Master Butchers Association and the Meat Trades Union had asked for closing on Saturday mornings and opening on Friday nights. Our view was that there was more demand for Saturday morning butchering, and we did not intend to alter the hours in relation to Saturday morning. The butchers had a five-day week by agreement amongst themselves, not under the provisions of the Early Closing Act, and that was broken when, in fact, packaged meat was supplied to supermarts and butchers were forced to open in competition with the supermarts.

Mr. Becker: Why didn't they stop packaged meat?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Who would stop the packaged meat? How would we do that? We cannot say to the supermarts, "You cannot sell meat," and the supermarts were not prepared to agree with the butchers. I appreciate the honourable member's point of view; he is a supporter of the five-day banking week committee! However, I hope he will have a talk to a few of his colleagues who apparently want to open up the banks again on Saturday mornings.

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. 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. That was stated in the Minister's explanation. Apparently, the Leader did not appreciate it, but I am making it clear now. It is not intended, if the referendum is carried, to close butcher shops on Friday night.

Mr. Millhouse: Say that again!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not intended, if the referendum is carried, to close butcher shops on Friday night. They have the same trading hours as the general retail trading hours to be provided. Secondly, the Leader said that in taking the step we are taking we are under union domination for the restriction of hours: let me point out to the Leader that the Shop Assistants Union is opposed to this particular move, and it has said so publicly.

Mr. Hall: But it is not against your stopping weekend shopping.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader cannot have his cake and eat it. Where is the union domination in this?

Mr. Hall: It is in your stopping weekend shopping.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Rubbish! Where is there in the petition any reference specifically to Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading?

Mr. Hall: It is referring to the whole thing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is Friday night that the people are interested in, and the Leader knows that. I am perfectly prepared to answer every one of the Leader's petitioners and to write to them and tell them what the truth is in this matter rather than the extraordinary things that the Leader has been saying.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the truth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member apparently has not been listening.

Mr. Millhouse: I've been listening intently.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is that there is so little real demand for Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading generally in the metropolitan area that it would create an intolerable situation if we did not have, in the foreseeable future, uniform trading hours in the metropolitan area. The Leader himself knows perfectly well that he cannot cure that by holding off the situation for two years and then having a local option poll to see whether people want to have Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading. That is not the way to do it, and he himself admits that there is a question whether Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading is necessary in talking about the necessity of holding a referendum in two years' time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: A few years ago the Opposition would not have agreed to people working on a Sunday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so. There was a great fuss while we were in Government about the suggestion that hours should be opened up for people to have recreation on Sunday. May I point out to honourable members opposite that the Party that has been most responsible for extending facilities and hours in South Australia for people's recreation and entertainment is my Party. The fact is that this is not a poll to take away from people in Elizabeth or Christies Beach their Friday night shopping: it is a poll to see whether Friday night shopping shall be given to people in the remainder of the metropolitan area. The Leader has asked me what our position is regarding Saturday morning trading: I say to him quite clearly that there is no proposal whatever to interfere with the normal and present course of Saturday morning trading, and we do not intend during the

life of this Government to make any move concerning Saturday morning trading.

What we are trying to do here is not to provide for general restrictions but to get some sort of reasonable rationalization so that the intolerable anomalies, which are now occurring in trading within the metropolitan planning area and the municipality of Gawler, are removed and so that everybody gets a fair and equal go and receives adequate service.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And so that there is no unfair competition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is correct. It has been suggested to me in one place that what we ought to do in order to maintain some businesses in outer areas is to see that people in other areas are restricted so that they cannot compete. I do not think that that is fair; I do not think that that is a basis on which we should approach trading in the metropolitan area. I think the only way in which we can proceed is to get uniformity. On the question of uniformity, since at the time of the election we had said we would maintain a division which we now find we cannot maintain, it is proper and democratic for the people to be consulted; and, what is more, it will be obvious, after the referendum is held, where the social support in the community lies in relation to trading hours, and a Government required to enforce trading hours provisions will clearly have the backing of the people. In these circumstances, this is a social measure of great importance to the people of South Australia. The course that the Government has chartered ahead is clear: we are trying to get uniformity and reasonable provisions in trading to give facility to people to do their shopping when they need to. That is a clear course. As the course that the Leader proposes is anything but clear, I suggest to him that he give his support to a measure that deserves it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): We have just heard an apology from the Premier for the course of action that his Government has adopted in this matter and for the sudden and almost complete change of course that we have seen in the last week since the *Advertiser* published to the world the Government's plan on, I think, last Thursday. Before I go to the beginning of the matter, I wish to refer to a couple of points, while they are fresh in the minds of honourable members, that arise from the Premier's speech. The first is that it

has apparently in some way become suddenly clear to the Government (and it was unclear before when the Labor Party was in office) that several unfair conditions arise from the lack of uniformity in trading hours. For the life of me, I cannot see why the Labor Party had to get into office to see that, nor can I see what has transpired in the last few months to sharpen what has been obvious to any rational human being in South Australia—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why didn't you do something about it when you were in Government?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that there were tremendous anomalies in trading arrangements in South Australia. We realized this when we were in office. I refer members opposite to what I said and to what the Premier said last year when he was Leader of the Opposition and when he agreed that this was the case. Why did he have to get into office suddenly to see these anomalies? Of course, the answer is that there has been no development in the last three months that was not known or foreseen before the Labor Party came into office. Members opposite have found, as I think one writer in the *Advertiser* suggested last week, that this matter is a hot potato, too hot for them to handle, and they have taken this way out. This afternoon the Premier used the lame excuse that somehow these extra anomalies have appeared in the system since he has come into office: that they did not exist when he was in office before for three years or when he was Leader of the Opposition. This is one of the weakest points I have ever heard him put up, and it only underlines the embarrassment, confusion and lack of confidence that the Government is showing in this matter.

Mr. Hall: Especially the Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister sits at the other end of the front bench. He has the lightest Ministerial load that any Minister has had since I have been a member.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member discussing the Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, brought in by this Minister, who has only one portfolio. Perhaps with all the time he has had on his hands he has been able to find something under the surface that has not been known before. I will now deal with another point made by the Premier who said (and I took this down) that this was not a poll to take away from Elizabeth and Christies Beach their Friday

night shopping, and he went on to express confidence in the outcome of the referendum. If he is so confident of that outcome, why on earth are we having the referendum at all? However, I will not argue that at present. For the moment, I will assume (and I assume this only for the purpose of my argument) that the referendum is justified. What if the Premier is wrong in his confidence, and the referendum is not carried? Just what will happen then to trading at Elizabeth and Christies Beach? Surely, if there is any purpose whatever in having a referendum, there must be some doubt about its result. If there is no doubt at all, why go to the trouble and expense of having a referendum? This is utterly hollow because, as I understand the Government's proposals, if the referendum is not passed, we will not have 9 o'clock closing on Friday evening.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It will have to be agreed by the majority of the people.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What do we mean when we say that the referendum is carried or not carried? Surely it means that the majority of people vote one way or the other.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Then you're wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I am wrong in the point I am making now and if, despite defeat in the referendum, the Government does not intend to change trading hours at Elizabeth or Christies Beach, will the Government say so? Up to the time the Premier spoke, my understanding was that, if the referendum were held and not carried, there would be no shopping until 9 p.m. anywhere in that extended metropolitan area.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's exactly right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Acting Leader of the House—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is acting as if he were the Acting Leader of the House. Anyway, the Minister of Education says that I am right in what I say. If I am right in what I have said, the Premier is absolutely wrong to say that this is not a poll to take away from Elizabeth and Christies Beach their Friday night shopping, because that could be the plain result of the referendum.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's not its objective.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Premier made any point that had any validity at all, it was

that uniformity within an area—whether the area proposed rather vaguely by the Government of the metropolitan planning area plus Gawler, or whether the whole State—should apply.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're arguing about that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am simply giving the lie to the point the Premier made when he said that this was not a poll to take away from Elizabeth and Christies Beach their Friday night shopping. If there is to be uniformity included, obviously if this referendum is lost, the Government leaves up—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I think you're struggling.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must address the Chair and must not take notice of interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been very careful not to take notice of interjections. I have been addressing you, Sir, throughout.

Mr. Ryan: You've ignored the Speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not, except just then.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is ignoring me now, as I told him to address the Chair, and he has taken no notice of me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Anyway, obviously if this referendum is not carried, on what it has said so far, the Government intends to close the shops in Elizabeth and Christies Beach on Friday evenings. If that is not its intention, I ask the Minister, when he replies, to say so.

Mr. Hall: What about the petition?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the Premier has disparaged the petition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is supposed to address the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will make one last point arising from the Premier's speech. He said that this question of uniform trading hours for the whole metropolitan trading area should be put to the people. If that question should be put to the people, all I can say is that the question the Minister has framed and inserted in the Bill lamentably fails to do it, and this underlines the difficulty and, frankly, the futility of referenda on topics such as this taken in circumstances such as this; it is futile for any member to think that by asking the question in the Bill we will get all the answers to the problems associated with trading hours in this State. The Premier has

implied that the question in the Bill is submitting to the people of the State the whole question of uniform trading hours for the whole of the metropolitan area, but to say that is nonsense, because the question asked in the Bill relates to one particular closing time only, namely, 9 o'clock on Fridays. It begs every other question concerned with closing hours. I would be the last to deny (I could not possibly deny it, in the situation in which I am) that this is an extremely difficult problem, and it is one that the Government of which I was a member did not have time to solve during our two years in office.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You were in office for 32 years and couldn't solve it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is another futile interjection from the Minister.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to take notice of interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a difficult problem, and we did not have time to solve it. However, if we had remained in office, we would have been able to solve the problem during this session.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the member for Mount Gambier said that we did not do anything in 40 years. I do not know whether he blames me or the Leader of the Opposition for that. We had two years in which to do this and, if members cast their minds back, they will recall that during that time my immediate predecessor as Minister of Labour and Industry (the member for Torrens) suffered a severe illness. That was during our last year of office, when he had been wrestling with the problem and was preparing a Bill on the matter. Regardless of whether we should have done more than we did during our two years in Government, this referendum will not give us the solution to the problem. The Government still must introduce its amendments to the Early Closing Act and it will not get much, if any, help from the answer to the referendum question, because this is only one aspect of trading hours in South Australia, as the Minister knows.

The Hon. L. J. King: What is the answer to the problem?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Frankly, I do not know, and I am honest enough to say that. Does the Government know the answer?

Mr. Clark: We're trying to find out.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Government knows the answer, it should adopt a practice as nearly the same as possible to that adopted pursuant to the Commonwealth Constitution, when there is a referendum. The Minister said in his second reading explanation that he wanted the people to have all the facts before they voted on the referendum, and he stated:

I have explained the Government's proposal for other amendments to the present laws regarding shop-trading hours in order that the public may have all the facts before voting at the referendum.

That is a laudable intention, and I compliment the Minister on it. If members opposite have the answer to the general problem of trading hours, apart from this particular aspect, I ask the Minister, so that people may have all the facts before they vote at the referendum, to introduce the Bill so that we will know what the Government intends to do. If the referendum is carried, as the Premier says it will be, then the people will know what will follow a "Yes" vote at the referendum. The Government need not go on with it if it does not want to or if the referendum is not carried, but that is the only way the people of this State will know precisely what the Government intends doing if the referendum is carried.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That would mean unnecessary delay.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It would not. A moment ago members opposite were laughing at me because I was honest enough to say that I did not have the answer. I took from their derision that they had the answer. Let them tell the people properly, by introducing a Bill, so that we will know what we are voting on.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Sit down and read the second reading explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have read it again and again and have underlined many parts of it, including that part, but there are many matters unanswered in the second reading explanation.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What are they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have a list here.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not take notice of interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, can you stop the interjections, Mr. Speaker? I have a list of unanswered questions. My first question has been answered by the Premier since I made

out the list. The question was, "What about Saturday morning?" and the Premier answered that, at the invitation of the Leader of the Opposition. We now know the answer to that, but we did not know before, because the Minister did not put it in his explanation, that Saturday morning hours will not be changed. Another question I have here on which there has been no clear answer yet is, "What changes in other hours for other parts of the State?" Another question is, "What are the additions the Government is to make to the second and third schedules?" Are they set out in the list of items that I saw published (by whose authority I know not, or whether the *Advertiser* managed to get them in some unofficial way at the end of last week)?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That list is quite accurate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister says that that list is quite accurate. This is the first time the Minister has said so.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask you, in view of the fact that the entire front bench of the Government is persistently interjecting, whether you will please ask them to desist from interrupting the honourable member's speech and wasting his time, rather than criticize the honourable member for being put in the position of wishing to answer interjections?

Mr. LAWN: Before that is ruled on, Mr. Speaker, I ask you how many Ministers the front bench comprises and how many Ministers are here, because the point of order taken by the member for Alexandra accuses the whole front bench.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is out of order. There cannot be two points of order at one time. I will deal with the point of order taken by the member for Alexandra. First, there are only two members on the front bench now. Throughout the debate I have asked the member for Mitcham to address the Chair, not to address his speech to the two or three Ministers on the front bench. If members would take notice of that and address the Chair rather than try too much to provoke interjections, the interjections would not occur. I appeal to everyone to co-operate. I have been calling members to order for interjecting and I intend to try to hear the speeches of honourable members, but honourable members must co-operate by addressing the Chair, not provoking members on the other side.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, could I ask you about one matter I feel you may be a little unfair about?

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member for Alexandra reflecting on the Chair?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order and I ask him to withdraw that reflection immediately. I rule that he will withdraw it immediately.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: You asked me whether I was reflecting on the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do not intend to reflect upon the Chair, and I would certainly withdraw. May I ask, however, whether you are convinced in your own mind that the member for Mitcham was provoking interjections?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must raise a point of order, not embark on a series of questions during the debate. He is entirely out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will do my best to address you, Mr. Speaker, as I have been doing throughout my speech and as I always do. I was going through a number of questions to which no replies had yet been given by the Government. I refer, first, to the question of when the Government will say what is to go in the second and third schedules. The Minister has now said that the list that appeared in the *Advertiser* is fairly accurate. The next question on my list is that of petrol stations. Apparently the Minister said that the Government will not tidy up that situation; in the enlarged metropolitan area we are going to have some petrol stations open and some closed, as we do now. So, the Government proposes to perpetuate at least that anomaly in the present trading hours. In other words, if we extend the limits of the metropolitan area, will the same thing happen at Two Wells and Mount Barker? Will the Government act in future to see that the definition of the metropolitan area keeps up with development, or will it allow a new fringe area to develop?

I come now to a machinery matter. Why is there no provision for postal voting in the Bill? Is the Government going to take no note of a particularly strong vote one way or the other in any particular area? It appears quite likely that in the area represented for the time being by the members for Elizabeth and Playford there may be a very strong vote in favour of Friday night opening, but

in my district, where we do not have this, there may be a very small vote for it. If, for the sake of argument, there is a 70 per cent vote in favour of Friday night opening in Elizabeth but, in the whole of the area in which the referendum is taken, there is a 51 per cent vote against Friday night opening, is the Government going to take no note at all of such a strong demand in Elizabeth, or is it going to say, "Sorry, fellows, 51 per cent of the people voted against this, even though all of you voted for it, and you are not going to have it"? Is that the Government's intention? It appears that it is, if we are to have uniformity. It is certainly an anomaly. I can see how happy the members for Mawson, Elizabeth, Playford and certain other districts will be if this, in fact, happens! This will not make the political difficulties of the present Government any easier. They are just a few of the points on which there is no clarification, and there are plenty of other such points that one can think up if one wants to.

The obvious way for the Government to show its good faith and let people know precisely what it intends to do if the referendum is carried is to introduce the Bill to amend the Early Closing Act into this House before the referendum is held. In this way the people will know what is proposed. Then, if the referendum is passed we can discuss the Bill, knowing that the people have had full knowledge of the Bill. However, if the referendum is not carried the Bill can be sent up into Annie's room. In giving his reason for proposing a referendum, the Minister said:

The Government does not consider that it should take the responsibility for making a decision which can significantly affect the lives of the people in the metropolitan planning area and Gawler and upon which they have not been able to directly express their opinion.

That is a very wide reason indeed. If the Minister really sticks to that, it can be applied to any subject that comes before this House. We had an example this afternoon. The Leader, the member for Alexandra and I asked questions about the restriction of the powers of the police. Why do we not have a referendum on that? It is a matter that can significantly affect the lives of South Australians. Why not have a referendum on whether bread should be baked on seven days a week? I wonder how many referenda the present Government proposes to have and whether the Government would be kind enough to disclose the other subjects on which it would like to have referenda. I doubt it.

It is extraordinary that we are seeing this performance from a Government which was elected with a clear majority by the people of this State less than three months ago and which has been oozing with self-confidence up to now. One chap told me on election night that the Government would be in power for 30 years. At the declaration of the poll for the Mitcham District the member for Mitchell came along and said the same thing when I was thanking the Returning Officer for the State. Members of the Government are utterly self-confident, yet the Government has changed its policy on this matter within a period of three months. I cannot help thinking that, in spite of its clear majority in this House and its self-confidence, it is showing a great deal of weakness in resorting to a referendum to get it out of its political problem.

Mr. Burdon: You said that about the lottery referendum.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At least in 1965, when we had a referendum on the question of a State lottery, that was a plank in the Labor Party's platform. It had been known for many years that the Labor Party favoured a referendum on that question, but I have looked through the rules and the platform of the Labor Party and can see no reference whatever to a referendum on the question of trading hours. There had never been one suggestion from members opposite about such a referendum, in stark distinction to the question of a referendum on a State lottery. It was not until last week, when the *Advertiser* published the story, that there was even a hint from members opposite that there was to be a referendum on this topic. So, why has there been this sudden change of heart? The Leader of the Opposition said (I believe it is true, in spite of the Premier's denial) that it is because of the trade unionists, who support this move. We have heard much about the academics in this place who have university degrees, but when I look across the Chamber every day at members opposite I realize that, although as individuals they are a pleasant set of fellows, trade union influence here is quite evident.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the honourable member to address the Chair and not provoke exchanges of discussion. I ask him to confine his remarks to the Bill; there is nothing in it about the background of backbenchers on either side. The honourable member for Mitcham must speak to the Bill and not provoke interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently, I did not make myself clear. I made that allusion to confirm my point that it is trade union pressure that has caused this Bill to be introduced, and I was referring to the many trade unionists who came into this place as a result of the last election. I have no doubt that they have exerted much influence on the Government to introduce this Bill. I now turn to the history of this matter. Last year when I was Acting Minister of Labour and Industry, acting for the member for Torrens who was sick, I introduced a Bill that would have altered the second and third schedules to the Early Closing Act, as the Premier well knew, although he did not see fit to give me any credit for it, when he was speaking. What did I say when I introduced the Bill? In referring to the various submissions made to the Minister of Labour and Industry, I said:

The various submissions made to the Minister clearly indicate that some relaxation in the present restrictions are favoured by both shopkeepers and members of the public: there were, however, wide differences expressed as to the extent to which this relaxation should take place.

I continued:

The Government is proceeding with the review of the remainder of the Early Closing Act but feels that it is important that the provisions contained in this Bill should be implemented without waiting until it is possible to introduce amendments to all parts of the Act.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That was a weak excuse.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was on November 19, when all honourable members knew that the session was drawing to its close and we either had to introduce that Bill at that stage or not have any Bill at all on early closing. The funny thing is that despite what has been said by the Premier today, and by the disorderly interjections in my speech, the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, acknowledged the difficulty of the matter. As reported in *Hansard* of November 25, he said:

I do not suggest that there is any easy solution to this problem.

He went on to say what he believed should be done, and that is significant in view of what he is now doing as Leader of the Government. He said:

Therefore, I believe that we should try to hold the position generally, as it stands: that is, we should not interfere with existing vested interests but allow the situation to go no further;

Well, he has changed his mind on that, referendum or no. He continued:

that we should provide that throughout the State there should normally be a five-and-a-half day week apart from those specially proclaimed shopping nights agreed on by traders in the area for special purposes;

Now, that's all out, too. The then Leader continued:

and that we should leave Friday night shopping where it stands in areas in which this is already the practice.

I am glad to see the member for Elizabeth taking note of that, because it affects his district.

Mr. Clark: But your Leader said that you said something quite different.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is what the then Leader, the present Premier, finished up by saying, and it is rather different from what he said today:

I believe that we now need to amend the Act to hold the general retail trade situation where it stands and that, in relation to butchering, we should provide five-and-a-half-day butchering throughout the State. If we do not do that, the anomalies will increase. If we do anything else, we will only create new anomalies.

But that, too, has changed. He continued:

I believe that action is urgently necessary and I know that the Minister has been examining many proposals but, apparently, he has not come to any conclusions. The Opposition has come to the conclusion that this is the best that can be done in this difficult situation. It needs to be done now, and we should do it.

