

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 21, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

CARTAGE SURCHARGE

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he intends to increase the surcharge on grain carted from railway premises by road transport and whether, if he intends to do that, he intends subsequently to sanction an increase in rail freights on grain? Figures supplied to me regarding the Mid-North Carriers Association show the following comparative freight rates a bushel on grain from various points to the seaboard:

Source	Road freight cents	Rail freight cents
Crystal Brook . . .	2	3.883
Caltowie (34 miles) . . .	4.05	6.963
Gulnare	4.05	7.976
Wilmington	8	10.829
Melrose	6.5	9.811
Wirrabara	4.285	7.454
Booleroo Centre . . .	6.5	9.114
Laura	2.985	6.749

On freights from each of these places a surcharge of 2.223c a bushel is levied and paid to the Railways Department. However, road transport is still cheaper than the rail freight, even after the surcharge has been paid. The person who has contacted me on this subject is concerned that, if the surcharge is increased further, road transport operators may be put in an unfavourable position, not because of their own costs but because of the taxation effect that would arise from the Minister's action.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The charges for wheat, or for grain generally, to which the Leader refers are exactly the same as charges that applied while his Party was in Government. The surcharge is payable when the grain is stored on railway property, and this Government and the previous Government have considered it not unreasonable to place a surcharge on this grain when it is taken from railway property and transported by road rather than by rail. The existing practice is the same as has previously applied and there is no intention to alter it.

TRADING HOURS REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Attorney-General concerning the scrutiny of informal votes cast at the

recent referendum on shopping hours. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House I shall briefly explain it.

The Hon. L. J. King: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It concerns the scrutiny of informal votes.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member state his question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Have the informal votes been scrutinized officially and, if so, by whom and what is the result? Last evening the member for Ross Smith, when speaking on a Bill, said that the very high number of informal votes cast at the referendum (and you will remember, Sir, a high number was cast) had been scrutinized, and that they indicated about an even split in "Yes" and "No", although they indicated it so imperfectly that the votes were not valid. As I understand it, it is unusual for informal votes to be formally scrutinized and tallied, although I think scrutineers of all political Parties carry out this function informally at individual polling booths. Therefore, I was surprised at the point made by the honourable member, and I ask whether, in fact, officers of the Electoral Department have on this occasion undertaken a scrutiny of these informal votes and (to restate the question) if they have what is, in fact, the result of the scrutiny.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I was not in the House when the member for Ross Smith made his speech.

Mr. Jennings: You missed something.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, I did, and I regret that I was not here. As I understand from information that I have been given, the honourable member was suggesting not that the scrutiny to which he referred was an official scrutiny but that it was information supplied to or obtained by him from informal sources, which I take to be the scrutineers. I have no knowledge of any official examination of the informal votes, and I would be extremely surprised if there had been any. To be certain that my reply is correct, I shall check with the department, but no instruction has emanated from me to scrutinize the informal votes, and I think it is highly unlikely that there was an official scrutiny. However, I will confirm this.

D.D.T.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about D.D.T.?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Recommendations for the control of insect pests affecting humans are normally supplied by the Public Health Department, with the health inspectors liaising with councils where specific insect problems affecting human health occur. The chances of any D.D.T. used for the control of mosquitoes in septic tanks being found as residue in agricultural produce are extremely slight, and its use for this purpose would not present any threat to our rural exports. The human health aspect of this matter has been taken up with the Public Health Department.

AMERICAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Works about the need for a water supply at American River. This follows a question that I asked on the subject on July 30 last, when the Minister told me that he was treating this matter as urgent. Can the Minister now say what has transpired in the meantime?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member was good enough to notify me that he would be inquiring about this matter, I have obtained a report from the department. Alternative water supply schemes and estimates and revenue estimates have been prepared for the American River township, and approximate revenue estimates have been prepared for the farm lands along the alternative routes of the feeder mains. The revenue estimates for the farm lands were based on proposed 1971 unimproved value assessments provided by the Valuation Department with a note of warning that it was most probable that they would be varied. However, more definite advice has now been received from the Chief Government Valuer, and detailed estimates based on the proposed 1971 valuations are now being prepared for the farm lands. When these estimates are completed, the department will make a recommendation on the proposal.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport, with officers of the Highways Department, the Road Traffic Board and local government, considered the installation of underways under main roads for which pedestrian crossings are being considered, as well as considering gradually replacing existing pedestrian crossings with underways? Recently it has been noticed that, on main suburban roads, traffic build-ups have been caused by ground-level pedestrian crossings. An underway has operated successfully for some years

at the Goodwood railway station. The safety of pedestrians is improved by the use of underways. I have noticed that a major underway is being constructed in Perth, and there seems to be support for the future use of underways as a means of improving traffic flow.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The general question of overways and underways at pedestrian crossings is being actively considered at present. I think it is generally accepted that, with the growing volume of traffic on our roads, the conventional crossings (whether zebra crossings or crossings with push-button lights or traffic-actuated lights) leave much to be desired. However, at this stage I can say no more than that the problem is being actively considered in an effort to find an economic solution. The information I have had so far indicates that a crossing of the type suggested would probably cost about \$40,000, so that obviously few of them could be constructed, particularly as the cost of the average pedestrian crossing with lights is only about \$10,000. On this basis, we could put in only one grade-separated crossing for the cost of four crossings with traffic lights. We are still looking into the problem, hoping that some solution can be found, for I believe that in future the only way that we shall be able to protect pedestrians is by using underways and overways.

BUNYIP CHILDREN'S THEATRE

Mr. COUMBE: My question relates to the productions of children's theatres in schools of this State, and may be of some interest to the Treasurer as well as to the Minister of Education, as it involves funds for the performing arts. Can the Minister of Education say why a South Australian theatre that has produced plays of a very high standard in South Australian schools for several years has been superseded by a similar company from Victoria? I refer to the Bunyip Children's Theatre of South Australia, the principals of which are wellknown actors and producers and are constituents of mine. To my knowledge, they have produced plays in South Australian schools for at least four years and possibly longer, and their work has been widely acclaimed as being of a high standard. They are anxious to expand their operations into the country and to other schools (at present they produce plays for many departmental and private schools). My information is that this company, in the latter part of this year, has not had its contract or approval renewed; rather, it has been replaced

by a company from Victoria that produces similar plays whose quality is no better than that of the plays produced by the Bunyip Children's Theatre. This company from Victoria will now produce plays in South Australian schools. Will the Minister either give me information about this now or obtain for me a considered reply to this very vexed question?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is the first I have heard of the circumstances alleged by the honourable member. Certainly I am aware of the Bunyip Children's Theatre and of the quality of its work; indeed, the Government is concerned to see that it is supported. I have no knowledge at all of the Victorian group to which the honourable member refers; he did not even give me its name. However, I will inquire about what may have happened in relation to this matter and bring down a report for the honourable member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member said that I, too, was directly interested in this matter. I point out that the Government is concerned to help the Bunyip Children's Theatre. Indeed, that organization would by now have received a letter containing Government proposals for immediate assistance to be granted to it for the work it does. The Government is also considering the allotment of performing arts grants. However, the final allotment of these moneys has been held up until the new Development Officer for Performing Arts and Tourism, who has been appointed to that position, takes up his duties with the Premier's Department next week.

PARA VISTA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the development of playing fields at the Para Vista Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Plans had been drawn up for the grassing and reticulation of the Para Vista Primary School oval in autumn of this year but, because of difficulties experienced with the type of reticulation system originally approved, it has been necessary to change this system. The one to be provided now is more costly, and the project has had to be referred back for additional funds. It is expected that tenders will be called shortly but planting is now unlikely to be carried out before next autumn.