Mr. Lawn: What date was that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: November 25.

Mr. Clark: Were the amendments tabled then?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader, as he was then, intended to support the second reading of the Bill that I had introduced.

Mr. Clark: And to move a whole sheaf of amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There were not many of them: I have them here and, for the information of the honourable member, perhaps we should consider what the Leader intended to move. He intended to add a little to the schedules as I was introducing them. He was to include candles, fireworks, panti-hose, and stockings but, apart from that, he was satisfied, apparently, with the second schedule as I had introduced it and which contained about 100 items. I do not know whether the member

for Elizabeth thinks that in some way I am to be blamed for introducing a schedule that was widely supported by his Leader.

Mr. Clark: Tell me about the other amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader did not intend to amend the third schedule, which contains a list of exempted shops. He intended to introduce amendments concerning butchering, as he had fore-shadowed in his speech: not what he now thinks, of course, but, nevertheless, he was going to do that. He intended to repeal several of the provisions concerning the petition sections of the Act, and he intended to re-enact section 24 in another form and to repeal sections concerned with the abolition of shopping districts. That was all.

There was no hint of a referendum or anything else, because I have read from his speech what he intended to do some six or eight months ago. Yet, we now have a great change on his part. Incidentally, he presented a petition to this House during the session, signed by 5,694 people, stating that there was a need for an amendment to the Early Closing Act to cover South Australia and to provide for trading between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. Monday to Thursday and between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. Friday, and praying that the House give earnest consideration to this. In fairness to the Leader, he may not have agreed with that petition, but it is significant that the Leader of the Opposition presented it to the House.

Mr. Coumbe: Was that 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Friday?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but no Saturday opening at all. I can remember when that petition was presented, because I thought that it came from the Shop Assistants Union as those people did not want more than a five-day week. Of course, that attitude is also in line with the policy set out in the platform of the Australian Labor Party. However, since then we have had a great change. The Leader of the Opposition has quoted from the policy speech of the Labor Party showing that not a word was contained in it about a referendum. In His Excellency's Speech, which is the latest exposition on general Government policy on this matter, all that we heard was a mention of the Early Closing Act in a list of "also rans". Apparently, when I was in Queensland a couple of weeks ago, the Minister fell into some controversy on this matter and, suddenly, out of the blue we hear an announcement about a referendum. I believe that a referendum is an unsatisfactory way to legislate.

I have already given the reasons why I believe that. I believe that members of Parliament are elected to make decisions on this matter and on every matter that comes before them. If people do not like what we do, they have their remedy at the next election. But obviously what this Government is trying to do is get off the hook by taking this way out, because it knows that it is in great political difficulty on this question of trading hours.

I know that it is a difficult problem but, whatever the result of the referendum, I do not believe that it will overcome those difficulties or that we will be significantly further ahead than we are now. However, the State will have had to bear an increased cost at a time when, as we all agree, money is short. People will have had to go to the polls, according to the Government's plans, whether they like it or not, and I do not agree to compulsion in this matter. As I have said, it will all be for nothing, or for very little, because there are so many other matters which cannot possibly be covered by a referendum and which the Government must decide.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): This is such an important issue for the people in the fringe metropolitan areas that it seems to me necessary to try to set out clearly the history of the matter without the smoke screen that has been set up by other people, so that the people in the areas concerned can see the position and judge the matter for themselves. The first question to be asked is: what is the present position in relation to trading hours in Adelaide? Greater Adelaide (Adelaide as set out in the Bill) is artificially cut into two sections; one section, which I might call the old metropolitan area, and another section which, in the course of the last few years, has become the true metropolitan area of Adelaide. The old metropolitan area currently enjoys trading hours from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday to Friday; Saturday morning trading hours; no Saturday afternoon trading hours; and no Sunday trading hours.

In the new metropolitan area, the general position is the same, with important additions: first, there is provision for Friday night trading; and, secondly, there is provision for Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading. The people in the new metropolitan area, as I have described it, had their opportunity at the last election to look at the Labor Party's policy and to judge the candidates on that basis in relation to trading hours. The policy was set out in three main parts. First, it dealt with

baking, in which case a five-day week was the policy, and that policy remains unchanged. I do not really think that anyone, including the former Ministers of Labour and Industry opposite, strongly suggests that there should be more than a five-day baking week, because we all know of the great difficulties, troubles and disruptions that are caused to employees in that industry by its very nature and by the long hours they work. I am sure that former Ministers, in forming their judgments, would have considered the position of employees and employers and would have balanced their judgment with the needs and necessities of the community. Therefore, I do not think that the question of baking hours is really a live issue. That was the policy at the time of the election. I have heard of no-one seriously contesting it since. Certainly, employers and employees in the industry have strongly supported Government policy in this matter.

I now turn to the retail butchering trade. In the policy speech it was stated that there was to be a five-day trading week for retail butchers, with the provision of Saturday morning trading: therefore, the overall provision was there for a 5½-day week. The third and final plank of the policy on trading hours was that the new metropolitan area, with the exception of baking and retail butchering hours, would remain in the position it was in prior to the election.

What is the present policy? The policy on baking hours, as I have said, has remained unchanged. The policy in respect of butchers and others as regards Friday night trading is in issue. The policy on Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading is still the same. The electors in the new metropolitan area will ask: was there any valid reason to justify this change of policy? My answer is, "Yes; there are valid reasons that have forced a change in policy." People living in the new metropolitan area know full well that, since the advent of the Labor Government 2½ months ago, certain trading organizations (they are not part of the large retail trading groups, nor are they the small traders, to whom I shall refer later, who took a risk in these fringe areas earlier: they are what I can only call opportunist groups) have intruded into this field and caused tremendous financial difficulties to the small trader. It is unique that it falls upon the shoulders of a Labor Government to be the Party to represent the small traders. Some interesting questions will be put to the Party opposite by the Retail Traders Associa-

tion, and also by the small traders, after the comments made in this House this afternoon.

Mr. Clark: I know one butcher of long standing who is now working as a barman.

Mr. McRAE: I should not be surprised at that, but I shall be interested to hear the comments of the Retail Traders Association on the Leader's suggestion that we should be having unrestricted trading—seven days a week, 24 hours a day. The next question that should follow, if we accept that a referendum has been forced upon the Government (which I do accept) is: should there be a limitation on the issues contained in that referendum? Once again, I say there should be a limitation because the change of policy has been restricted to the areas in which the residents and small traders have been put to great disadvantage because of opportunists who have taken advantage of loopholes in the current legislation.

What principles should be adopted by any Government in looking at matters of this kind? The basic principles that should be followed are these: first, that in the regulation of retail trading hours the Government should aim to protect the interests of employees and employers alike; and, secondly, that retail trading hours should give adequate opportunity for the greatest possible service to be provided to the community and set a pattern for a standard of commerce befitting a capital city like Adelaide. In other words, as I see it, three groups are involved—employees, employers and the community at large. Responsibility falls heavily upon the shoulders of the Government to see that the views and needs of all three groups are taken into account.

I am well aware that the change in policy has meant that the differential advantage previously enjoyed by areas such as Elizabeth, Salisbury and Christies Beach, in the new metropolitan area compared with the old metropolitan area, may well disappear. As a representative of a large group of people affected by this issue, I felt it incumbent upon me to look at all its ramifications and see whether contained in this differentiation there was any need still to protect the outer metropolitan area. In considering this point I fell back upon the three main groups of people concerned—the people in the area, the employees and the employers. I support (and I have been consistent in this approach in the statements I have made) Friday night and Saturday morning shopping; I oppose Saturday afternoon and Sunday shopping, with the exception of those exempted businesses or goods

that have been under discussion. I will now give my reasons for advocating those principles. For people in the fringe metropolitan areas, Friday night or Saturday morning is not only a shopping but a social occasion. Traders well know that the amount of trading that goes on on a Friday night may not be all that significant, but it is an important social occasion. It is perhaps the one occasion of the week on which the wife, husband and family can shop or window-shop together and make it a social as well as a shopping occasion.

The same applies in varying degrees to Saturday morning. So I support the Friday night and the Saturday morning opening principle because there has been a strong public demand for these hours and this demand is not unreasonable, in present-day circumstances, to employees or employers. But, at least in my electoral district (I do not purport to speak for any other district) there has been no significant demand by the people, the shoppers, for either Saturday afternoon or Sunday shopping. What then is the attitude of the employers? As I have said, they fall into three groups. There is a very strong reaction amongst small traders to any suggestion that the policy against Saturday afternoon and Sunday opening should be changed.

As an example, I shall take retail butchers, of whom there are many who operate in a small way in the Salisbury, Para Hills and Elizabeth areas and who have carried on their businesses for many years. In opening businesses in an area which was once a fringe area and which has now developed into part of the metropolitan area, these people invested capital and took the trouble and the risks; throughout they have abided by the health regulations imposed on them and the arbitration provisions relating to wages. They have done all those things and they are now faced with an operation known as the Lazy Lamb. I do not know who operates it: it is certainly not supported by any of the other traders. These butchers now face blatant unfair competition from this organization. I do not expect any member opposite to find much joy, if he follows what I understand to be the principles of his Party, in seeing the small traders (and there are many of them, so that I am sure that members opposite, including the former Minister of Labour and Industry, have heard from them) decimated by an organization such as the Lazy Lamb which, through massive buying and selling and other techniques, can cut prices and gradually eliminate small traders.

E2

If members opposite do find joy in that, they should come out into the open and say so: they should say that they advocate Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading in these areas, and then the people will know just exactly where those members stand. I am attempting to be clear in what I say. Members opposite keep hinting that people will decide in favour; they should let the people hear both sides of the case. If they are advocating something, they should tell us what it is. At least I am advocating something, but all I have heard from members opposite so far is a confused series of criticisms. No constructive comments have been made that would produce a solution to the problem. I challenge members who support Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading to say so; if they support unrestricted trading, let them say so. However, they must be honest enough to tell people of the experiences in other countries, particularly the United States of America, where unrestricted trading has been permitted, and I know that the former Minister of Labour and Industry knows about this.

I challenge any member to deny that what I am about to say has been the experience in America, where organizations like the Lazy Lamb originally masqueraded as great friends of shoppers, as they brought down prices and kept up quality. Incidentally, no one denies that the quality of meat at the Lazy Lamb is up to standard or that prices are lower than those of small traders in the area. However, there is a catch to all this that some members opposite will be interested to know. The United States has unrestricted trade that has reached the point in some States where there is trading not only on seven days a week but also for 24 hours a day. America now has three major cartels, which control the whole of the retail meat trade and which have proceeded to dictate the buying price to the grazier and the selling price to the community. Members opposite may be interested to know that the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated is not too happy at the prospect of such a thing in Australia.

In view of the comments made by the Retail Traders Association, the small traders and the United Farmers and Graziers, none of which could by any remote stretch of the imagination be said to favour the Labor Party, I am rather surprised that members opposite are still pressing for unrestricted trading hours, or something like that; I am not sure what they are pressing for. If members opposite intend to

press for an extension of trading hours they should say so; they should be fair to people, telling them of the experiences abroad. I can predict that in the next few years, if trading were not controlled, large cartels would gain control of retail butchering, as they have gained control of retail grocers and, in due course, they would dictate the buying price to the wholesaler or grower and the selling price to the community.

Mr. Nankivell: They do now. How many butchers buy privately?

Mr. McRAE: Do they? I suggest that this should be prevented. If members opposite know that prices are being dictated, I am even more surprised to hear some of them advocating unrestricted trading. Having dealt with the question of the small trader, I now turn to the Retail Traders Association which, I believe, would be amazed to hear that members opposite were supporting unrestricted trading or trading on Saturday afternoons and Sundays.

Mr. Payne: The Leader said they were.

Mr. McRAE: I am not sure what the Leader said. He seemed to say that he favoured unrestricted trading or that he wanted that matter to be included in the referendum. He was a bit confused, not being sure of the position of retail butchers: it was fairly difficult to follow him. I fully agree with those who have spoken that we are trading along dangerous lines of freedom, security and prices. If we are to be responsible we must take all these things into account in order to bring down a policy that will be effective and real. I support the Bill because I believe it is effective and real and because it can help to deal with the difficult situation of prices, which could otherwise increase. It seems to me obvious that, if we are to have unrestricted trading, prices must increase as a result or, alternatively, the situation will be monopolized. Regarding prices, as the member for Mitcham has said, everybody in this State is well aware of our difficult financial position. Last week I was accused of being a little harsh in referring to the Prime Minister's rotten, lousy deal in the Loan allocation to South Australia. I see that we face another lousy deal this evening in wine tax and motor car tax. I am sorry that we should be in this position but, because of the further vindictiveness that this State is facing from the Prime Minister—

Mr. Nankivell: Ha, ha!

Mr. McRAE: The honourable member may laugh. If he supports the Loan allocation and the Prime Minister, let him have the guts to say so.

Mr. Clark: All Australians will agree with you tomorrow morning.

Mr. McRAE: Yes. We have seen the difficulties in this question of shopping hours. Having considered the matter objectively, I support the Bill. I wish to make the further comment that I am not dictated to by unions any more than I am dictated to by Parties or anybody else. I accept the policy and, if something in that policy was unacceptable to me, I would resign. I make no bones about that. My only remaining comment is that, if Friday night shopping is to be introduced uniformly, it is only fair to the employees that a 40-hour week should be introduced or some adjustment of penalty rates made.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): The member for Playford took the opportunity to make another few vindictive charges against the Commonwealth Government. Apparently, he knows what to expect. I think he would do well to suggest to the Premier that, if he does not want anything unpleasant to happen in the Commonwealth Budget, he should stop squealing about lousy deals, and that sort of thing.

Mr. Ryan: You've been squealing about lousy deals.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not in order in discussing the Commonwealth Budget. The honourable member may recall that the member for Playford referred to the Commonwealth Budget only in regard to increased prices of motor cars and bottled wine. To that extent, that limited reference to the Commonwealth Budget is in order but no general discussion of the Commonwealth Budget or what will happen this evening is in order in this debate. I think the honourable member will agree with that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is all I wanted to refer to, too, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable member seems or claims to have some advance information as the basis for his statement about wine and motor cars. As long as the Premier complains that he needs more money for this State and then insists that the Commonwealth provide it, the Commonwealth Government must provide something that the member for Playford will find disturbing, but he will call it vindictive as long as we are here, because we know that honourable

members, including myself, have favourite words and, whether we like it or not, these words keep coming out. The word "vindictive" has been used in every speech that I have heard the member for Playford make, and I expect to continue to hear it. Last week I complained that the Government was acting with unreasonable haste on this measure.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have seen some pretty barefaced and dirty political tricks played in the last few years but this one exceeds all that I can recall. For blatant political opportunism I have not yet been able to think of a match for this one. The Minister started by making a speech that one might have thought meant something; he said he intended to revise completely the present laws that restrict shopping hours. Naturally, the word "restrict" suggested, as the Leader pointed out, that the Minister would completely revise the laws that he thought should be altered. Of course, the trick has nothing to do with shopping hours at all. This Bill, as I foresaw when I objected to its being forced through the House by a suspension of Standing Orders last week, is being rushed with untimely haste to meet the target date of the Midland by-election. The Bill is so hurried that half the things that would normally be in such a Bill have been omitted. The Minister has even forgotten to provide for postal voting.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's not so.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There are no provisions for postal voting in the Bill. The Minister had planned to make a dramatic announcement in the House, but unfortunately the drama was swept away and it appeared in the morning paper. So, the Minister then brought in a Bill without giving the usual notice. He suspended Standing Orders so that he could give the second reading explanation straight away. I objected that in normal circumstances he would not be able to get to the stage of the second reading explanation until August 19, but he was able, by forcing the suspension of Standing Orders on the House, not only to give the second reading explanation last Thursday but also to bring on the debate today.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: After a whole weekend!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister had the cheek to add that he would give us the weekend to think it over. An Opposition rarely objects to a suspension of Standing Orders, but everyone knows the

importance of the Standing Orders and why those provisions are there. They are there simply to see that legislation is not rushed through the House because of a sudden Government wish. Of course, there is a very nasty reason for all this: there is to be a by-election for the Midland District of the Legislative Council. There are eight Assembly districts comprising the Midland District of the Legislative Council. Of those districts four are held by Labor members in the House of Assembly.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how this has anything to do with the Bill before the House, particularly as the honourable member is speaking about a political election. This is not a political election: it is a poll or a referendum. I cannot see how the honourable member can connect with the Bill his remarks about a Legislative Council election.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra can tie his remarks up with the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course he can.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not uphold the point of order. The honourable member can tie his remarks up with the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It does not cause me any regret to make the member for Pirie uncomfortable.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I was telling you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not regret having made the member for Pirie uncomfortable. I wanted you to know that, because sometimes members say that they are sorry for making a member uncomfortable, but I cannot apologize for doing that to the member for Pirie.

Mr. McKee: I wouldn't want you to.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have pointed out that there are eight House of Assembly districts in the District of Midland in the Legislative Council and that four of them are held by Labor members. In these districts people will be compelled to go to the polls to vote at a referendum. Of the other four districts, the District of Gouger and the District of Kavel are not included in the metropolitan area or in the area of Gawler, which is also included in the reference to the referendum. These districts have returned Liberal and Country League members. The District of

Goyder is almost entirely out of the referendum area although a small part of it is included in the metropolitan planning area. The District of Light is mainly out of the referendum area although a part of it is included. A mere glance at that situation shows what a swindling trick this is.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's quite unfair.

Mr. Millhouse: I suppose you thought it up.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's unfair, and uncalled for.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government was in such a hurry (against the wishes of the Opposition) to introduce the Bill last Thursday in order to meet that deadline so that on no account would it miss the date for the Midland by-election.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We wanted to save the Government and the country money.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In four Labor districts the people are forced to vote, and in four L.C.L. districts the people are almost entirely not forced to go to the poll.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It is a voluntary vote for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is why I have said I cannot remember a more swindling trick than this is.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have a bad memory: you cannot remember back to your term in Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is on his feet and must be allowed to speak.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is so blatant and the Government knows it. One only has to refer to the Midland by-election and a point of order is raised by the member for Pirie, and I am grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, for not sustaining that point of order. The Ministers can hardly contain themselves. They have to be called to order again and again.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You should be with J. C. Williamson.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is making this speech. The Minister of Roads and Transport must not interject.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have the greatest contempt for the Government's wishes in this respect. The next point is that this referendum is compulsory. The entire metropolitan planning area and the Gawler area will be forced to go to the polls even though

we know that many people would not vote if they were not made to. Those people will cast a vote that will alter the future of not only their own areas but the whole of South Australia. The Early Closing Act has always contained a principle that there should be a local factor in the choice of shopping hours, but this local factor will be removed. The people in this huge area will be forced to vote whether or not they like it. They will determine the question whether or not they are interested, and that will affect the future of the whole State. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the outside areas, the areas beyond the referendum area, would no longer have their local choice now provided under the Early Closing Act.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I did not say that at all.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister knows very well that he will remove the local choice.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: No; this is absolutely untrue. It's not what I said.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: And he will take charge of the future of shopping hours in the country just as surely as he has taken charge of them in the metropolitan area. The old system of petition and counter-petition will no longer have the effect it had. Now, the Minister will determine these questions as he likes.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's not true; the honourable member should be fair.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I forecast that the areas just outside the metropolitan area will be affected by the Minister's decision; otherwise, he is only pushing away a little further from the present boundary the unrestricted hours, because we know there is nothing to stop country areas altering their shopping hours under the present Act; the Minister cannot stop them. However, under the provisions announced by the Minister in his second reading explanation, he will take charge of shopping hours outside the metropolitan area.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's not true; you have not read it properly.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister is anxious to tell me that it is not true, but he made a speech the other day which I have since read and to which I can turn.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You should read my explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister said:

The Government intends to introduce legislation to provide that the present country shopping districts should continue but that the present system of petitioning and counter-petitioning should be abolished. However, provision will be included in that legislation for a local government authority outside the metropolitan area to apply for the creation or abolition of a country shopping district within its area. In making such an application the local government authority will have to report to the Minister of Labour and Industry on the inquiries that have been made to ascertain the wishes of the public in their district, as well as indicating the view of the municipal or district council concerned.

I ask members to note those words, also bearing in mind the stated intention of the Government to provide for compulsory voting at municipal elections. If anyone can show me that the old system will continue I shall be interested to see how that will happen: it will clearly be abolished. The Government intends that all the outer areas now enjoying unrestricted shopping hours shall be brought under the same conditions that operate in the metropolitan area, with or without Friday night shopping.

Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading will go, and I notice that no member opposite is now saying that I have not read the Minister's explanation. People who have traded at these times, building up their businesses and way of life accordingly, will no longer be permitted to do so. The member for Mawson knows that Saturday afternoon shopping is extremely important in his district, just as important as is Saturday morning shopping. Although I do not know to what extent, Sunday shopping is also important. Members opposite have said that this is a social occasion. Although I do not know what that means, I do know that much weekend shopping is done by people in the Districts of Mawson and Elizabeth and in areas between Adelaide and Gawler, and these people will not want to lose those hours for shopping. The member for Playford seems to know a good deal about it. He used a very critical term, suggesting that a trader who traded on Saturday afternoon was an extremely unfair type of person.

Mr. Evans: An opportunist.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, and he said that in a very opprobrious tone. The members for Playford and Mawson will soon find out many other things about the people they represent. I think the member for Eliza-

beth probably has no illusion, realizing the approval for Saturday afternoon shopping in his district.

Mr. McKee: How come you didn't do anything about it when you were in Government and were asked to do something?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The real reason for introducing this Bill now and rushing it so that the referendum can be held on September 12 is so that Labor voters will be forced out to vote while Liberal and Country League voters will vote voluntarily. Ostensibly the Government intends to revise completely the present law, but how complete can that revision be when the simple question asked at the referendum goes only as far as, "Are you in favour of shops in the Metropolitan Planning Area and the municipality of Gawler being permitted to remain open for trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays?" How much information does one get from a vote on a question like that? It is purely an expression of opinion by the electors, and they are asked for only a limited opinion. They are not being asked whether they favour still further extensions. That question has been avoided. It would be just about as popular with the Government as asking, "Have you got cholera?" or something like that.

The Government does not want to let the people express an opinion that goes further than this. The Government must cloud the issue by asking what I call a silly question, whereas, as the member for Mitcham has explained, the general practice in referenda is for a Government to have a Statute passed through the Parliament and dissented from subject to a referendum, so that people have something definite to vote for or against, instead of having nothing more than a silly question, with about as much force as a cream puff and which does not go far enough.

Obviously, if the Government is going to go to the trouble of asking a question like this in a conversational way, it should ask the people what more they want and give them a chance to express an opinion on whether they want further relaxation of trading hours. We know the commotion that the matter has caused in the Labor Party. In order to conduct this referendum with the by-election in the Midland Division of the Legislative Council, the Labor Party has had to swallow many statements and lose much of its past face on shopping hours. The member for Mitcham read the statement made by the present Premier last year. What a statement that is, compared

with his statement today! The honourable member read how the Premier's attitude last year was completely different from his present attitude. We know that the Labor Party has had many arguments about this question, and it is probably because of those arguments that the news started to get around before the Minister had time to announce the referendum.

I say that this question should not be restricted to Friday night shopping, and there is also another side to the matter. Strangely, there is no reference to Saturday morning, and the public will have to depend on the Premier's assurance (and I take it they have an assurance) that there is no intention to deal with Saturday morning trading.

Mr. McKee: He gave an assurance from the floor of the House. What more do you want?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I pause for breath sometimes and I know it is a mistake, because the absolute inanity of the interjection is incredible. The Premier gave his reply from the floor of the House! That sort of interjection always astonishes me. The Premier has made various public statements on this matter and now we wonder what he intends to do about Saturday morning shopping.

Mr. Langley: Haven't you ever changed your mind?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, I have changed my mind, but when I have done so I have always been prepared to admit it. There is nothing wrong with a person changing his mind, and there is no need for him to apologize for doing so. In fact, no-one should have to apologize for that. However, when a person changes his mind without admitting it and without giving any sort of explanation, we are naturally a little suspicious when that person makes another statement.

Mr. Langley: You have always been suspicious of the Premier.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to know the Government's intention regarding Saturday morning shopping. It should be made clear to every person who has to vote at this referendum that there is no intention whatever to tamper with Saturday morning shopping.

Mr. Jennings: The Premier has assured you, so what more do you want?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have said that the question to be decided by the people

of the metropolitan area is to be decided under compulsion, in many cases by people who would not vote if they were not forced to do so, and for the very good reason, from the Government's point of view, of helping it in a by-election for another place. I have said that the Bill has been prepared with haste; indeed, I would say it has been prepared with undue haste. The last thing I want to add is that in no circumstances should this vote be compulsory, and the question should not be a woolly one: it should be a series of questions that will at least show what the people think. It has no legal force, but at least it will show what the people think. If we are going to have things like referenda, the sooner we get back to Parliament's passing legislation that people can understand before they vote, rather than allowing the Government to interpret a limited vote afterwards, the sooner we will get some satisfactory result. I think that the whole thing will be spoilt for the sake of this Midland by-election. It should not be a compulsory vote, and we should not ask the metropolitan area to determine a question that will be interpreted to influence the future of the State's shopping hours as far distant as the Western Australian and Victorian borders, which is what will happen.

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support the Bill, for I consider that justice will be done if the referendum is carried because it will give to citizens in the proposed greater suburban area an equal opportunity to enjoy Friday night shopping, a privilege afforded now only to citizens of this State outside the area covered by the provisions of the Early Closing Act. We have heard much about the desire of many people to have this privilege.

I point out to the member for Alexandra that most Friday night shoppers come from outside the areas in which Friday night shopping facilities are available. To my way of thinking, this has created an unfair trade practice. There is no real competition, because traders in the area prescribed by the Early Closing Act do not have an opportunity to compete with traders in adjacent areas who can operate legally on Friday nights. I am fully aware that people in the Albert Park District travel to Elizabeth and even to the top of Tapley Hill Road to do their shopping on Friday night. There is no shadow of doubt that the people who shop on Friday nights include many from country areas to the north of Adelaide.

The member for Alexandra said that country people would not be given the opportunity to vote on the question. However, I (a new member) remind him that machinery already exists whereby country people can make their wishes known. I remind the Leader of the Opposition (I wish he were here to hear this, but he can read it in *Hansard*) that deputation after deputation from the trade union movement tried to assist the previous Government in the dilemma it was facing. It was holding a hot potato, because it experienced the same problems as the present Government is experiencing. However, the previous Government did not face up to them.

The trade union movement compromised some of its principles in an effort to see that the people of South Australia were justly treated. The unions were prepared to accept a 40-hour week; one union was prepared to approve its members working on Friday nights whilst another was prepared to approve its members working on Friday nights and Saturday mornings, provided there was no further shopping during the weekend. Those unions are still prepared to compromise to that extent. So, the opportunity should be given to the people of South Australia to express their wishes. Because of the keen business competition existing today, we should not strangle one business man to the advantage of another. Let us be big enough to accept the proposed referendum and give the people an opportunity to vote for or against the question. It has been alleged that the date of the referendum is tied to the by-election for a seat in another place.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't it?

Mr. HARRISON: What a shambles would have been created if the Government had proposed to hold the referendum on one Saturday and the by-election on the following Saturday. I am proud of the Government's action and I am sure that it has acted in the interests of all the people, not just some of the people. I sincerely hope that my constituents in Albert Park are given the same opportunity as people are given in other areas of South Australia. Have no fears about country people: they can solve their problems themselves, because the opportunity is available for them to do so. Opposition members know as well as I know (and I have been a member for only five minutes compared with the time some of them have been members) that country people will not let Opposition members pull the wool over their eyes about being left out:

they want to be left out, because they can solve their problems. I am sure that, at this stage, the Government has nothing to reply to in what has been said by the Opposition. I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): We can never know which path the Labor Party will travel, particularly on things like referenda. The Government announced it would introduce a lottery only after it discovered that, under its rules, it had to have a referendum to do so, although a Gallup poll had shown that 80 per cent or more of the people in the State favoured a lottery. The Labor Party put the people to great expense by having a referendum so that it could carry out what was printed in its little book, which can be bought for 50c. However, there is nothing in the little book about a referendum for shopping hours, but we realize that a statement was made in the policy speech about shopping hours.

However, this matter was found to be a hot potato, despite the fact that the Deputy Premier said that there would be a 70 per cent vote in favour of it. It has been said, as a result of the recent election in Great Britain, that polls are not accurate, but many of those in Great Britain were conducted by newspapers. A newspaper favouring the Labor Party stated that it would win by 10 per cent, but a newspaper favouring the Conservative Party forecast that it would be only 2 per cent. A scientific poll indicated that the Conservatives would win by 1 per cent; therefore, notice can be taken of scientific polls. This Bill refers to part of an area that I represent, and a vote will be given to people living in Blackwood, an area that is well and capably represented by the member for Fisher. Part of the area on the other side of the freeway in my district will not be included and its residents will not be able to vote.

This question is not to be decided by the electoral boundary, but by a line drawn through part of the district. This situation makes it difficult for the Electoral Department to select those who should be placed on the roll. After the recent electoral boundary redistribution many people were enrolled in the incorrect districts and, no doubt, this will occur for the referendum. With a freeway through the District of Heysen, if late closing is allowed in the metropolitan area on Friday evenings it will also be necessary to allow it at Mount Barker, otherwise people in that area will be penalized. An excellent method of determining a question like this was by local option poll, which could ascertain what people in a

particular area wanted. But now we are embarking on some vague way of doing it. The exact words of the Minister are as follows:

Other provisions will be included in the legislation for a local government authority outside the metropolitan area to apply for the creation or abolition of a country shopping centre within its area. In making such an application, the local government authority will have to report to the Minister of Labour and Industry on the inquiries that are being made to ascertain the wishes of the public in their district as well as indicating the views of the municipal or district council concerned.

So the people in my electoral district will be treated differently from the people in the town planning area, because they will be deprived of voting on the referendum in certain areas, where it will be left to the local government authority to ascertain, in some indefinite way, the opinions of that area, and then refer them to the Minister of Labour and Industry.

What did we have from the Minister of Roads and Transport the other day in reply to a question? He said that we should take notice of the experts. The Minister cannot make a decision on his own when only common sense is entailed. Whom will the Minister of Labour and Industry call as an expert to decide the wishes of the people in Heysen? This is rank discrimination against one section of the community, depriving it of a way of determining its opinions. The member for Playford has indicated that nobody on this side of the House has announced his beliefs. I for one say there should not be Sunday trading. I do not say that on religious grounds, but I think one day a week at least should be set aside for us to forget about the trade and turmoil of the week. We should have that day off, but for the rest of the week, as we are free and mature citizens, those people who want to trade should be able to, as people in other parts of the world can.

When I was in Canada, we had a party one night and at 1 o'clock in the morning we wanted some beer. We telephoned the local storekeeper and got a dozen bottles of beer with no trouble at all. If somebody is willing to provide this service at a certain time of night, why cannot people have this choice? During week days we should not place any restriction on people trading when and how they like, in the normal way. It is inconsistent of the Minister of Labour and Industry to say:

The two main problems which exist at present are, first, the frustrations caused to the public by shopkeepers of exempted shops being

required by law to lock away after normal trading hours many goods, particularly food-stuffs for which there is a considerable demand at nights and weekends.

He is saying he thinks there is a demand. If we are a good Parliament, we should provide the facilities for people to trade at reasonable times.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are we not doing that?

Mr. McANANEY: A person goes into a delicatessen and gets mixed up buying a pair of panti-hose when he is there to buy food-stuffs. What sort of discrimination is this when we say to the regular seller of panti-hose in a certain area, "You must not sell panti-hose at certain times but I can go to a delicatessen and buy panti-hose at certain hours of the night"? Members opposite talk about justice and fair play in regard to trading, with everyone equal, yet they say it is not all right for one person to sell panti-hose whereas it is all right for delicatessens to sell them.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you suggesting that all shops should be open all the time?

Mr. McANANEY: I have already spoken about that, but the Minister never listens to what is said. I said that I did not believe in Sunday trading but that, for the rest of the time, I believed that people who were willing to trade should have the opportunity to do so. This Government repeatedly talks about the mandate it has for various matters, but it is showing signs of weakness in not being able to make a decision on this matter. The member for Albert Park made a special point about the need to be fair to everyone. It is not fair when there is discrimination against people who trade in various ways. As this is very much a Committee Bill (I will have opinions to give more fully during the Committee stage), I will support the second reading. I hope the Government will decide to give the people of South Australia a wider choice. Everyone should be entitled to say what hours of trading should apply, including country people. The people should have a wider choice than being asked merely whether they want Friday night trading: they should have the opportunity to say whether they desire longer hours. On the one hand, people are being told they are grown up enough to decide about Friday night shopping but, on the other hand, they are not being asked about Saturday afternoon shopping. The people must be given the opportunity to express their opinion on every facet of this matter.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I hope to be mercifully brief, as was the member for Heysen, the best feature of whose speech was its brevity. This has been a most peculiar debate, but that is nothing unusual. During the past few weeks, people whose politics I have not known who have been sitting in the gallery have told me that they have never seen an Opposition flounder in the way the present Opposition is floundering this session, and I have to agree. Although I have been a member for quite a time (probably some will say that it has been too long), I do not think I have ever listened to such poor debates as I have listened to this session, particularly with regard to arguments put forward by Opposition members. In this connection, I am reminded of the debate on the State Government Insurance Commission Bill. When similar legislation was discussed during the term of the previous Labor Government, it was one of the best debates that had taken place in this Chamber, but what a difference there was in the debate this session. The Opposition appeared to flounder, having only one argument to put forward, and that was not at all valid. We were treated to a similar spectacle in the debate on the first line of the Loan Estimates. I had never heard a debate like that: it was over before it started, its brevity apparently being the result of the Opposition's having nothing to say.

Mr. McAnaney: How many of your side spoke on that debate last year?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen is out of order: he has just concluded his speech.

Mr. CLARK: Thank you, Sir, although I do not mind how much the honourable member interjects. To me, the Opposition's contribution to this debate has again been pitifully weak. In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition made evasive and, indeed, untrue statements. From other members we have had a mixed up Irish stew of so-called argument. Because we have been criticized about changing our minds, I thought it might be of advantage to the House if I read from the policy speech delivered by the then Premier of South Australia (Hon. R. S. Hall) at 8 p.m. on Monday, May 4 last. I looked through the policy speech to find what the then Premier said about shopping hours.

Mr. Langley: Don't tell me there's nothing in it!

Mr. CLARK: I have read this document carefully three times, and that was no mean

ordeal, but it was better than listening to the loud raucous voice of the former Premier when he delivered the policy speech. This document contains not one word of Liberal and Country League policy regarding shopping hours. This afternoon the member for Alexandra told us that our case in this debate was blatant political opportunism. If that is not what he said, he will correct me. If his statement were true (and I deny it), even blatant political opportunism would be better than nothing at all on the subject, and the former Government's policy speech contained nothing at all.

I, like the member for Playford and other members on this side, am firmly convinced that in my district the bulk of the traders and shoppers want a five-day week plus a half day on Saturday and 9 p.m. closing on Friday. I am sure that at least a large percentage of the people want that. I have been interested to read in the press in the last few days that the Government's proposal to hold a referendum has been endorsed by many people. I do not say all those people will vote "Yes" but I do say they agree that a referendum should be held. The *Advertiser* of Saturday, August 15, contains a report about the President of the South Australian Retail Traders Association (Mr. I. S. D. Hayward), as follows:

The president of the South Australian Retail Traders Association (Mr. I. S. D. Hayward) said the referendum was the most constructive and effective approach in two decades to what had become an involved problem.

If I may interpolate there, my colleagues and I think this problem has become involved and can be solved only by a vote of the people expressing their wishes. The report of Mr. Hayward's statement (and I agree with him) continues:

It was an intelligent move which took into account some realities which, in the past, had been swept under the carpet.

We want to use a vacuum cleaner. I shall also quote the remarks of the Trading Hours Steering Committee. I do not think that committee will advocate a "Yes" vote, but a report in the *Advertiser*, again of Saturday, August 15, states:

The Trading Hours Steering Committee, which represents 12 retailing associations, said that no final plans on tactics for the campaign would be made until the referendum Bill was passed by Parliament.

I hope that some of those people are here today to see just how the debate is proceeding. The report goes on to say that the

Trading Hours Steering Committee strongly supported the Government's move. It states:

"We think a referendum is the only way of gauging the feelings of all sections of the public on this issue," said the committee's chairman, Mr. G. E. Demasius.

I am not suggesting how these people I have quoted will vote: all I am saying is that they have said they most definitely favour a referendum, as of course does the Government.

Let me refer to a few remarks made by the Leader in his speech (if one could call it that) this afternoon. He took the opportunity of mentioning that there were 12,000 people who agreed with him. However, I believe that the bulk of those people do not agree with him. I fully believe that the bulk of them are advocating that the existing hours for most shops in the area should remain; by this I mean that those people want a five-day week with the shops open on Friday night, plus a half-day on Saturday. What makes the Leader think that we have any intention of taking any shopping rights from anyone? Rather do we hope to extend the present shopping hours to others who we believe are unjustly treated. However, we are not going to do this idly: we are going to leave it to a vote of the very people who are concerned with the question.

The Leader of the Opposition accused us of delaying progress on the Early Closing Act Amendment Bill that was introduced by the previous Government in the dying hours of last session. Apart from the fact that this is quite untrue, all that was proposed by that Bill, which was introduced by the then Attorney-General on behalf of the Minister who was ill, was an extension of the list of exempted goods. The only real value in that legislation was in the amendments moved by the then Opposition, which did attempt to provide for some useful things. Rather than it being us who delayed the Bill so that it could not be passed, it was the honourable gentlemen who sit opposite who, because they did not like our amendments, did not go on with the Bill.

I strongly resent, as do my colleagues, untrue statements being ascribed to members of my Party. As was so aptly said this afternoon, I think by the Premier, the then Government members refused to grasp the nettle; they were afraid of the sting. Now they condemn us because we are prepared to do

that. All we are doing is giving the people the opportunity of having what they want in the areas concerned.

I now want to refer to a statement which reminded me of some remarks the Leader made when he quoted some semi-mythical document to refute arguments put forward by Government members. The former Premier boldly claimed that in the second reading explanation of the Bill his Party put forward last session a definite promise was made that there would be no further restrictions. I had the impertinence (so it seemed) to challenge this statement of the Leader (indeed, I challenged it with some confidence because I had before me at the time a copy of the explanation as printed in *Hansard* and there was absolutely no reference to the statement that the former Premier claimed was there). Because I had the effrontery to deny that the former Premier was telling the truth he adopted the normal practice of referring to Government members as silly or moronic. I resent this type of argument. When the Opposition tries to refute an argument with complete untruths, it is very poor to say that the Government member who advanced the argument is silly. It is not my practice to tell untruths to suit my case, and I am capable of reading and understanding a second reading explanation.

The former Premier should realize that the penalty for regularly telling untruths or half truths is that soon only his fanatical supporters (and they do not last forever) will believe him. We can safely say that the previous Government did virtually nothing (I suppose the extended list of exempted goods was something). The only value in the legislation proposed by the previous Government was the value that the Labor Party attempted to put into it by amendments. By holding a referendum we are hoping to establish uniform shopping hours in appropriate areas.

Although I find it difficult to agree with the arguments of the member for Mitcham, his delivery of speeches is always excellent. However, I cannot apply this description to his arguments. He spoke today of a hot potato, but I assure him and his colleagues that this was a hot potato that they dared not touch. However, the present Government has grasped it firmly, and I assure Opposition members that the Government will not burn its fingers on it, despite what we have heard today. There is some truth in the honourable member's statement that the previous Government did not have time to solve this problem. Of

course, that statement was in direct contrast to that of the Leader of the Opposition. I suppose the member for Mitcham is entitled to disagree with his Leader but it may be a good idea for them to put their heads together before the honourable member makes such statements.

When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier, if the Labor Opposition wanted something and strove manfully to get it, Sir Thomas charitably allowed us to introduce an amendment if he supported our idea. I can remember that he used to say that the time was not ripe. My experience of the Party opposite has been that the time is never ripe for it to do something, or to agree to something that the Labor Government is likely to do. I was intrigued by the remarks of the member for Mitcham about postal votes not being provided for in the legislation. The member for Alexandra continued in this vein, and it makes one think that the honourable gentleman may have read the second reading explanation but certainly they have not read the Bill. Clause 6 (1) provides:

Subject to this Act, the provisions of the Electoral Act and the regulations thereunder, so far as they are appropriate and applicable, with such modifications as are necessary, apply to and in relation to the referendum as if it were an election for the return of members to serve in the House of Assembly.

Clause 15 provides:

In the referendum the scrutiny shall, subject to the provisions of this Act and the Electoral Act, and the regulations thereunder, relating to absent voting and to voting by post, be conducted as follows:

It then sets out the conditions. I am unable to understand how these honourable members missed these provisions. We have been accused by Opposition members of changing our policy. At least we had a policy to change. It seems to me that the Liberal Party has, unfortunately, forgotten nothing and learned even less. I assure the House that there is much that it would be well for Opposition members to forget. It must be obvious to all members that the Opposition's refusal to change has caused its present situation. We had the courage to grasp the nettle, or the hot potato, and, because we realized that this was not a simple problem, we were prepared to put it to a referendum, the most democratic method we know, so that the people could have their say. I cannot believe that Opposition members are serious when they accuse us of a fault in changing our mind about something.

Mr. Gunn: Do you admit it?

Mr. CLARK: We have always been prepared to change for the better if we were convinced that something better could be obtained. Any political Party that cannot change its opinions or its attitudes on various matters faces extinction. Recently, the Leader of the Opposition has told his members that they need to get a new face, and I agree with him on this issue, although usually I find it hard to agree with him. The member for Alexandra made one point only concerning the Midland by-election.

The honourable member had something to say about matters that had been raised by the member for Playford's condemnation of the Commonwealth Government when he said that it had given South Australia a lousy deal, and this will affect most widely the interests of people who are selling things. This lousy deal has been further extended this evening. I understand there is to be an 8c levy on every bottle of wine; petrol is to be 3c a gallon dearer; and extra sales tax of 2½ per cent has been placed on motor cars; but out of the Commonwealth Government's benevolence it will give pensioners 50c more! The only point that the member for Alexandra made was about another place, but that point was not valid. He claims that, if we hold the referendum on the same day as the Midland by-election, we shall be doing a dreadful thing because we shall be forcing everybody to vote in four Labor-held districts, while people are not compelled to vote in the other four districts. However, not only are we forcing Labor supporters to vote in these four districts, but we are forcing people to vote for the honourable member's Party, too. In case the honourable member does not know, I point out there is a restricted franchise for the Upper House. Since the Labor Party was last in office, very little attempt has been made to inform people whether or not they have the right to vote for the Legislative Council, so the utmost confusion will reign over the Midland by-election.

One of the chief values of holding the referendum on the same day as the by-election is that most people who go along to vote on the referendum, as the member for Alexandra and I believe, will want to register a vote for the Legislative Council. One of the greatest blows ever struck against the existing franchise for the Legislative Council will be struck on that day, because hundreds, and possibly thousands, of people will for the first time realize that, although they are South Australian citizens,

they are not on the Legislative Council roll, and that many of them could not have got on to the roll even if they had wanted to: in other words, that they are second-class citizens. It will be a wonderful argument for the need to give an unrestricted franchise for the Legislative Council. In this one respect I agree with the Leader of the Opposition which, of course, does not happen very often. How could it be expected to happen very often?

Mr. Jennings: Only when he is right.

Mr. CLARK: That is right; that well describes it. Had we proposed holding the referendum on a day other than the day of the Midland by-election, we should have been hotly criticized for it, on two grounds: first, that we were increasing the cost of the referendum and the by-election, and, secondly, that we were dragging people out on two occasions when one occasion would have done. It looks as though whatever we tried to do would not be right in the eyes of the Opposition.

I started to listen with interest to the remarks of the member for Heysen, who began by advocating his support of scientifically-conducted polls and then ended by opposing this poll. I doubt whether there could be anything much more scientific than a poll with everybody voting. I agree with the honourable member, too, about Sunday trading, but not for the same reasons. I have tried to reply to a few of the things that have been said by Opposition members, but this has not been easy to do, for not much has been said in the way of logical argument. I intend to vote "Yes" at the referendum because that is the way most people in my area will vote (I believe most people eligible to vote will vote that way, as that is what I believe they want). I entirely subscribe to the views expressed by my colleagues today, particularly by the member for Playford, who, despite the harsh strictures levelled against him by the member for Alexandra, placed a most logical case before the House. I am happy to support the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The member for Elizabeth castigated members on this side for making illogical statements on what is not a minor matter by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. Carnie: He played the man and not the ball.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, I am rather at a loss to find that such a nice man can be so rough. The member for Elizabeth said he could find no reference to late shopping in the Liberal

and Country League policy speech delivered by the Leader. I suppose leaders of political Parties have to leave out 100 things in this modern day and age when they take up the cudgels on television. Probably many things were left out of the honourable member's Party's policy speech. However, in delivering the Labor Party policy speech, the Premier said:

To ensure the health of the industries involved and to restrain prices, a Labor Government will amend the Early Closing Act to provide a five-day week baking throughout the State; a 5½-day week retail butchering throughout the State; revision of the list of exempt goods and shops; and no extension of Friday night shopping beyond areas where it now obtains.

Since then there has been something of a change in direction. The member for Elizabeth castigated the Leader, saying that the Leader had said that he had a petition from 12,000 people. Actually the petition was signed by 10,000 people.

Mr. Clark: I am only going on what the Leader said.

Mr. RODDA: He said 10,000 people. We can make some allowance, as some verbal altercation was taking place between the two gentlemen when this matter was referred to. The member for Elizabeth did not take much to the fact that, in this short space of time, these people have seen fit to petition the Leader.

Mr. Clark: I know what is in the petition.

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member was probably asked to sign it, hence his great knowledge of it. That petition shows the concern being felt by people in that area at what the Government is doing. Some very good new members may be put in jeopardy as a result of this hasty legislation introduced by the Minister last Thursday. The member for Salisbury and the member for Mawson, who is a very nice young man making rapid strides in this Parliament, will be affected. The member for Playford got rather verbose this afternoon and castigated members on this side about what they should do. The member for Elizabeth also has a stake in this pie, as has the member for Gilles. These are all worthy gentlemen, facing a problem that has been brought about by the change from the Government's policy speech.

Mr. McKee: Where did you get that tie, Allan?

Mr. RODDA: I did not get it from the member for Pirie.

The SPEAKER: The member for Pirie is out of order. He should refer to members by naming their districts.

Mr. RODDA: Perhaps I should tell you, Sir, that I did not get it from the member for Boothby in the Commonwealth Parliament. The Minister, in his explanation, states:

The Government intends to introduce legislation into Parliament during the current session to make a complete revision of the present laws which restrict shopping hours.

When we compare this with the statement on page 28 of the Premier's policy speech, it is little wonder that members on this side, in their proper role as members of Her Majesty's Opposition, start looking askance at the Minister's first Bill. The Minister of Labour and Industry is not being called the "Minister" any more: he is known as the "monster" of Labour and Industry: as the little monster, if I may say so in an uncharitable way. The Minister also said in his explanation:

The two main problems which exist at present are, first, the frustrations caused to the public by shopkeepers of exempted goods being required by law to lock away after normal trading hours many goods, particularly food-stuffs, for which there is a considerable public demand at nights and weekends. Secondly, the unrestricted trading hours in the large areas immediately surrounding the metropolitan shopping district have resulted in shops in those areas (often on the other side of a road from the metropolitan area) trading at night and weekends when shops in the metropolitan area are required to close.

Mr. McKee: That's history. What about a speech of your own?

Mr. RODDA: Obviously, some members opposite do not like this history being quoted, and they will find that the 10,000 people who have petitioned my Leader regard it not as history but as facts getting under the skin of the Government. They will not be as charitable as I am, because I am one of the 180,000 who will be denied a vote on the matter. I remind the little monster of that, too.

Mr. Jennings: What about telling us what you want to say?

Mr. RODDA: The member for Ross Smith has a penchant for getting people off the rails.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Ross Smith is out of order.

Mr. RODDA: We have come to regard the honourable member with both like and dislike, Mr. Speaker. They were the two points that the Minister made about the need for a referendum, and the prescribed question,

which is akin to the question "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?", is continued in clause 4, as follows:

Are you in favour of shops in the Metropolitan Planning Area and the municipality of Gawler being permitted to remain open for trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I think even you would understand whether you had to vote "Yes" or "No" there.

Mr. RODDA: I am also able to understand that what has been spoken of over the years is happening: the metropolitan area will be defined, and we will have a chunk of Gawler included in it. I and my friends describe this as a gerrymander, which is a word often used in the past by members opposite. For the first time for many years the Labor Party has been elected to office with a workable majority. Although it criticized us for many years for having what it called a gerrymander, the very first thing it did when it came to office was to sneak in a gerrymander of its own. As was pointed out by the member for Alexandra in opposing a suspension of Standing Orders, this Bill was introduced by a masterly piece of trickery. Had it not been for the able and ingenious press officers, who sounded the warning in the press, we might have been caught, because we are not terribly skilled at this sort of thing. It was brought to the light of day, and sure enough this unnamed Bill was brought into the House. Leave was sought to suspend Standing Orders, and the Minister of Labour and Industry surreptitiously introduced his first legislation. It is little wonder that there has been some protest from this side. The Minister was kind enough not to leave the country people out of this matter altogether. In his second reading explanation he said:

The Government intends to introduce legislation to provide that the present country shopping districts should continue, but that the present system of petitioning and counter-petitioning should be abolished.

That is the sugar on the pill. He went on to say:

However, provision will be included in that legislation for a local government authority outside the metropolitan area to apply for the creation or abolition of a country shopping district within its area.

This nebulous question mark hangs over us.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Isn't this what your local council would want? Have you asked?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: It is not a question of what my local council would want. I am interested in the rights of the individual. One vote one value has been mentioned.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree to one vote one value?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: One vote one value is not embodied in this.

Mr. McKee: Do you reckon it is not fair?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: Apparently, we are to have a local government body reporting to the Minister.

Mr. McKee interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Pirie that when I rise to my feet there will be no interjections and that when I call for order I want order. That applies to every member in this House. The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the most nebulous paragraphs in the Minister's second reading explanation. What are country people to think about this? I believe that I should be permitted to refer to the effect of foreshadowed legislation on local government.

Mr. McKee: Be careful, or I will take a point of order on you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: Legislation with regard to local government will be introduced into this House. I think the Government should spell out in its legislation that any poll affecting shopping in the country areas should be decided by the people who live there. Judging on the Minister's second reading explanation, I do not think he cares whether it affects them or not. According to that explanation, the Minister will be empowered to make further inquiries (if he wishes to do so) after the local government authority has reported to him. After an application for the creation or abolition of a shopping district has been made, if the Minister is satisfied that the Act should or should not be applied in any country district, he is to recommend to the Governor that a country shopping district be created or abolished. So, we will be at the mercy of the Minister's whims. And let us remember that, despite what I have said about the present Minister, we could get an even worse Minister. Consequently, I have serious misgivings about the Bill. The member for Elizabeth said it was

right to have the referendum on the same day as the Midland by-election. Perhaps we should call this Bill the Lloyd Hughes Protection Bill. References have been made to second-class citizens, but I do not think there are any such people in South Australia. The Deputy Premier said he believed that 70 per cent of the people would vote for Friday night shopping in the referendum.

Mr. McKee: Are you prepared to give an opinion?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Victoria must address the Chair. There are too many interjections.

Mr. RODDA: This afternoon the Premier said he believed that the majority of the people would vote for Friday night shopping in the referendum. With both the Premier and the Deputy Premier so convinced, it is a wonder that the Government is wasting time in going on with the referendum. Why does it not introduce the Bill now, if it believes that 70 per cent of the people will vote "Yes" for Friday night shopping? I will consider the matter further during the Committee stage.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): In rising to speak to this Bill, I wonder just why we are debating it. The Government has said on countless occasions that it has a mandate for practically everything it wants to do. This is debatable, but the Government has been elected by the majority of the people: no-one is arguing against that. In view of that, why does the Government not govern and make a decision instead of calling for a referendum on this matter? Why is it passing the buck and avoiding the real issue? Could the introduction of this Bill have anything to do with a certain by-election that is to be held shortly? Perish the thought!

The fact that voting for the Legislative Council is voluntary is a thorn in the Government's side but, if it is proud of its policy and believes that most people support it, one wonders of what it is afraid. Nevertheless, it is afraid. Government members now come forth with the obvious red herring and the obvious ploy to get people to the poll on that day. All people in the Midland area cannot be made to vote unless they reside in the metropolitan area, as defined, an area heavily weighted in the Government's favour. Yet the Government accuses us of a gerrymander! How can it justify this differentiation? If a referendum is to be held it should be on a State-wide basis.

The member for Playford, although speaking for a long time, did not speak to this Bill. He spoke as if it were a debate on a Bill to alter shop trading hours, but this Bill is to provide for holding a referendum of certain House of Assembly electors. We are debating whether people should be asked whether certain hours should be altered and, if so, what form the question will take. The Premier has said that people should have the right to say, but this question does not give them that right. If a referendum is to be held, why does not the Government make the effort to ascertain the people's wishes on the full scope of shop trading hours? This would not cost the State any more. There could be a significant number of people who want unrestricted shop trading hours: most could want a five-day week. The Government should ask the people these questions, and then it could say that it was truly following the people's wishes in this matter. A reply to the present question tells the Government little, and the question tells the people little about the Government's intention after the vote is known. People may favour trading on Friday evening, all day Saturday, and all day Sunday, but this question does not give them the opportunity to express that view.

The member for Victoria referred to it as a question similar to the famous one of, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" A series of questions would give the Government and the House a truer indication of the people's wishes than will the question that is set out in the Bill. If the Government resists the inclusion of these questions it will prove to the House and to the people that its prime reason for holding a referendum and for putting such a question is not to ascertain the people's wishes on shop trading hours but to ensure that a certain section of the people (but not all of them) goes to the polls on a day when there is a by-election for another place. The Premier said that this is not a Bill to do away with the shopping rights of people living in Elizabeth and other areas, but is to place Friday evening shopping within the reach of all, but if the answer to the referendum question is "No", surely this will be the exact result.

If Friday evening shopping is taken away from these areas it could be done by people who live in other areas deciding for Elizabeth and Christies Beach, although local people living in those areas may vote "Yes". If the vote is "Yes" many areas will suffer a restriction of present hours. Areas that have Saturday afternoon and Sunday shopping at present will be

reduced to a common denominator of Friday evening and Saturday morning shopping. I do not favour Sunday trading, but that is not the point. As the member for Alexandra said, this is a woolly question.

In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the present system of petition and counter-petition on the Early Closing Act in country areas would be abolished. I admit that this system can be unwieldy but the point is that it is a local decision. The new system that the Minister foreshadowed gives him the complete power to make the final decision. Another decision is thus taken away from the country and put into the hands of the city. Shopping conditions in country areas vary from those in the city and from town to town and for this reason they must be allowed to remain a local issue which must not be controlled from the Minister's office.

I query the reason for this referendum, but that is not vital. Everybody in this State knows why it has suddenly been brought before this House. What is vital is that this question will do nothing to settle any doubts. If the Government is genuine in wanting to solve the problem of shop trading hours (and nobody denies they are a problem) and is too frightened to make a decision, and if it thinks it is right to go to the people on a referendum, why not enlarge the question and get a truer picture of the feelings of the people? If it does not do this it is still sitting on the fence in respect of shop trading hours and is introducing this poll for the purpose of the Midland by-election only. I will support the Bill in the second reading stage but hope to see some alterations, particularly the enlargement of the question, debated more fully in the Committee stage.

Mr. EASTICK (Light): During the course of this debate we have been advised, both this afternoon by the Premier and subsequently by the member for Playford, that we are seeking uniformity and endeavouring (to use the Premier's own words) to "overcome an unfair balance". I wonder where the unfair balance is in this proposal, when in fact people who are close to the Gawler township but not part of the municipality of Gawler will be denied the opportunity to express their opinions? In view of the legislation that has come before this House recently, we now suddenly find we have three definitions of the metropolitan area. First, we have the metropolitan planning area, which is brought about by the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1969. Secondly, in

October of last year, on page 10, Schedule 2, of its report, we find a description of the boundaries of the metropolitan area as delineated by the electoral commission.

Now, thirdly, on page 2 of this Bill we have a further definition of a metropolitan area, which includes the municipality of Gawler tacked on to the metropolitan planning area. This still leaves an area south of the Gawler River, to which one may refer as an intrusion of the Mudlawirra council area, which is an integral part of the extension of the Gawler urban area southwards into the Munno Para district council area, squeezed in or intruded between the area of Munno Para and the municipality of Gawler.

Further, if we refer to the statements by the Minister in his second reading explanation of Thursday last we see, at page 707 of *Hansard*:

The Government does not consider that it should take the responsibility for making a decision which can significantly affect the lives of the people in the metropolitan planning area and Gawler and upon which they have not been able to directly express their opinion.

As recently as 1967 the people of the municipality of Gawler and its environs expressed their opinion on this matter, and they were successful in having changed the Early Closing Act in late September or October of 1967 so that shopkeepers in the area could trade outside the hours previously provided in the Act. Surely that is a recent expression of opinion in that area. Therefore, I ask the Minister what reason other than expediency or opportunism exists for including the municipality of Gawler in this referendum.

If the Government is not capable of exercising its right and prerogative to proceed in this matter, I do not oppose the referendum. It has been said that the right exists by virtue of what is outlined in the Premier's policy speech, but he has decided to give this opportunity to the people. Regarding the Premier's reference to uniformity, I ask why people who live on the southern side of the municipality of Gawler, by virtue of the fact that they are in the defined metropolitan area, and people in the area of the Munno Para council are given this opportunity, while people in the Mudla Wirra area and people in the Light South subdivision of Light, which, in great part, is contiguous to the municipality of Gawler, are to be denied the vote. Where is the uniformity in this sort of situation which gives to some and not to others?

It has been said that the Minister will deal with other aspects of late closing in other

areas of the State in association with representations made to him by local government. The Minister is asking us now to sign a blank cheque. In his second reading explanation, he said that in due course he would make available to us a Bill that would enable us to discuss the means whereby this other issue would be decided. However, he is asking us now to accept this legislation without telling us in any detail whatever what the legislation dealing with the other areas will be and whether it will tie in satisfactorily for all concerned.

Clause 4 of this Bill provides that the prescribed question shall refer to trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays. What is intended when the Friday is a holiday? What is intended with regard to late trading on the day before or the second day before Christmas Day? Is it to be understood that there will be no late shopping on the Thursday night preceding a holiday?

Mr. Jennings: You are not deciding that legislation now; this Bill is only for a referendum.

Mr. EASTICK: As I pointed out, I am saying that this Bill specifically refers to 9 p.m. on a Friday. I am asking for information that I hope the Minister will supply.

The other area that I should like to canvass relates to the preparation of the rolls that will be necessary if the referendum proceeds. In 1967 the people of the municipality of Gawler stated their position and the Premier, the member for Elizabeth, and other members this afternoon have stated categorically that there is no need for a referendum, that the "Yes" will doubtless win. Therefore, why are we asked to find the cost of a referendum? On the occasion of the consideration of the Act in 1967, the Gawler council, through its officers, was requested to check the eligibility of the persons whose names appeared on the petition that was presented. That work took the office staff, including the Town Clerk, a period representing 3½ working weeks and for this work, which was directed to it by the then Minister of Labour and Industry, the council received the princely sum of \$18.95 as recompense. I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry who will pay the costs incurred by any council in the preparation of these rolls or the checking of the names of persons on the roll. Can we be assured that, if councils are specifically asked

to assist, the recompense that they receive will be commensurate with the cost of the labour involved?

In conclusion, I hope the member for Playford does not deny to his constituents the present lower prices for meat because an organization known as the Lazy Lamb operates in his area. I fully appreciate the other side of the coin, that if there was no competition prices could change, but the inference to be drawn at present is that persons at present enjoying lower prices will be denied those prices. I shall require information about the areas of which I have spoken before being able to support the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I have deliberately waited to hear the views of members on both sides before entering this debate, and I have heard many varied and conflicting views, some of them addressed to the Bill before the House. Soon after taking office as Minister of Labour and Industry, which portfolio I held for about two years, I quickly concluded that the Early Closing Act was one Act above all that had to be, and should have been, revised and reviewed. To say the least, it was Victorian in its outlook; I think every honourable member would agree with that. In fact, the Act should have been amended at least five years ago. I invited numerous bodies to come to see me, and I presume that the present Minister has also seen various bodies.

It quickly became clear to me that this was a very thorny question and that it would take the wisdom of Solomon to solve the problem presented to me late in 1968. I think all members have been circulated by a meat organization. As the then Minister of Labour and Industry, I was asked in March, 1969, to introduce early closing for butcher shops. As I announced last year, it was my intention as the then Minister to introduce several amendments to the Early Closing Act. One of these amendments concerned the delicatessens and the line of goods under the schedule that an exempt shop could sell. The present Minister has now taken action on this, and I agree with him in this matter. The second amendment concerned country districts, and the third related to the question of trading hours. Unfortunately, I was unable to proceed with my intention. My colleague, who acted for me during my illness, was able to bring down a Bill in November which could contain only the amendments that had been prepared for the extension

of schedules for the exempt shops. It was the Government's intention to take action in this regard.

However, we have before us tonight a different question altogether. The Bill now before the House seeks a referendum. It was not my Government's intention, or mine, to recommend a referendum, for a referendum on a question such as this does not find favour with me. We are being asked to support a Bill which is, in effect, a referendum Bill. The Minister has said in this Chamber and outside that he and the Government will abide by the result of that referendum. If it is carried by the majority, Friday night shopping will prevail throughout the whole of the extended metropolitan area; if it fails, there will be no Friday night shopping at all. That is the position as I understand it.

If the referendum is carried (and this could be influenced by the position to the north and south and partly to the east of Adelaide, where Friday night shopping is currently permitted), the shopkeepers within the present metropolitan area who do not now open on Friday night and who do not wish to open will be forced to open then in order to preserve their livelihood, for if they are not open people will shop outside that area. It will also preserve the right of the people outside of the present metropolitan area who at present open on Friday night to remain open.

If the referendum is not carried (and the Government has said that it will abide by the decision), no-one within the extended metropolitan area, with the exception of exempt shops, will be permitted to open on Friday nights at all. That is the kernel of the matter. I do not think it is right that we should be asked to vote on such a Bill tonight. There are several anomalies not only in the Bill but also in the Minister's second reading explanation. The member for Light referred to Gawler. Why has this town been included in the scope of the referendum, whereas it was specifically excluded from the metropolitan area as defined in the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act? Secondly, why are petrol stations to be allowed to remain open in the outer metropolitan area on Friday nights and at other times? I am well aware of the representations that have been made to the Minister by employers and employees in the butchering trade (similar representations were made to me when I was Minister). A speech that the Premier made today conflicts with a

reply given to me by the Minister of Labour and Industry only last week. Today the Premier said:

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. Therefore, if the referendum is 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. That was stated in the Minister's explanation.

I looked at the Minister's speech, but I could not see this. The Premier continued:

Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition did not appreciate it, but I am making it clear now. It is not intended, if the referendum is carried, to close butcher shops on Friday night.

After an interjection had been made at this stage, the Premier continued:

It is not intended, if the referendum is carried, to close butcher shops on Friday night. They have the same trading hours as the general retail trading hours to be provided.

Earlier, the Premier said:

We cannot say to the supermarkets, "You cannot sell meat."

On August 5 I asked the Minister a specific question on this matter. In reply to my inquiry about what would be the position in supermarkets in connection with the butchering trade, the Minister said:

The honourable member has referred to butcher shops that are built into the structures of some supermarkets situated outside the metropolitan area;—

that is, the old metropolitan area—these shops can be closed conveniently. The meat can be taken out of the refrigerated units and stored every evening. It can be cleared by 5.30 on Friday evening, and we expect that the butchering industry will be closed at that time on Fridays.

Yet today we have heard the Premier say exactly the opposite. He said that the Minister said that in his speech. Here is another split on the front bench, where we see two Ministers saying exactly the opposite thing. When presenting the Bill the Minister defined the area in which the referendum would be held. I do not intend to touch on the hackneyed subject of something happening on the same day as the referendum, but why is this referendum being held in the greater metropolitan area only? The argument in favour of doing this

is that it affects only a particular area, but I consider that this matter affects the whole State. The Early Closing Act was first introduced many years ago to prevent unscrupulous employers working their employees for inordinate hours each day and each week. That legislation was similar to an Act passed in Great Britain, and was humane legislation introduced in order to protect employees.

I am aware that in some parts of South Australia the Act applies but in others it does not. When I was Minister I received several petitions for parts of the State to be governed by the provisions of the Act, or to be excluded from those provisions. Some were successful and others were not. After receiving the petition the Minister had a duty to specify a date before which a counter-petition could be presented. Eventually, the result was announced and either the district was included or excluded. In many of our large provincial towns the Early Closing Act applies, but in other areas it does not. If this Bill applies only to the extended metropolitan area, after it is passed what is to stop Joe Blow from setting up a series of shops immediately outside that area? The Minister may say that a council can petition him, but on what basis will the Minister decide? We would have a replica of what happened a few years ago when many petrol stations were set up from Cavan through to Tea Tree Gully and at Darlington, because they could sell at any hour.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What did your Government do about it?

Mr. COUNBE: I announced what I was going to do. It is germane for me to ask what the position would be. Would we have a replica of this? Why is this matter being confined to the metropolitan area? Why should not all the people of South Australia have a say in this in exactly the same way as the people did in relation to lotteries in 1965?

Mr. Clark: A better comparison is with the old local option poll, where people perhaps voted for areas with which they were not concerned.

Mr. COUNBE: The local option polls had many drawbacks, as the honourable member would be the first to recall. This affects the whole of South Australia. If it was good enough in 1965 when the lottery referendum was held, why is it not good enough now?

Mr. Clark: You know the answer to that.

Mr. COUNBE: I think I know why the Government is bringing it in in this way but I am saying it is important to consider whether it would not be better to have it for the whole State. We are now asked to vote on a Bill that provides for compulsory voting. "It is the duty of every elector to vote" is what the Minister said about the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: You can lead a horse to the water but you cannot make it drink. All an elector has to do is have his name struck off the roll on polling day. We cannot make a person vote.

Mr. COUNBE: The honourable member should be very learned in the processes of this House, and he is arguing with me about electoral matters and the provisions of this Bill, which contains a clause that states—

Mr. Lawn: It is called compulsory voting but we cannot make a person vote if he does not want to.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUNBE: The Bill defines an elector as a person who is enrolled for a House of Assembly district; it provides "and it shall be the duty of every elector to vote". That is the common phraseology used in respect of compulsory voting.

Mr. Lawn: That's right.

Mr. COUNBE: So we are in accord on that. Therefore, we are saying that everybody must vote whether or not he wants to vote. Those people who are enrolled on the House of Assembly roll must vote or be fined.

Mr. Lawn: A person must have his name struck off the roll or else he is fined.

Mr. COUNBE: I see. May I infer from that, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Adelaide is suggesting improper practices?

Mr. Lawn: No.

Mr. COUNBE: I should be the last to suggest that, but how else can I take it?

Mr. Lawn: That is the law.

Mr. COUNBE: I heard in another debate, to which you, Mr. Speaker, would not allow me to refer, the Premier saying that we do not have to obey certain laws. Now in this debate, to which I can refer, the Deputy Speaker is saying that we do not have to obey a law. How many more members of the Government will say that we can break a law with impunity?

Mr. Lawn: You know the legal position.

Mr. COUNBE: I know a little about it. Why is this referendum being held? The answer to this lies in the phraseology used by the Minister in his explanation when he said, "The Government does not consider that it should take the responsibility for making a decision." The Government has not got the guts to make a decision. On May 30, the Government was elected to govern the State, and we have had rumours of all sorts of legislation providing that people shall do certain things. Yet, this Government that was supposedly elected to govern the State, on one of the first major Bills it has brought down, does not consider that it should take the responsibility for making a decision. One of the principles of democracy is that a Government makes a decision and, if that decision does not meet with the wishes of the majority of the people, the Government falls: it either stands or falls by its decisions. Any Government that has any backbone should be able to make a decision. However, in this case the Minister and the Government found themselves in a dilemma that they could not get out of, so they have conveniently shelved it by providing for a referendum.

Mr. Lawn: Do you know of any fairer method?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. COUNBE: In his second reading explanation, the Minister also referred to country shopping districts, and so on, and I have touched on all those matters. I have shown that today the Premier said one thing about the meat industry whereas last week the Minister said another. Whom are we to believe? What will be the position with regard to the meat industry? Last week the Minister said that all butcher shops in supermarkets would be closed at night, but the Premier has said that butcher shops will be open on Friday nights.

Mr. Millhouse: He also said that they could not do anything about people selling meat in supermarkets.

Mr. COUNBE: Yes. These questions should be answered, because these matters will affect the lives of thousands of people for years to come. If the referendum is carried every shop will be able to open, if the owner wishes to open it. However, if the referendum is not carried, all shops, except exempt shops and petrol stations, will have to shut, and that could be the result of the referendum.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If it were, it would certainly be the majority view.

Mr. CUMBE: What will happen to all the supporters of the member for Playford and the member for Elizabeth to whom those members so ardently referred today? Will they be hobbled and restricted? Does the Minister want them restricted and shut up? That is what will happen. I have pointed out several anomalies in the Bill, the Minister's explanation, and the speeches that have been made and, because I want replies to my questions, I will support the second reading so that the matter can be debated further in Committee.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I will not support the Bill while it provides for compulsory voting. I consider that that is political trickery and a deliberate act by the Australian Labor Party Government to ensure that people who live in A.L.P. districts will go along to vote.

Mr. Clark: What about L.C.L. electors? The same will apply to them.

Mr. EVANS: I agree that L.C.L. voters will go along, too, but the honourable member must realize that most of those compelled to vote in this area are A.L.P. voters.

Mr. Clark: Nonsense! On the Council roll? Whom are you kidding?

Mr. EVANS: Many of these people do not know that they could be on the Council roll. Is that the fault of government? Neither the Government nor the Opposition tells people of any change in the law. The member for Elizabeth knows that a Government relies on the press and other news media to tell the people of changes. I understand the member for Adelaide has been heard to say that people do not have to vote, but it would be stupid to force people to waste time putting a blank ballot paper into a ballot box.

The member for Adelaide and the member for Elizabeth know why voting has been made compulsory: so that in future the Party opposite will be able to use this in debate, saying that the reason for confusion was the restricted franchise for the Legislative Council. The member for Elizabeth said this openly in the House and I admire him for admitting that it is political trickery and a swindle to have this in the Bill.

Mr. Clark: It's to get rid of a swindle.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Albert Park also said that it was fair to hold a referendum. I believe in referenda, particularly on issues like this, but I do not believe in

politically-loaded referenda, which the member for Elizabeth has admitted this is. If the member for Albert Park believes in democracy and a fair go, which he says he does, let him say openly that he thinks voting should be voluntary. The member for Playford and the member for Elizabeth have both said that they favour trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays. We know that the reason for this is that in their areas people do not want shopping hours restricted further; if anything, they want an extension. I remind both members of their Party's policy speech, which states:

To ensure the health of the industries involved and to restrain prices, a Labor Government will amend the Early Closing Act to provide . . . no extension of Friday night shopping beyond areas where it now obtains.

I have taken only the third aspect of that policy statement, because the other aspects have been mentioned regularly by other speakers. This evening two members have said that they do not believe in that policy. I wonder who was the big hammer forcing a policy of no extension of Friday night shopping! Was it big business, or was it the trade union movement? Is the Government trying to protect the little man, or to force him out so that then big business and the trade union employees will be in full control of industry? Is the Government forcing the small people out?

Mr. Clark: They are the people we are trying to help.

Mr. EVANS: The Government is not trying to help them in any way. If the Lazy Lamb or any similar business wished to open on the other side of the Onkaparinga River at Mylor, it would be able to do this because it would be outside the area defined by this Bill. How would the Minister handle that situation? In the area of the District Council of Meadows, because of the result of a local option poll, there are unrestricted trading hours. The member for Mawson will realize this. If the Minister is able to change this situation, will he change it against the wishes of the people of that area? Will he say that an opinion expressed by the people of that area shall be over-ridden and that they shall have no say in this matter? I ask the Minister to answer that question.

Fortunately, I was able to represent in the previous Parliament a very good area at Braeview. The member for Mawson now has that area and a very good group of young people to serve, and he will know that in most instances both the husband and wife in this

area go to work. I do not know whether or not he has been along to their progress association meetings. I was fortunate to be in the group that formed the progress association to work for that group. If the honourable member looks at its minutes for last year, and if he wishes to take an interest in the people of that area, he will find that they are in favour of having no restriction on their trading hours: they wish to preserve their Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading.

The present Premier, in the debate last year, said that it was difficult to change these hours and that he did not think it was possible to do that, yet in his policy speech given before the last State election his Party policy was to not extend trading hours but to cut down the hours in which butchers should be permitted to operate.

Mr. Clark: Your Party said nothing.

Mr. EVANS: It was in direct contrast to what he said last year.

Mr. Langley: What did your Party say?

Mr. EVANS: Recently in the Stirling council area a petition was taken up to extend trading hours. We now have in that area the normal trading hours of five days and until lunch-time on Saturdays. A vast number of people signed the petition in favour of extending trading hours. However, I must admit that a bigger group of people signed not to have trading hours extended. In the main, it was not the people who worked to have the hours kept as they are at present: it was the traders who worked towards that end, because it was more convenient for them not to have the trading hours extended. The same thing will apply in this case. Who will work for a "No" vote at this referendum? In the main, it will be the big traders, who will be responsible for widespread publicity and who will spend much money on it. The organization within the union groups will also be fighting for a "No" vote. Who will be fighting for the "Yes" vote? Only a few like myself who believe in democracy and freedom of the individual to have a voluntary vote. If a voluntary vote was provided by this Bill, I should be happy to support it in the main.

The member for Torrens mentioned a point that I believe is pertinent. He referred to service stations. Why exclude service stations? I can think of one reason. Just before the last State election the then Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, sent a letter to every service station proprietor in the State saying, "Support my group and we will help you". This

is why service stations have been left out: the Government cannot do an about-face. I could show honourable members at least five such letters, and I am sure that I could find more. I agree that service stations should be allowed to remain open. However, the only reason why they have been excluded from this Bill is that the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier) made sure that he got a few of these people on his side. Why did the Labor Party say earlier that there would be no extension of Friday night shopping? Why has it changed its mind? Perhaps the members for Tea Tree Gully, Mawson, Elizabeth and Playford realized that the issue was a hot potato. Perhaps they said to the trade unions (which were bringing pressure to bear) that the issue could result in political suicide. There would be trouble for the A.L.P. in the Brighton District if there was a swing of only 750 votes.

I will be honest and admit that it is difficult to legislate on matters such as this. The member for Playford said that opportunists were the cause of the trouble in the areas where there is unrestricted trading. Who is an opportunist? I suppose each of us is an opportunist when he uses an opportunity to progress in society. Did the honourable member mean by "opportunist" a person who had the foresight to make use of the law in those areas? Surely people will make use of it in Mount Barker and Hahndorf, which are only a short distance from the General Post Office, if the people vote against Friday night shopping. No member has said how the owners of small businesses will get on in such towns. Is the greengrocer or grocer being protected, or will we see the cartels take over to a greater extent? The more time there is to display products before people's eyes, the more products they will buy.

Mrs. Byrne: They have only so much money.

Mr. EVANS: More money is being spent on liquor because there are more liquor outlets and their trading hours have been extended. The same principle will apply to other primary products, such as meat. This is the industry that we should be assisting. I take my hat off to Lazy Lamb: that company may have affected some small butchers but it has stopped the larger cartels from taking over. The wholesalers buy and kill most of our meat; it is not the small retailer. Who is kidding whom when they say they are protecting the retailer? Who does the buying at

all the auctions? We know who it is, so does the Government, and so do the people of South Australia: it is the wholesalers.

I believe that trading for seven days a week would not do any harm. A Gallup poll result issued during September, 1968, showed that 49 per cent of the people in this State were in favour of shops being open on Saturday morning, and 39 per cent of the people wanted them open on Friday evening. I wonder if people like the Minister of Education and the member for Peake, who work with computers and figures, know this and are hiding the fact. Is this a gimmick to convince people that it is a referendum that is to be fought fairly? Big business and the trade unions will put so much effort into this that the referendum could be lost and Friday evening trading would be finished in all areas. Why should only one politically loaded question be placed on the referendum paper?

Many people will consider that, if they vote for 9 p.m. closing on Friday, Saturday morning trading will be affected. Why not put all questions to the people? If the Labor Government was genuine, even if it wants a compulsory vote, it would have placed all questions on this referendum paper that relate to trading hours, because they are all important. Earlier today the Premier said that during this Parliament there would be no move to close shops on Saturday mornings. Can we infer that in the next Parliament (if the Labor Party is lucky enough to win, and God help the State if it does) a Labor Government intends to cut out Saturday trading in shops? I believe that is the hidden danger in the present move, and as there is only one question on the referendum paper I will not support the Bill.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): If variety is the spice of life the Opposition's contribution has indeed been spicy, but it is difficult to know where it stands. Some Opposition members would have us believe that they are opposed to Sunday shopping and others, like the member for Fisher, seem to be perfectly happy at the prospect of Sunday shopping. The Leader of the Opposition modestly said he would wait until the Bill reached the Committee stage, and the member for Victoria made some rather monstrous suggestions about the Minister of Labour and Industry. The member for Alexandra said we proposed to ask the people a woolly question; yet, reading into what he and certain other honourable members opposite have said, it would appear they would like us to ask more questions than

merely the one. Just how woolly can we get? It is a little before my time, in a politically conscious sense, but there are those older than I who recall that the greatest mistake ever made by the A.L.P. was at one stage to put a referendum to the people asking 14 questions, the year probably being 1944. The more questions we ask, the more woolly the whole matter becomes.

The member for Torrens, in reminiscing on his days as Minister of Labour and Industry, said he had intended to move in this regard. It is strange that, if this was the fact, his Leader did not refer to this in the recent Liberal and Country League policy speech. I take up one or two things said by the Leader of the Opposition in his second reading speech. Very quietly, he exhibited what he said were 10,000 signatures. It is difficult to know what 10,000 signatures mean, because this petition was made available to people in the shops in the fringe areas prior to the time that the Government announced the Bill for a referendum. Therefore, there is no way in which we can ascertain exactly what the reaction of these 10,000 people was to the introduction of the referendum. They feared that this Government by legislation would take away from them their Friday night shopping, but most of the signatures would have been down on the paper before it was made known to them that they would be given the opportunity by way of referendum to preserve the Friday night shopping that they at present have.

It seems to me that those who collected these signatures did not do all that well. I wonder how hard they tried, because we recall that the member for Torrens, in speaking of his term of Minister of Labour and Industry, referred to a submission that had come before him from the master butchers. On that occasion, certain resolutions were brought forward. One was:

The Early Closing Act be altered to provide uniform hours throughout the entire State for retail sales of fresh or frozen uncooked meat.

The second resolution was:

Trading hours under the Act for retail sales of fresh or frozen uncooked meat be: (1) unchanged for Mondays to Thursdays from the hours at present provided by the Act; (2) extended by 3½ hours on Fridays to 9 p.m.; and (3) eliminated for Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays in any part of the State.

When we turn to page 4 of the submission, we find:

Forms setting out the aforementioned resolution and signed by approximately 8,000 customers are held by the association. As these

have been obtained from only 115 of the approximate 1,200 outlets in the State this indicates a high proportion of acceptance of the proposals by the public.

I know there is an overwhelming demand for the retention of Friday night shopping. Therefore, I wonder just how hard the people who collected these signatures tried. They should have been able to get well in excess of 10,000.

I want also to mention a newspaper article that was quoted by the Leader of the Opposition. I assume he was referring to the *Advertiser* of August 15, 1970, in the second and third columns on page 2. Briefly, he referred to this. There were no quotations given to us. In fact, I was on the verge of challenging him by interjection to read something from it, but I did not want to contravene Standing Orders. When we look at this article, although we find it is true that there are many parts of the world that have longer trading hours than we have in South Australia (and that, of course, by itself proves nothing) we do not find that there is a general move for increased shopping hours throughout the whole world. In fact, what we find is that, irrespective of the general length of shopping hours, restrictions on shopping hours are really the rule rather than the exception. In part, the article states:

Around the Mediterranean, if you want to go shopping the never-on-Sunday rule is one of only two restrictions. The other is not to expect to buy anything between 1.30 and 4.30 in the afternoon. In Brussels, the six-day trading week is an institution. But the Belgians don't believe in late night shopping. Throughout Germany shopkeepers lift their shutters at 8 a.m. and finish on weekdays at 6.30 p.m., with a two-hour lunch break from one to three. Saturday is a half-day in the Australian tradition, although shops are open from eight until 1.30 p.m.

I am not surprised that the Leader did not extensively quote from that article.

I want to take up members opposite on the issue of compulsion in voting, because it seems to me that perhaps certain new policies are being generated in the Liberal and Country League in that some of the things they are saying this evening are opposed to their legislative record in this area. South Australians were first compelled to go to the polls and have their names struck off the roll for the 1925 Commonwealth election. This was introduced by a Government led by Stanley Melbourne Bruce calling itself Nationalist, the South Australian wing calling itself Liberal. In the State sphere, South Australians were first compelled to go

to the polls and have their names struck off the roll at the State election of 1944, this legislation being introduced and passed by a Government led by the then Thomas Playford and calling itself the L.C.L. In each case, compulsion was introduced to the voting process in South Australia by Liberal Governments. I wonder whether the Opposition is now seeking to reverse this historical policy which it introduced and which it has supported down through the years. We have been challenged about our intentions with regard to local government and with regard to this referendum. People are compelled to vote at Commonwealth referenda. It seems to me that members of the Liberal Party both at the Commonwealth and State level, and particularly in this Chamber, say what it suits them to say at any stage on the issue of compulsory voting. I wonder whether there will be any amendments to this Bill in favour of compulsory voting, because the document which has been circulated with regard to amendments to be moved by the Leader makes no mention of it.

The member for Fisher waxed eloquent on the position of small business men. I have received submissions on various matters regarding trading hours from my constituents who are particularly concerned with the matter. As consumers, many of them want to retain their Friday night shopping. Many traders want to have Friday night shopping, while many traders oppose it even though they are in areas where it goes on at present. I want to quote from a hardware merchant in my area as follows:

I must compliment the Premier on his statement quoted in the *Advertiser* this morning in reference to trading hours for butchers. The Government for years has shirked its responsibility in relation to trading hours in all sections of the retail trade. I am writing this letter to acquaint you with my opinion on the subject. As a hardware trader in a fringe area, I can certainly assure you that we are not all in favour of unrestricted trading hours, as indicated by a few noisy complainers in the newspapers.

The fringe "pirates" that have opened businesses to capitalize on the restricted trading hours in the metropolitan area should not be allowed to sway the Government with statements such as "Give the public what it wants". Certainly the public would like unrestricted trading as it does not inconvenience them. It is the same as me saying I want garbage collectors, public transport, civil servants, council employees, etc., to work seven days a week because in the evening or on a weekend I may have cause to require their services. Surely society must be regulated for the benefit of all. If it is necessary to institute laws to protect the public in the fields of gambling,

censorship, traffic regulations, customs, etc., it is no less important that legislation should protect interests in retail trading. To destroy yet another institution (that is, the weekend), which is also enjoyed by people who work in shops, would be another step towards the sick society that seems to go hand in glove with certain types of progress.

There has been extensive reference by members opposite to the fact that since the last election the Government has changed its policy in certain particulars regarding trading, and we readily admit this, and this is the reason for the referendum. It seems to me to be entirely appropriate that those who at the election endorsed our policy that there would be no extension of Friday night shopping beyond the areas in which it then operated should again be consulted on a change in attitude to the matter.

I want to take up the point made by many members opposite that, as everybody knows the result of this referendum, why should we hold the referendum? This is not a point of view in which members opposite are united, because certain of them, particularly the member for Fisher, expressed grave doubts that the referendum would be carried, so in this matter they seem to have spoken with two voices. However, let us suppose that the vote of the people is entirely predictable. There is no difference between such a vote and the vote of the people at Australian elections. The Australian Gallup poll has proved many times that it can predict, within about one per cent, how the people will vote at an election. Certainly, in some countries where voting is not compulsory and it is difficult to predict the number that will turn out, poll predictions can be difficult to make, but we have never had that trouble in Australia. Does the member for Mitcham, who particularly raised this point, suggest that, because the result of elections is entirely predictable, we should not have elections? Of course he does not, and we will continue to have elections. Should the last State election not have been held, because everyone knew in advance that the Australian Labor Party would win? Of course not!

It would be quite wrong for us to say that, because public opinion polls and straw polls have shown the people will vote a certain way at an election, the particular issue should not be placed before the people or the particular election should not be held. I notice on an extremely decorative front page of the *Sunday Mail* that a straw poll has suggested that 70 per cent of the people will support this referendum.

It is difficult to know exactly what the Opposition wants to do about trading hours, but I wish to refer to one or two points about restricted trading hours, a policy that has been hinted at by certain members opposite. We cannot ignore the convenience of employees and small employers in the matter of unlimited trading hours. How hours of work would be apportioned during the week in a situation of unlimited trading hours would be regulated not by this or any other Government but by the award made by the Industrial Commission covering employers and employees. We would have no control over that matter and because of this we must give some measure of protection to employees.

The submission made to the member for Torrens when he was Minister of Labour and Industry last year stated that 12 hours a day, beginning at 6.30 a.m., was a regular feature of butchers' hours in the metropolitan area at that time. I will quote very briefly from the viewpoint that was put by one of the representatives of the employees in the meat industry in a letter to the *Advertiser*, when he said this:

In compliance with the award, a butcher cannot be rostered off for time worked in excess of eight hours from Monday to Friday; he must be paid overtime rates.

Since we can give no guarantee, because it is out of our hands, as to the actual working week that would have to be put in by employees in these industries, some measure of protection must be given to these people in this way. The quotation that I have just read to the House also raises the question of prices. At present prices at large establishments on the fringe of the metropolitan area are held down because those places have a large turnover arising from their advantageous trading position. This, of course, will go with the introduction of uniform trading hours, whether in fact they be restricted or whether they be unrestricted. Let Opposition members be in no doubt of the fact that any unrestricted trading provisions would mean a considerable increase of prices and would hit the pockets of those people who they suddenly pretend they are trying to defend in this place.

I will not delay the House by speaking about the extensive list of exempted goods that has been put up for revision. I believe that this extension in the range of exempted goods will go a very long way towards meeting the demands of people who, in the fringe areas such as the area I represent, have become used to Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading. I believe that exempted goods should be

such as to apply to those sort of things which one has to duck down to the shop and get at odd hours over the weekend; but I can see no real reason (and I have not had placed before me by the people I represent any reason) why there should be completely unrestricted trading throughout the greater metropolitan area.

I believe the referendum will be carried, and along with the member for Elizabeth I will be voting in favour of the question that will be placed before the people. No-one pretends that this referendum will solve all our problems in regard to retail marketing. However, I believe that Friday evening shopping and Saturday morning shopping will suit the convenience of shift workers as well as the convenience of working wives, and at the same time people on the fringe areas will be compensated for the loss of their general Saturday afternoon and Sunday shopping by the very large extension in the range of listed exempted goods. For those reasons, I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Labour and Industry): Since I have been a member in this House I do not think I have ever seen Opposition members so divided on a question or so unsure of their ground. I have noted here this evening that very few of them have spoken with the one voice, and on almost every occasion they have had to resort to insults to try to develop any sort of comment at all about this matter.

Mr. Jennings: And they are not even good at that.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In answer to the criticism that one member made that he had not had sufficient time to look at this Bill, I would say that this could possibly apply to all members opposite, although I think that if they had had a month to study it they would still not fully understand what it was all about. I do not think this lack of understanding about trading hours and the difficulties in this State is something that has come about just in the last week or two, because for the last 30 years members opposite have failed to take any positive action to correct the problems of shop trading in this State.

Three members who have spoken this afternoon and this evening have been involved in the last two years with many submissions. Evidence has been placed before them from all sections of the community, both as traders and as members of the public. However, during the last Parliament those people once again were unable to take any positive action

to correct the difficulties that have been created by the application of this present outmoded Act; yet because the present Government is prepared to take steps to correct the position, members of the Opposition are critical of any actions that we plan to take. It must have been obvious to anyone listening to the debate today that there was little sincerity on the part of members opposite in their opposition to this measure. It is significant that Government members have pointed out that our action has been supported by all the leading retail organizations in the State. No person has objected to the step we are taking, and I am sure that Opposition members would say that the Government's action had not resulted in very much criticism.

Mr. Rodda: Is that why the petition was presented?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Most of the signatures on that petition were obtained before the Government made its announcement. The Government's present attitude is different from the position it took when the matter was debated last year and when the Labor Party presented its policy before the last election. True, when the previous Government came forward last November with nothing in its proposal, we pointed out that the proper way to handle the matter was to continue to permit the trading then in operation on Friday nights and not to extend it further. Since then one or two things have happened that have affected our thinking on this matter. First, after the election, Government members, particularly me, received submissions from all interested sections of the trading community. Secondly, development in the last 12 months just outside the existing metropolitan area at places such as Ingle Farm and Salisbury has been much faster than it was in previous years.

As a result, the pressures experienced by traders who are just inside the existing metropolitan area have become much greater, and the representations made to the Government in the last three months have become correspondingly stronger. Consequently, the Government came firmly to the conclusion, which is shared by almost everyone involved in this matter, that uniform trading hours must be provided throughout the wider metropolitan area. Because I have not heard from Opposition members much criticism of this commonsense attitude, I assume that they agree that it is desirable. Having made that decision, we had no hesitation in saying that Saturday afternoon trading and Sunday trading should not be permitted in the metropolitan area.

I have been amazed to hear the range of opinions on this matter expressed by Opposition members; some have wanted trading on Saturday afternoons and Sundays, whilst the completely unbelievable attitude of the Leader was that there should be unrestricted trading hours. I do not know whether he thinks that trading should not be restricted on Saturdays and Sundays or whether he means that shops should be able to open at midnight and trade for 24 hours a day. So, it is not a question of trading on Saturdays and Sundays but of trading for all hours every day.

Mr. Coumbe: They can open at midnight now.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: But they cannot go through until midnight. I am amazed that the Leader has advocated these hours, because I should think that there would not be people advocating to him that there should be unrestricted trading hours in South Australia. I was surprised more when he gained support from some of his colleagues on this argument. Perhaps his visits overseas have gone to his head in some way, but I wonder whether he has considered how South Australia can be compared with cities he visited in which there are longer trading hours but which have a much larger population than we have. We have had reason to change our attitude from the one we stated some months ago. I am not ashamed of this, and Government members have not indicated that they are ashamed of it either. It is to our credit that, after a proper examination and with evidence now available to us that was not available before, we considered that there should be some change, and we should not be criticized for this.

Mr. Millhouse: What evidence was not available to you before?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Evidence from people who made representations to me who were not making representations to me when I was a member of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: Utter nonsense!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is not. You didn't have the guts to handle this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know whether the honourable member believes that every member of this Parliament receives the same representations as an ordinary member of Parliament as he does when holding a Ministerial position. If this happened, I would be surprised. I am certain that no member

received deputations from the retail trading organizations, which would not be prepared to speak to members of Parliament in the same way as they would speak to a Minister. I am surprised at the Opposition member's view. On the one hand, the Government has clearly decided (and its attitude was spelt out in the second reading explanation) that there should be uniform trading hours within the metropolitan planning area and that there should not be trading on Saturday afternoon and Sunday.

We have made this decision in the light of increasing the number of exempted goods that could be available to the public at those times through many outlets, so that there would be no inconvenience to the public who wished to purchase such goods. We believe (and I think Opposition members would believe, too, if they thought about it) that if we extend the permitted trading hours on Saturday and Sunday throughout the metropolitan area (and this would have to happen once the conclusion was reached and I think Opposition members are not arguing about uniform trading hours in this area) there would not be the market for shops to remain open competitively for sales of goods that would be available on Saturday afternoon and Sunday. The Government has made that decision. I will re-state what the Leader has said for the benefit of members who have pressed the Government about this question and who may not have noticed that I spelt it out in replying to a question asked by a newspaper last week. The Government does not intend to interfere with the present Saturday morning trading hours. A report in last Friday's *Advertiser* states:

Asked whether the Government might later consider abolishing Saturday morning shopping if the referendum were carried, Mr. Broomhill said: "I do not expect any such change. Submissions from organizations and individuals point to Saturday morning shopping being vital to the community."

Mr. Hall: What did you say about butcher shops being open on Friday evenings?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will discuss that point soon. This aspect, too, was spelt out. We believed that Saturday morning trading was important to the community and the retailers. We have made the firm decision in relation to Saturday afternoon and Sunday for two reasons, the first of which was that there had been no demand from the public or from retailers. In fact, there had been complete opposition from most retailers. On those issues we were quite clear. As members

opposite have said, it is the Government's job to make decisions and stick by them. We were able to do that in those areas.

However, Friday night shopping is in a different category. In our submission, it has been shown that there is some demand from the community for Friday night trading. It is all very well to say, as many members have, that it is believed that the referendum will result in a considerable majority of the people voting "Yes", but at the same time those people who will vote "No" will feel strongly about it, as is evident from the comments appearing in this morning's newspaper from people engaged in their particular industry who are totally opposed to Friday night trading because of their involvement in it. However, it is well for us to try to assess the desires of the people about Friday night trading. This will have a fairly dramatic effect on industry, because, if we have general Friday night trading, there must be some impact on where the greatest markets will be—whether or not Rundle Street will attract custom from areas like Glenelg or Port Adelaide, whether or not all shops will be able to open conveniently and whether or not staff will be rostered. These are things of some magnitude.

As the public has indicated by its present use of the facilities where they are available on the fringes of the metropolitan area, we could perhaps anticipate that a "Yes" vote would prevail; nevertheless, we believe we should tackle this by holding a referendum and that the question should be put clearly to the public whether or not it wants the opportunity to have Friday night trading.

I now mention briefly the questions that have been asked. I know I shall miss some because members seem to have different attitudes on this matter, but I was requested to say why the Government had not decided to have the referendum on a State-wide basis and why it had restricted it to the people who would be within this new metropolitan area. The answer is quite clear. We have no problem about this matter in the country. Members who have attempted to raise problems have suggested that people from the country districts come to Adelaide from time to time on holiday or for other reasons, and they should have a say in whether or not there should be Friday night shopping. This is not a reasonable attitude to adopt; these are not valid reasons for people outside the area affected having any voice in this matter. As I have mentioned in the second reading explanation, the hours

outside the metropolitan area will not be affected as a result of this referendum unless there is a particular request from the people in that area.

Complaints have been made by members about our attitude to the methods by which country areas determine what their future will be on shopping hours, and the fact that we have indicated that the petition system will be abolished has also raised criticism from members opposite. I am surprised at this because former Ministers in this portfolio in recent years will be well aware that, whenever the question of country shopping hours has been raised, there has never been one voice in support of continuing the present system of petitioning. As all people in the country areas (except, apparently, the members, who perhaps do not know the feelings of their electorate) know, country people are happy at the Government's announcement that it will do away with petitioning. Members opposite may agree with this, but perhaps they are not happy with our proposals. If that is the case, members can put forward their point of view, which we will consider, when that Bill is introduced. Perhaps members opposite representing country districts are not aware of the feelings of people in their areas in relation to the most unsatisfactory position that presently exists with regard to petitions to abolish a shopping district. It appears to me that country people should not be included in the determination of people in the metropolitan area whether or not to have Friday night trading. Country people will not be affected in their own areas yet, if those people had a vote, they could have a marginal influence one way or another. I am surprised that members opposite have not accepted the Government's proposal that only people who are directly affected shall be required to vote.

I think that two members have raised the question of the extent of the new boundary of the metropolitan area that we have suggested, and have said that this will not work, as people can establish shops just outside of the boundary (just outside of Gawler, for instance) and trade at hours other than the uniform hours specified. Members should consider this matter closely, for we have taken into account any future developments likely to take place for some years. As we are including areas as far out as Meadows and Bridgewater, members will see that it is unlikely that any large housing developments will commence in these places. No person is likely to establish any

form of shopping centre as far away from a community centre as these places are simply to take advantage of being able to trade on a Friday night, Saturday afternoon or Sunday, because he would not have the Monday to Friday shopping community to enable him to make a go of it. I believe that the fears members opposite have expressed that we have not put the boundaries far enough out are unfounded.

The member for Alexandra was perhaps the most insulting Opposition member towards me on this matter. He seemed to think that the whole question was some sort of trick, that we were not interested in people's views on shopping hours, and that we simply wanted to get them out to vote on the same day as the by-election was being held. True, we are aiming to have a referendum on the day of the by-election; I think we could be criticized if we did not aim to do that. Two factors are involved: first, and most important, we should not ask people to vote twice within a few weeks when we can enable them to vote twice conveniently on the same day, and secondly, we must consider the costs involved. The honourable member sees something sinister in everything that happens.

He has objected to the fact that on this occasion we sought to suspend Standing Orders to enable the second reading to be moved without notice. I admit that this happened, and I do not believe that it is something that should normally apply. However, the honourable member should consider the significance of this matter. Had I given notice last Wednesday that on Thursday I would introduce a Bill to provide for a referendum to be held on shop trading hours, honourable members can imagine what would have occurred. We would not have been able to continue with the second reading and, as newspaper reporters would have realized that on the next day the Government would introduce this Bill, we would have had all sorts of speculation that could have injured people.

Mr. Millhouse: How could it have injured people?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Because assessments made of the Government's intentions could have been misinterpreted.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Would have been misinterpreted!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, I consider that it would be misinterpreted. I am surprised that the member for Alexandra

did not have the common sense to realize the reasons for our taking that step, which I remind the honourable member again did not injure him in any way, because he had four days in which to examine the Bill. After hearing his speech, I am certain he did not read it or did not get his advisers to tell him what it was about. I have been surprised and disappointed at the attitude of members opposite. They still have different attitudes on the matter.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the butcher shops?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If I reply to two questions briefly now, the matters may not be referred to in Committee. First, it was asked why service stations were not included. At present the marketing of petrol in this State is satisfactory. No complaints have been received from the Royal Automobile Association, the industry, the persons working in the industry, or the community about the availability of petrol supplies. The introduction of self-serve petrol pumps has enabled proprietors in the metropolitan area to work reasonable hours during the week and they have not had to work on Friday night, Saturday afternoon, or on Sunday. Any person travelling from Adelaide to the country can get petrol reasonably near the city area and a motorist who suffers a minor accident and needs a light globe, for example, does not have to travel far to obtain it at the perimeter service stations.

When we have a difficult industry operating on stable grounds, we should not interfere with it and create difficulties for members of the public, who are satisfied, or for service station proprietors, who are also satisfied that the present arrangements prevent their having to work unnecessarily long hours. Regarding the hours of trading of butcher shops, the Premier has answered this question very well today by saying that the butchers will not be required to open on Saturday afternoons or Sundays, and the decision in relation to the opening of butcher shops on Friday evening will be considered in conjunction with the result of the referendum.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

Mr. HALL: I have a series of amendments, most of them consequential and only two containing the matter that I wish to debate. I ask for your guidance, Mr. Chairman, about

whether I should conduct all debate on the first amendment, which, nevertheless, is a substantial consequential amendment. It seems sensible to discuss the matter now.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader has only one amendment to clause 1.

Mr. HALL: Yes. The crux of the matter is in lines 20 and 21 but, if you allow me to discuss the whole matter of widening the voting area on the first amendment and if that amendment is lost, as it may be, that would obviate the necessity for further discussion on the other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the first amendment, which is to clause 1, should be moved. There is only the one amendment in clause 1, and that is to strike out "metropolitan area".

Mr. HALL: I move:

To strike out "Metropolitan Area".

Obviously, the Government will vote against this amendment. I will see how far you will let me go, Mr. Chairman. I believe my first amendment is more necessary than ever now that we have had the impoverished speech of the Minister of Labour and Industry in replying to the second reading debate. In his own plausible way, he tried to support the restrictive voting procedure provided by the Bill. He used the same type of trick he has used in interjection for years in this place to make plausible a story which is completely implausible. The great democrat, the Minister of Local Government, can show his support for an adult franchise in a properly democratic vote as opposed to a gerrymander by supporting my amendment.

The procedure confines the vote in this matter to only a portion of the Midland District; the Premier knows this very well. Members opposite have been strangely silent in their justification for introducing a compulsory vote on an election day for a by-election in Midland which will bring out the metropolitan area by compulsion but will not bring out the country area. This suits the political ambitions of the President of the South Australian Labor Party who sits opposite in the guise of the Minister. However, it does not suit any democratic procedures or anyone who supports them.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You would not know the meaning of "democratic procedures".

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HALL: The Minister would apparently chide me for a slight weighting of 10,000 to 16,000 country representation. However, he

would remove the comparison altogether by making one section compulsory and the other voluntary.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't be so childish.

Mr. HALL: The Minister of Labour and Industry is attempting a political manoeuvre in relation to the Midland District. We are not children, and we know very well the political manipulation behind this Bill. The question of 9 o'clock closing is just as important to people living outside the greater metropolitan area or the newly-defined metropolitan area and Gawler as it is to those people inside. As members on this side have amply demonstrated, this is simply drawing a larger boundary and allowing the non-uniform conditions the Government is complaining of now to apply again to a new developing area. The Government is only postponing the day or causing business interests to take advantage of the demarcation involved by creating this division.

Secondly, I do not believe one should ignore the country vote on this important question. If we are going to spend money in obtaining an answer, what is wrong with knowing what country people think? Why are there to be two types of citizen in this community? For a long time we have heard the word "gerrymander" from members opposite, yet in the very first session of this Government's term of office this magnificent group of democrats grades South Australian people into two types, those who will be given a say in deciding their shopping hours, and those who will not. The great democrat, the Minister of Local Government, who promised a shining new era of local government, denies people a vote in the new guided democracy. My amendment provides that all citizens entitled to vote at House of Assembly elections will have a say on the questions to be submitted at the referendum. I want the Government to be given an indication of what all citizens think on the question of trading hours. My proposal would ensure, too, that there would be a fair by-election in the Midland District. I know full well that the timing and method of voting in that election is a matter of political intrigue by the Government. The referendum will be deficient if the Government does not accept my amendment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Labour and Industry): I do not know why, every time the Leader of the Opposition speaks on this matter, instead of speaking on the merits of it he talks about the likely result of the Midland by-election. I am not really

sure what he intends. Does he intend all the voters in South Australia to have a say whether there should be 9 p.m. closing within the metropolitan area or to have a say whether there should be 9 p.m. closing all over the State? He does not make this clear. His argument fails because he does not know the present situation. Some shops in country areas are in shopping districts and others are not.

All shops not in shopping districts have no restrictions on their trading hours. Shops in the Barossa Valley, Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, and Naracoorte (to give a broad cross-section) can now trade until 9 p.m. on Fridays if they so desire—and on Saturdays and Sundays. Are people in these areas to be asked to record a vote whether their own privileges should continue? Are they all to be asked to say whether Adelaide people should have shopping on Friday nights? Whyalla people would hardly come to Adelaide to shop on Friday nights, and they would hardly avoid coming to Adelaide because they did not want to shop on Friday nights. Is the Leader asking that these people should have a vote in relation to the metropolitan area, or is he asking for uniform conditions to apply throughout the State?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the amendment, and it is obvious to anyone, who wants to understand, the reasons behind it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't talk rot.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am talking common sense to anyone who wants to understand and to anyone interested in doing other than making a political point. The Minister of Local Government has made his larrikin interjections persistently on this matter in attempting to put off Opposition members, but he has failed, and I suggest he be quiet. I am trying to make a point in reply to the Minister in charge of this Bill, who queried the Leader's reference to the Midland by-election. I suppose he is trying to say that it is a happy coincidence that the days are the same.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Any reference to the Midland by-election is not in order. In Committee the debate must be directed to the particular clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am replying to a question asked by the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader made a brief reference to this point and I was about to ask him to direct his remarks to the clause when he left the matter. It rests there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister took it up.

The CHAIRMAN: The Midland by-election cannot be introduced into this clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is it a happy coincidence that the Government intends that the referendum should be taken on September 12 and that this has no connection with the by-election in the Upper House? Only a moron would believe that. This is a deliberate ploy by the Government to obtain a political advantage in that by-election. We are not saying that restrictions should apply throughout the State, but we are saying that the question of trading hours is as relevant at Oodnadatta, Port Augusta or Mount Gambier as it is at Whyalla, Modbury, Tea Tree Gully, Reynella or in Rundle Street. If five-sixths of four-fifths of the electors are to express an opinion (and that is all the referendum is) on a matter, why should not the rest? What the Minister has said about outer areas of the State that do not come within shopping areas is as true of Elizabeth or the area in the District of Mawson as it is of country areas.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It is to apply to them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If we are to have a referendum all electors should be able to have their say, but that would not suit the Government for other political purposes, apart from any other argument. Does the Minister think that it is only people living within the enlarged metropolitan area who are affected by this? Has it never occurred to him that people come from country areas, because of the convenience of shopping, at the weekend or on Friday evening to Elizabeth? Does the Minister think that no-one comes from the area represented by the Leader of the Opposition to Elizabeth to shop? If he thinks that, he is even sillier than I believe him to be, because people do come from these outer areas and it is just as much for their convenience that they should be consulted as it is for the convenience of the people living within that area. Let the Minister deny that if he can, yet he will deny them a vote.

We hope to give them a vote on this matter so that they, too, who are equally affected as those at Elizabeth or Burnside are, can express their opinion. That is an answer to the arguments that the Minister has put up. If we are to have a referendum, as we are (we have said it is unnecessary but the Government is intent on it), let it be a true expression and not exclude many people whose

convenience and pockets can be affected. Let them have a say as well. As soon as we draw a line anywhere on the map for this purpose, we get anomalies. I do not know whether the Minister has realized what he has done by drawing the line and giving the definition as he has but I understand (and I think the member for Light can deal with this in more detail) there is a serious anomaly in the areas around Gawler because of the way in which this has been phrased.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister denies it but, after he has heard the member for Light, I hope he will take account of what has been said and do something to correct the position. He can do that by voting in favour of the Leader's amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader and the member for Mitcham are suggesting in this amendment that a referendum be held on hours affecting shopping areas within the State, although at present it is the case, and will continue to be the case after the referendum, that there are many areas in the State not affected by shopping hours at all. It is suggested that a question to be asked in the referendum be, "Are you in favour of extending the hours of shopping to 9 p.m. on Friday?" What does that mean in non-shopping areas? What is the conclusion one is to reach in non-shopping areas if the referendum is carried in favour of extending the hours to 9 p.m. on Friday? Does that mean that it is only to be in shopping areas that 9 p.m. closing will operate? If it does, honourable members opposite are suggesting that the residents of Nunjirkompita, Whyte Yarowie and Bull Creek will decide what shall be the shopping hours for people within shopping areas that in no way affect them, because, if the honourable member is suggesting there is a constant stream of traffic from Nunjirkompita, Whyte Yarowie and Bull Creek to the metropolitan area for shopping purposes, I can only suggest he should take a better traffic count.

This is an absurd proposal. What has been proposed is that there be a uniform shopping provision within the metropolitan area and that, in consequence, the metropolitan shopping district be extended to the whole of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan area, plus the municipality of Gawler; and there should be uniform hours within those areas. In other shopping areas in the State, the local people will decide what is the pro-

vision for them because in those areas in many cases quite different positions obtain from those obtaining in the metropolitan area, as every country voter will say. Country people have the right of proper representation in relation to their own local needs. How can it be suggested that we will have a poll throughout the State to determine shopping hours within restricted shopping areas within the State?

Neither the Leader nor the member for Mitcham has been able to tell us what the result of the poll will mean in relation to the extension of Friday night shopping if there were a favourable vote in non-shopping areas. What does it mean to those areas? If it means anything at all, it means that we should extend throughout the State the uniform shopping hours for the metropolitan area. That would mean that the Leader and the member for Mitcham are suggesting that we restrict hours in areas at present proposed to be left without restriction. If it is not proposed to restrict the West Coast and Mount Gambier, for instance, to uniform shopping hour provisions, is it suggested that the people at Ceduna, Penong or Port MacDonnell should determine what should be the shopping hours for people at, say, Elizabeth and Kent Town? I think that the matter that you, Mr. Chairman, suggested should not be debated here is exercising the minds of members opposite, for I can see no other reason for this proposal, absurd as it is. There is absolutely no logic in this proposal except that it is hoped that some compulsory vote somewhere will affect someone else advantageously.

Mr. HALL: The Premier is at his theoretical best and practical worst, because he does not know what he is talking about as so often happens when he approaches a practical subject. First, he has not listened to what has been said. For his benefit, I repeat that I advocate no further restriction of shopping hours. Therefore, irrespective of the result of the referendum, I stand for no further restriction anywhere. I can move clearly for an assessment of opinion of people throughout South Australia on 9 o'clock closing or on any other question I want to put to them. I would not restrict the result in any way. The Attorney-General seems to think this is funny, but he will learn to respect the views of people. This referendum is unnecessary.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And you're proposing to widen it.

Mr. HALL: Let us be practical: we know the Government can put it through. We want

to make it as sensible and as democratic as possible. The Premier immediately assumes that we are bound by the result. What we want is the opinion of South Australians to put before the impossible group that is now in Government. We are not asking for a policy to guide our advocacy on closing or further restriction; we ask the people to give their full opinion.

The Hon. L. J. King: Ought the Government to take notice of the result?

Mr. HALL: The Government does not know how to ask the question in the first place. The Premier has derided the statement that people in outlying areas have a shopping interest in the metropolitan area. What residential area in Adelaide has some local application to Rundle Street? Does the Premier think that country people do not shop in Adelaide? What an absurdity! He says that we need a road count (or, perhaps that we do not need one) to establish whether the people come from Bull Creek or Whyte-Yarcowie. Has the Premier not heard that people do come from these places? No wonder the country people get a raw deal. They are separate people in Labour thinking, and always have been. At nearly every point the Premier either misconstrues the Opposition attitude or disregards the country opinion, and I make it plain that he cannot attribute to us any thought of restricting shopping hours. I repeat that the Government needs a wide selection of opinion, not a direct question, to do justice to the matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Never before, whether in the Commonwealth Government, State Government, local government or any other area, have I known a man who claims on the hustings to represent the principles of democracy to stand up barefacedly and say that he would not take any notice of the opinion of the people. No wonder the Liberal and Country League Governments in the last 30 years have been minority Governments! They have not listened to the voices of the people. However, a few weeks ago, when for the first time in 30 years the people had an opportunity to have their voice heard a little better than had been the case previously, they told present Opposition members and some of their colleagues who are no longer in their ranks what they thought of members of Parliament who were so arrogant as to say publicly that they were not interested in the voice of the people. This is the basic difference between the philos-

ophy of the Australian Labor Party and that of the L.C.L. It is complete hypocrisy for the Leader on the one hand to move an amendment that a referendum ought to be State-wide and on the other, scarcely before the *Hansard* reporters have had time to get that statement down, to say that he would not listen to the voice of the electors, anyhow. Why is the Leader moving this amendment? The facts are abundantly clear. The Opposition is opposed to something being done for the benefit of the people of this State.

Mr. Evans: Of part of the State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Fisher may speak if he likes. The former Minister of Labour and Industry, the member for Torrens, will acknowledge that he told this Chamber many times that his Government was seriously trying to resolve the extremely complex problem that he, as Minister, had inherited because of lack of attention to this most important matter in the previous 30 years or so.

Mr. Coumbe: Including the three years of the Labor Government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, and including also the 30 years of Liberal Governments. It is all too easy to put the blame for everything that was wrong in just that little compartment of three years. Much remedial action was taken during that period to overcome the many thousands of deficiencies that we as a Labor Government inherited from previous Liberal Governments that were completely inactive.

I repeat that I believe the member for Torrens would be the first to admit that his Government tackled this problem but did not find a solution to it. When the Labor Government is prepared to tackle the problem (and we believe we have found the solution), there is a degree of envy on the part of the Leader and the Deputy Leader, and the result is that they sink to the level of hurling abuse. They have both said that this ought to be a State-wide referendum, when in fact we are dealing with a problem in the expanded metropolitan area; perhaps we should call it the Adelaide statistical area. This is where the problem exists: it does not exist at Corny Point, out in the Althorpe Islands, at Bull Creek, Cockburn, Ceduna or Penong or any such places. The problem is here in the Adelaide statistical area, and the people here have a right to determine for themselves whether the shopping hours should be up to 9 o'clock on Friday nights or whether they should be the hours that currently apply in Rundle Street.

Do members opposite support the current position? Do those members honestly believe that the stores in Elizabeth and Tea Tree Gully and in the south at Reynella and Christies Beach and so on ought to have one set of trading hours? Is the Leader advocating that the people within the wealthy wall of the Adelaide City Council ought to have a more restrictive set of hours?

Mr. Ryan: That is what he has suggested.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The previous Government did not seek to alter the hours at all in its last two years of office. The Opposition has launched a series of amendments in attempting to attack the Government. Actually, it is not so much an attack as a mere sham, and it is nothing short of hypocrisy. When it launches a series of amendments such as the Leader has put forward, I would have thought that its members would get together and discuss these things. I had been under the impression that it was only the Liberal members of the Legislative Council that did not talk to the members of the House of Assembly: I did not know that it applied within the House of Assembly itself. This afternoon the member for Alexandra said that it was wrong to have a poll in this wide area.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister is out of order in referring to the second reading debate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and I accept your admonition. I think there ought to be a degree of consistency in the advocacy of the various members of the Opposition. This has not been forthcoming. One attitude has been expressed by the Leader of the Opposition and a completely contrary attitude has been expressed by other Opposition members. The amendment is nothing more than a sham, and I do not think Opposition members are sincere about it. The fact that the Leader himself has said that he will take no notice of the result of the referendum shows that his whole attitude is one of utter hypocrisy.

Mr. HALL: I do not accept the charge of hypocrisy. It is the deficiencies of the proposed referendum that have aroused the opposition I have for it. The purpose of the question that the Government proposes to put in the referendum is apparently to establish some basis for changing the policy it announced three months ago. The policy has been changed for rather peculiar reasons; the Minister said that those reasons were not apparent at the time the Labor Party's policy speech

was prepared. Those reasons relate to the unprecedented growth in South Australia, of which the Minister was unaware three months ago. Evidently that is why he did not give us credit during the election campaign for the outstanding growth in South Australia that we said had occurred. The Government is asking the people to comment on one question but is ignoring other major questions. The Minister of Local Government charged me with hypocrisy, but he is recommending that we ask this limited number of people about Friday night shopping; yet he says we should not ask whether they want to continue to be able to shop on Saturday afternoons and Sundays, because the Government has decided that this will not occur. That is not in the policy speech, nor is it in the referendum. Thirteen days ago the Premier gave a very strong answer, by inference, when he said that these matters would not be altered, but today he has said that they are to be altered. Now the Minister charges me with hypocrisy!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are not even talking on the amendment.

Mr. HALL: I am talking about the subject that the Minister dealt with. My opposition to the Bill is based on the narrowness of the question.

Mr. EVANS: The Premier said that this matter did not affect people in certain districts, including Bull Creek. I do not know whether he knows where Bull Creek is.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have canvassed all of Bull Creek in my time.

Mr. EVANS: One can realize why the Premier makes some of the statements he does. Bull Creek is in the Meadows District Council area, and so are Darlington and Braeview. The Darlington people will have a vote on this issue, but the Bull Creek people and the Meadows people also patronize the same shopping area, and they will not get a vote. The Mylor people who live on the city side of the river will have a vote but the people on the other side of the river will not have a vote.

Mr. Hall: A pretty unfortunate reference, wasn't it?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. If a group of people wished to build a shopping complex in the Meadows District Council area at Mylor, and developed an area intended to be a beautiful playground for the children, we would have the same situation as we have today. This centre would be within 25 minutes' travel of the

G.P.O., that is, no farther away than Elizabeth, Christies Beach or Reynella. If people in the Mount Barker and Woodside districts had a local option poll and decided in favour of unrestricted trading hours the same thing could happen at Verdun, Hahndorf, Woodside or Balhannah, all of which will be within 25 minutes' travel of the G.P.O. when the freeway is completed. The boundary of the metropolitan area, as defined in the Bill, will be within 25 minutes or less travel of the G.P.O. when the freeway is completed. Let us be honest: let us cover the whole State. If we want uniformity let us ask the people, and if those in country areas do not want trading hours restricted they will say so. Let us tackle this issue fairly, but I do not think that is what we are doing now. I have no envy, as was suggested by the Minister, only disgust. I support the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: The last time the Premier mentioned Bull Creek he suggested, by advertisement, that under the Liberal gerrymander they had too many votes and that one vote from Bull Creek equalled four votes in Elizabeth. Now he is taking away their right to vote, perhaps to even it up. At Strathalbyn the Foodland Store is open on Saturday afternoons and everyone seems to be satisfied with that arrangement. Unfortunately, the people of Mount Barker do not have this opportunity, and the Minister has said that he will take away the right of the people in that area to have a referendum.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I did not say that.

Mr. McANANEY: It is in the Bill, boy, and it is in the Minister's second reading explanation. The member for Ascot Park claimed that the Liberals had not won an election for 30 years, but on a one vote one value basis we would have obtained a majority for 20 of those 30 years.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't talk rot.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Virgo—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must address members correctly. He has referred to the Minister of Roads and Transport as the member for Ascot Park and as the member for Virgo. When referring to the Minister the honourable member must refer to him as such, that is, as the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. McANANEY: I take it that I cannot refer to him as the member for Ascot Park?

The CHAIRMAN: No. The honourable member must refer to the Minister as the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. McANANEY: I maintain that the Minister was deliberately making a false statement when he said his Party had won every election for 30 years on a majority of votes. That is not correct. We cannot select one section of the community and say they can have a vote on something and deny another section of the community the opportunity to vote. The Government says that the many people who would come from my district to shop in Adelaide on a Friday night are not entitled to vote on this matter. I support the amendment as something that brings democracy into the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the amendment. The Minister of Roads and Transport assures the Committee in strident tones that the Government has found a solution. It has found a solution all right: it has a patently transparent referendum before the Committee designed to get it off the hook. The Premier has stated that the Government can confidently predict the result of the referendum even before it is held. In the circumstances, I see little sense in holding it but, the Government having undertaken to hold it, it should be broadened to make sense. The Leader pointed out initially that we could not really discuss this amendment without considering further consequential amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will debate the matter now before the Chair. I have already ruled that. He cannot debate consequential amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This referendum as it now stands will have very little significance. This amendment is a first step towards making something sensible of a referendum that at present makes very little sense: in fact, it is a waste of public money. I have always considered that a referendum concerns the people of the State (or, in the case of a Commonwealth referendum, the whole Commonwealth). This is simply a cooked-up, glorified local option poll.

How does the Government intend to deal with country people? It says this will be a matter for subsequent legislation. If this referendum is to mean anything, it should be so framed as to include all the citizens of the State; it could then at least be claimed that it is a referendum. The Government obviously assumes that the country people have no interest in it. If it had been thoughtfully planned

the country people would have been included, for they have a vital interest. People from my own district motor to Adelaide and are concerned with shopping on Fridays. In Lyn-doch a supermarket is at present being constructed. Those people have a vital interest in shopping hours and are outside this limited area; they are disfranchised. Surely they deserve consideration. The basic difference between the two Parties is that we on this side are concerned with country people and believe that this referendum should have been so framed as to include them. As the matter has been ruled to be outside the provisions of this clause, I will not refer to the by-election. I do not care whether the electors be Liberal or Labor; there will be two different electorates, and it is wrong that country voters should be excluded.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The argument put by the Opposition really amounts to this: widen the area of the poll; extend the question; and take no notice of the result. I do not think it deserves further comment.

Mr. HALL: Like the Premier, the Attorney-General completely misconstrues the question. The 10,000 people who have signed this petition have no say in the matter, and they should not be ignored. The Opposition does not have to be convinced: it is the Government that must be convinced, and I want full public opinion to be before it before it makes some wretched mistake in relation to shopping hours that will deprive people of many of the freedoms that they value more than the Premier knows. We want the Premier to have the advice of the people; he should not ignore them by restricting the number of people who may vote or by the way in which he puts the question.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller), Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

Mr. HALL: For obvious reasons, I do not intend to proceed with my amendments to this clause.

Mr. EASTICK: I move:

In the definition of "the metropolitan area" to strike out "and the municipality of Gawler."

As recently as 1967 the people of Gawler voted on the trading hours they desired. They then sought to alter the Act that permitted them to trade outside the Early Closing Act.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Was this a poll of ratepayers?

Mr. EASTICK: The Minister will be fully aware of how the Act can be changed and of the material submitted to the appropriate authority. Many people in Gawler have indicated that this is the type of trading that they require.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We cannot accept this amendment. The reasons given in support of it seem strange, because the honourable member knows that, by drawing up our developed area in the new metropolitan area, we have included those areas that have been built up. We have done this to prevent what Opposition members have said may well happen, namely, to prevent people from taking advantage, in a built up area, of trading hours different from the standard hours operating outside their area. If we exclude Gawler so that that town could continue to find its own level, we could find developing this unfair competition that we are attempting to prevent. I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: This is a ridiculous assertion for the Minister to make, because in the Hills area just the other side of Norton Summit the boundary is much closer to the centre of Adelaide than is the township of Gawler. This is also the position with many other places. We must draw the line somewhere.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 3—"Fixing of day for referendum."

Mr. HALL: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "question" and insert "questions".

Perhaps I should have pursued this topic during the discussion on clause 2, which has been passed, and it may be necessary for me to ask for clause 2 to be recommitted to have my consequential amendments inserted. Do I have your permission at this stage, Mr. Chairman, to canvass the substance of the amendment that I have foreshadowed in clause 4,

namely, to insert a second question, "Are you in favour of shops being permitted unrestricted trading hours?"

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the Leader proceed until he transgresses Standing Orders.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the amendment we are now considering is carried it will enable the second question to be inserted, and it seems appropriate to canvass this topic now. This is not an advocacy of unrestricted trading hours: it is simply a desire that I and many members of the Opposition have to put these questions to the public, although at present it is only a section of the public. It seems to me that this would give a very valuable indication on a district basis of what people in different areas thought. It would enable the Government to assess the strength of the support for completely unrestricted shopping in the areas from which petitions have come. It would enable an assessment to be made of the support for unrestricted trading, and at least the Government would be better informed on what people think about many aspects of trading than would be the case by merely putting the limited question.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you open Rundle Street up on Sunday?

Mr. HALL: I should like to know what the public thinks on this matter. I have already told the Minister that I advocate having no further restriction. I believe the question of how wide shopping hours should be should depend on the wishes of the public, and I am willing to listen to the public and to put further questions to them in order to ascertain what they think.

This afternoon I was pleased to receive from the Premier an undertaking that certainly not in the lifetime of the present Government would Saturday morning shopping be jeopardized. If that assurance had not been forthcoming I most certainly would have moved that that question be included in the Bill in order that the people could properly express their opinion to the Government. The Government is planning to remove the availability of Saturday afternoon shopping and Sunday shopping in areas where it is now enjoyed by many people. I would like the Government to know what people think of completely unrestricted shopping hours in those areas. It would cost very little extra to get another answer in the referendum. Unless

the Government is afraid of public opinion expressed in this way, it will support my amendment. There seems to be no other reason why public opinion should not be gathered on a wider issue.

[Midnight]

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I completely oppose the amendment and I am amazed that it has come forward. The question proposed in the amendment is: are you in favour of shops being permitted unrestricted trading hours?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why should you be amazed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Nothing that comes from the other side, particularly from the honourable member, should amaze me, but from time to time I am amazed at what the Leader of the Opposition puts forward. According to his proposal, if people favoured Saturday afternoon trading how would they answer? They would naturally answer "Yes", because there would be no alternative. If people favoured Sunday trading, they would still answer "Yes". If people wanted shops open until 9 p.m. every night of the week, they would answer "Yes". What sort of information would we be able to gain if we were foolish enough to include this in the provision? It is all very well for the Leader to tell us that he will not take any notice of the information gained but, as a responsible Government, if we put any questions in the referendum, we want to be able to act on the answers provided. However, the answers provided to a question as wide as that in the amendment would be completely valueless to the Government.

The Government has made decisions in relation to Saturday afternoon trading and Sunday trading. It has been criticized for not making decisions on the one hand and no doubt Opposition members will now criticize it for having made decisions. We have found that there is no demand from the public or from retailers for any extension of trading after 12 noon on Saturday. So, the only doubt in our minds relates to the attitude of people toward Friday night trading. The Government cannot accept the amendment because it would serve no useful purpose.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The criticism made of the Government relates to its inconsistency in making a decision to chop out all Saturday afternoon trading and Sunday trading but not to apply the same restriction to trading on

Friday evenings. We are criticizing the Government for its inconsistency. We do not think much of a referendum, because it is the duty of members of Parliament to decide, but if we are to have a referendum it should be a proper one that obtains the opinion of the people on all matters in issue. If the Minister believes that there is no demand for trading on Saturday afternoon and Sunday he should visit the areas represented by some of his colleagues. The Minister's argument underlines the difficulty of framing questions that mean something in these circumstances. The proper way of having a referendum is to tell the people precisely what is wanted by introducing a Bill and then inviting their opinion of it. It should not be assumed that an isolated question will settle all problems about trading hours.

We cannot make the Government disclose details of its Bill and, in spite of the assertions that have been made today to the contrary, I believe that the Government does not know what it will do about other aspects of this question. It is trying to obtain a political advantage, but the best thing we can do is to improve the wording of the question that is to be put to the people. If we accept this amendment we will allow people in the restricted area to express an opinion not on an isolated matter of Friday evening trading but on the question of trading during the seven days of the week.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): Does the Opposition believe that if a referendum that provided for completely unrestricted trading were agreed to by the people, and such a proposal was introduced, we would not be faced with the situation where almost all shops would trade on Saturday afternoon and Sunday because they had to maintain a competitive advantage? Would not this be what would happen? Let us consider for a moment what it would mean. Its effect would be a 30 per cent increase in selling costs.

Mr. Millhouse: So you are not going to take the risk of asking the people.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader and the Deputy Leader want to put to the people of South Australia as a reasonable proposition that they should be encouraged into contemplating a "Yes" vote on such a question when there would, as a consequence, be an extraordinary rise in costs.

Mr. Nankivell: There would be increased costs in Friday night trading?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes; it amounts to an increase of one-third in the metropolitan planning area. That is an increase in selling costs and people say, "We want this extra service and are prepared to pay for it". However, there is a limit to the extent to which anybody is prepared to pay for extra service. We should not put it to the extent that we are being ridiculous in asking the people such questions. Members opposite know full well that unrestricted trading on the present basis, with some parts able to have it and others not, is completely inappropriate. It results in unfair competition, which is what the Leader believes in. He wants to give certain traders a special advantage over others: either that, or he wants a completely open slather for everyone and a 30 per cent increase in costs foisted on the public. (Incidentally, that takes no account of penalty rates.) Surely we should be able to expect from the Leader some basic degree of common sense, or is he just trying to play a little politics to curry favour with somebody?

He knows he cannot win. His own record in Government was hopeless and gutless; he refused to face up to the question in any way. If he exercises any intelligence (and he is an intelligent man) and cares to sit down and tackle the job, he knows that the principle of uniformity within an area where there can be competition is the only principle on which it can stand, that people must be able to trade on the same basis. In these circumstances, if we have completely unrestricted trading hours, they must be unrestricted for everyone. The Leader will not tell the people of South Australia, "If you want it, I am prepared to advocate a 30 per cent increase in costs—or more, because of penalty rates—so that you can all have this extra service"; or is this one of the questions which, if the Leader got a "Yes" vote, he would ignore?

Mr. HALL: Flattery will get the Minister of Education nowhere. There seems no doubt that the Minister of Labour and Industry is completely in the pocket of big business. It is amazing to see the Party opposite, led of course by the President of the Party, who is absent for the moment, continually attacking big business. However, this time business men have told the Government that longer hours will affect their profits, and the Minister has agreed not to do that. The Minister is completely in the hands of big business because he is ignoring the people. Both the Minister of Education and he have said that people are not fit to assess the worth of this question

and cannot be trusted to vote on it. The Minister of Labour and Industry said he did not understand the question.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If people voted "Yes" under your amendment, I wouldn't know what they wanted.

Mr. HALL: I have said that we would ignore anything that had a restriction in it. If 50 per cent of the people voted for unrestricted trading hours, that would be my policy. The Minister of Education has blandly asserted that unrestricted trading would cause costs to increase by 30 per cent, but of course unrestricted trading operates now in certain areas of South Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Only because they get an unfair advantage; it does not apply generally.

Mr. HALL: The fact is that it does apply at Elizabeth, for instance. Have costs where it applies increased by 30 per cent? Does the Minister understand that with 7-day-a-week trading in meat at the Lazy Lamb costs are considerably lower?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not really.

Mr. HALL: It is all very well for the Minister to say that prices will increase by 30 per cent: he knows that the opposite has occurred in a significant industry.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I don't know that.

Mr. HALL: If the Government does not widen the question it puts to the people, there will be much protesting in the community about the restricted question, which has already been described publicly as a trick question. This could mean that there will be difficulty in assessing some votes given at the referendum. I believe many people will give write-in answers on votes at this referendum. This is bound to occur in areas that are certain to lose freedoms. If squares on the ballot paper are filled in as set out in the directions in the Bill, can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether write-in answers that may be given in addition will invalidate the votes, because no doubt many people will wish to express a wider view than they can possibly express in answering this limited question? I want to be assured that as long as the number 1 is legible, a write-in answer will not affect the validity of a vote.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One can only express amazement that a question, "Are you in favour of shops being permitted unrestricted trading hours?" should be proposed and supported by the Leader. He suggests that we put

before the public a proposition that the Early Closing Act should be abolished, that there should be no restriction on trading hours, that we should have trading for the 24 hours of the day on the seven days of the week. I clearly remember having great difficulty when we were previously in Government in getting through this Chamber a proposal for the most limited extension of provisions for recreation on Sundays, because the Methodist Church and various other church bodies, strongly supported by members opposite, bitterly attacked a proposal that would have involved some people in working at ovals on Sundays. Now the Leader of the Opposition proposes that all the shop assistants in the metropolitan area should be at work, that all the shop assistants in the State will be subject to the requirements of business that has to compete if one business in the area chooses to operate.

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.

The Leader may have examined the costs involved in weekend trading in some States of the United States. I do not know whether he has examined the contrasting award provisions, because the award provisions in that country do not provide for the same weekend penalty rates that are uniform in Australia, and the increasing costs of Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading for traders in Australia will be much heavier than in other countries. The cost increase would be considerable if Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading were opened up generally and, with a not greatly increased market, that could not but affect the cost of servicing the public in retail selling. As this State is trying to maintain a cost advantage, that is not something that we could reasonably afford. The Leader has referred to the cost of the Lazy Lamb operation, but he knows perfectly well that that operation is upon the basis

of meat sold and that the meat is not killed under export conditions. In consequence, the cost of meat to that market is quite different from the cost to the average master butcher in the metropolitan abattoirs area. Consequently, the difference in costs there is not related to labour costs in the same way that the Minister of Education was talking about.

Mr. Coumbe: One member praised the policy and said that it would be cheaper.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That may well be true. However, the honourable member knows perfectly well the costs facing the State on export killing conditions. I do not know whether he is advocating that we abolish the metropolitan abattoirs area. The fact is that it is reasonable to provide that the butchering trade shall be upon a competitive basis. Lazy Lamb can still get its meat under non-export conditions. How is the fact that they are trading during the same hours as other butcher shops going to affect them adversely? That is not the issue that is involved here. What the Leader is proposing here is the opening up of trading hours to the extent that people will be required to be brought into work at times which most people in South Australia would consider entirely inappropriate; there is no suggestion of a provision that we have one general quiet day at least in South Australia.

Then we get the most extraordinary suggestion from the Leader that he was interested in taking this poll not in order to get uniform trading hours in the metropolitan area in an unrestricted fashion but so that he could gauge where there should be unrestricted hours within the metropolitan area, and so still create the anomalies which this whole referendum is trying to avoid, by having a look and seeing whether some areas would vote for unrestricted hours and others would not. How would one interpret whether people were voting for unrestricted hours in that area or in the whole metropolitan area? How in the world could we get some effective result upon a selective basis out of replies to that particular question? We could not, because the vote is upon the basis of what should be the trading hours in the whole statistical division. The whole purpose of the referendum is to get uniform trading hours and competitive conditions throughout the statistical division. Therefore, if the Leader is trying to get the kind of poll he was talking about in moving this amendment, all I can say is that his question is not designed to achieve the result he is looking for.

Mr. HALL: The Premier is making remarks and adapting them to his own meaning. Let me return to my earlier statement. I believe that there should be 9 o'clock closing throughout the metropolitan area and all around the State if the people want that. I said earlier that there should be no restrictions in the areas which now have unrestricted trading and that we should take a poll in those areas at a future date after the citizens had had time to consider the implications and to decide for themselves what they wanted in those areas. We do not advocate unrestricted trading throughout the State; I made that clear when I first moved my amendment. I said that it would be very useful for any Government to know what the people thought on this issue. It would surely govern its overall approach to know what strength was behind the proposal for unrestricted trading hours in this State. The Premier knows that it is wrong to draw a picture of shops open all the week: the shops must make a choice based upon economics, their employees, their costs, and their capacity to operate for a given number of hours. It is simply not true that seven-day trading would apply generally. It would be an adjustment that the industry itself would make, and it would be a healthy one. If the Government is seriously to attempt to control the number of outlets or the number of hours of each outlet, what does the Premier have to say about the almost weekly announcements of new shopping centres to be established? Will they not dilute the custom of existing businesses as much, if not more, than the extended hours that may be chosen by some shops? It is not possible to say by how much costs will increase if businesses have a choice of trading hours. There would have to be a demand before they would open beyond normal trading hours. Dozens of voters may write their opinions on the ballot-papers in addition to placing numbers in the squares. Can the Minister say whether, as long as the numbers are validly written in the squares, ballot-papers will be valid if opinions are written on them, too?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the Leader reads the Bill that he has had before him for some time he will see in clause 14 the provisions relating to ballot-papers. The final decision is in the hands of the Returning Officer.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller),

Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller), Brown, Burdon, and Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader has another amendment, but I take it that he does not wish to proceed.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Chairman, for reasons known to us all I will not proceed.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Question to be submitted to electors."

Mr. COUMBE: My question deals with butchering and meat sales in the evening. In reply to a question I asked on August 5 the Minister of Labour and Industry said:

The honourable member has referred to butcher shops that are built into the structures of some supermarkets situated outside the metropolitan area; these shops can be closed conveniently. The meat can be taken out of the refrigerated units and stored every evening. It can be cleared by 5.30 on Friday evening, and we expect that the butchering industry will be closed at that time on Fridays.

On receiving that reply, I assumed that the butchery would be closed, that this would apply to frozen meat, and that the position would be that one could go into a shop and do ordinary shopping but could not buy any meat. The Premier said this afternoon that he could not tell the supermarkets about this, and the butcher shops in them would be open. So I have had two opinions. What will the position be if the referendum is taken and 9 p.m. closing becomes the order of the day?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This has already been answered. If the referendum in favour of Friday night shopping is carried, butcher shops throughout the State will be permitted to open to the hours of retail trading in the metropolitan statistical division, which will include trading on Friday night. The position about which the honourable member questioned the Government was at the time that the Government was simply referring to the policy that had been announced at the election, which was not subject to the modifica-

tions we applied after investigation of the new conditions that had come about since the election in relation to the referendum.

Mr. Coumbe: You are referring to your changed policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am referring to Friday night trading as a uniform provision in the metropolitan area rather than unrestricted trading in one section of the area and restricted trading in the rest. That position, having arisen, has led to our decision to hold the referendum. We have taken the view that it will be anomalous to provide uniform trading in the metropolitan area except for butcher shops. Therefore, butcher shops will comply with the general retail trading hours. We made investigations into the butchering trade before coming to that conclusion about a referendum. So the position should be quite clear. If the referendum is answered affirmatively, the butchering trade will be expected to have permitted hours to the same degree as the remainder of normal retail trading other than exempt shops and garages in the metropolitan area.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Voting compulsory."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose this clause. I do not believe voting at this referendum should be compulsory. If we are to have a referendum, I believe voting should be voluntary. This would allow those wishing to express an opinion to express it, but it would not force everyone to go to the poll. As time has gone on, I have become less and less impressed by the arguments for compulsory voting. In South Australia, we have compulsory voting for the House of Assembly, but I do not believe that it has the benefits or advantages that it is sometimes assumed to have. I do not believe that people should be obliged to vote whether or not they have any interest in or knowledge of the question they have to answer. For that reason, if for no other, I oppose the clause. If the clause is deleted, the voting on the referendum will be voluntary and those who have an opinion to express will be permitted to express it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I oppose the clause for the reasons set out by the member for Mitcham. The compulsory vote is almost a peculiarly Australian custom, and we have taken it to such an extent in this country that it is becoming ridiculous. I think it is

reasonable to say that a question such as this should be decided by people interested in it and not by people not interested in it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I, too, oppose the clause. I think compulsory voting is bad, and I do not agree to it in principle. One member opposite said today that people would go to the polling booth but that they did not have to vote. To me that is morally wrong, and I oppose that thinking, too. I think it is a sorry state of affairs that we have to force uninterested people to vote. If people are interested enough I am sure they will register their approval or disapproval.

Mr. EVANS: I oppose the clause on two grounds. First, I believe it is undemocratic: I have never believed in any compulsory voting. Secondly, there is the question of cost. Many people will hand in a blank paper or cast a vote that they do not wish to cast. If 20,000 people are compelled to vote under the Bill and only 50 per cent of the people entitled to vote cast a vote on issues such as this if the vote is voluntary, 10,000 people are being forced to vote. Most will drive motor cars to the polling booths and a few living nearby will walk. If the cost is averaged out at only 50c a person, a large sum of money is being squandered for no purpose if people are forced to vote.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I oppose the clause. I think the Government has compulsory voting on the brain. I believe we should be moving towards voluntary voting. We know the Government's intention of meddling in local government affairs by providing for compulsory voting, and that will be a most unpopular move. Perhaps the Government will want a referendum on that. There is no valid reason why the vote at this referendum should be compulsory. If the Government wants an informed vote, it will want voters to take an interest. Of course, we know why the Government wants the vote to be compulsory. I oppose the clause.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister say how voters will be told whether they are enrolled? The boundary of this prescribed area cuts through subdivisions of House of Assembly districts, and persons are listed on a roll with an address that is only approximate and does not say on which side of a line the person lives. Will the onus be on everybody to go to a post office, examine the roll, and find out whether they are compelled to vote? If the Government intends to treat this, unlike the way the Labor Party would

treat the National Service Act, seriously and prosecute people for not voting, many people may not realize that they are obliged to vote.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I agree that there are some difficulties in relation to the four part-country areas. Many people living in those areas towards the boundary may have doubts about their obligation to vote. Therefore, the Government is ensuring that a letter will be sent to these persons, telling them they are required to vote.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: How many people are involved?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think about 15,000 are involved, but I may be able to check that.

Mr. McANANEY: How will the Electoral Department determine to whom to write letters? Many people were incorrectly enrolled as a result of the last redistribution, and this matter will be more difficult to deal with than the redistribution, because old electoral district boundaries between subdivisions were a guide, whereas this area includes the Hills district, where there will be no lines, and it will be guess work. When does the Government expect that the rolls will be available?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The position is not as complex as members may think. Persons in these part-country areas are being listed by the Electoral Department and the persons who reside within or without the area can be determined. Consequently, there is no real difficulty.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Does the Electoral Department know where these people live? It may have only a postal address. I understand that the Government wants this to be done by September 12.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know how many times I have to tell members opposite that arrangements have been made to sort these people out. It is an unusual situation, but the Electoral Department is able to undertake the work of sorting these people out. I do not believe that we ought to go into great detail about how the department will do this. However, there are street rolls, together with names.

Mr. Millhouse: How do you expect the department to do that?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It can be done conveniently within the department, and it will be done in sufficient time for people to be informed.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am not aware of the finer details of how names are recorded on the computerized electoral rolls, but I know that the Electoral Department has produced a list of streets throughout the State which probably all members have had or have been able to get. This list, produced before the last election, shows in respect of a particular street which street numbers are in a particular subdivision and which are not. For example, we find in a long road like the Anzac Highway that the houses up to a certain number are in one district and those from that number onwards are in another; and the houses on the other side of the road are in another district again. I do not think it is an insuperable problem to sort out these few people. I am sure that most people concerned will be in street areas and that it will be easy to find out the ones outside that by checking the computerized rolls.

Mr. McANANEY: In the electoral rolls, every person who lives in Langhorne Creek has been put in Heysen. The same thing has happened with Kangarilla and many other towns, and I do not think the matter has yet been straightened out. What will happen in Uraidla, which is about where the boundary will be? The computer does not have the facts and figures necessary to put Uraidla addresses in the right group, and it will just be a matter of hit or miss up there where there are no numbered streets. Although some corrections have been made in Hahndorf, I believe that the roll is still not accurate. I do not see how we can get an accurate roll with the information the department has at present.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller), Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 14 to 28 passed.

Clause 29—"Financial provision."

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say how much the referendum will cost?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I cannot give a completely accurate assessment, but I understand the cost would be about \$75,000 if the referendum were held on an ordinary day, but because it is being held on the same day as a by-election, the cost will be reduced by more than \$10,000.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and there is present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House. Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I oppose the motion to suspend Standing Orders. I made a similar objection—

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders have been suspended.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister moved that Standing Orders be suspended and you counted the House to consider whether the motion should be put. You called for a seconder, and I rose.

Mr. Coumbe: It has not been put yet.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I have explained in similar circumstances on a motion dealing with this Bill, in 99 cases out of 100 I would not object to the suspension of Standing Orders. It is in the interests of everybody that we facilitate the passage of a Bill when there are no problems. However, I object to bulldozing the one Bill in a hundred where the House is not unanimous on its being passed quickly.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What more do you have to say on it? You can say it on the third reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The fact is that the passage of this legislation has produced a show of bulldozing by the Government, and little else. It has been bungled and now bulldozed.

Mr. Jennings: You bungled it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It was bungled last Thursday, when the Minister had to rush in to try to catch up with the papers.

He had to move a Bill without giving notice; he had to have the Bill read a first time and then give the second reading explanation. He could not have given the second reading explanation before Wednesday if there had not been a suspension of Standing Orders. In spite of that protest, with no explanation whatsoever since that protest was made by me, he has gone ahead with the various stages of the Bill and now, for the second time in its passage, he is moving to suspend Standing Orders, presumably against the wishes of the House, because I have no doubt—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is not against the wishes of the House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Perhaps I have not the support of some members behind the Government but the Minister is going ahead against the wishes of the Opposition. He knows it is a bungled, bulldozed Bill. I oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: For the motion say "Aye"; against the motion say "No". There being a dissentient voice, ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller), Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Lawn, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman (teller), Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, and Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.18 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 19, at 2 p.m.