MIGRANTS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of immigration, say whether promotional material is still made

available to prospective migrants, particularly those from the United Kingdom, aimed at influencing their migration to South Australia? Also, has the content of the material been altered recently and, finally, where can a copy of the material so distributed be obtained?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware, the only material available is that regarding the situation in this State, which is supplied by the Commonwealth regional migration officers. In addition, at South Australia House in London an officer of the South Australian Housing Trust, who is involved with migration matters, gives information on the situation in South Australia to prospective migrants, particularly information regarding the Housing Trust. A suggestion made to the previous Government that an officer of the Immigration Department be employed at the Agent-General's Office was refused by the member for Alexandra when he was Minister of Immigration. There is no migration officer from this State at present in London. The question of our stationing such an officer in London and having him visit the regional migration officers is, at my request, currently being considered by the Public Service Board. Regarding the final part of the honourable member's question, no specific printed information, apart from that contained in inter-departmental communications, is available to migrants in London, other than information emanating from the Industrial Development Branch or the Tourist Bureau.

ADVERTISING

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding misleading advertising?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Prices Commissioner reports that a number of examples of misleading advertising have been brought before the Prices Branch in recent years and many have been settled by negotiation. However, the matter of advertisers not quoting prices has not been noted as a factor responsible for misleading consumers. Purchasers must assess value for money when making any purchase (and this is usually done when the goods are sighted) so that a lack of pricing information in an advertisement, while necessitating inquiry in that regard, could not in normal circumstances be considered to be misleading. Further, to insist by legislation that all advertisements list prices of goods advertised could be onerous on many reputable firms, particularly where a range of prices exists for an item depending on sizes, styles,

and so on, or where nationally advertised lines with price variations between towns are involved. I agree with the views expressed by the Prices Commissioner, but I think I should repeat the statement I made in reply to the honourable member when he first asked the question: that I did not think it would be reasonable for the law to require that in all cases the advertisements include a reference to price. Nevertheless, it does seem reasonable that, if a price is stated, it should be stated fully and accurately and in a way that does not create a misleading impression.

DENTAL TREATMENT

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question about dental services, for which I have been waiting anxiously since July 22?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states:

The opening of new clinical facilities in the dental department, Royal Adelaide Hospital, has not resulted in the elimination of long waiting lists of patients requiring treatment. This is due to a considerable increase in the demand for the dental service. With regard to country areas, plans are in hand for dental officers of the Public Health Department to assist where possible in providing dental services for pensioners. This must be subject to the demands for the dental service in schools. It is hoped that such a service can commence at Kingscote in February, 1971, and at Port Augusta and Mount Gambier in May, 1971.

ST. LEONARDS INFANTS SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on October 13 about the 1970-71 subsidy allocation to the St. Leonards Infants School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I forecast in my interim reply to the honourable member, one reason for the reduction in the subsidy to the St. Leonards Infants School this year was a substantial increase granted to the St. Leonards Primary School, which was allotted \$1,250, compared with \$800 in 1969-70. This year St. Leonards Infants School requested a subsidy of \$400 and was allocated \$200. The total subsidy allocation for primary schools this financial year is greater than the amount provided last year. However, primary schools made requests for subsidies totalling more than \$500,000, so it has been impossible to meet all demands, as it has been in the past.

GRAIN CHARGES

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Marine say when cereal growers who have delivered, at the Port Giles terminal, grain

that will be exported after going over the port facilities will receive a refund of the differential deduction from those deliveries? Recently, in reply to a question about the imposition of a charge of 2.5c on grain handled over the Port Giles facilities, the Minister told me that that charge would not apply. During the 1969-70 season, a freight differential charge, I think of 3.5c a bushel on barley and 4.5c a bushel on wheat, was imposed on all grain delivered to Port Giles in order to cater for road transport if the grain had to be transported to Ardrossan. If the grain was discharged over the facilities, the charge would include the 2.5c. As most of this grain will be exported over the Port Giles facilities and this will not necessitate a 2.5c surcharge or a freight differential for freighting the cereal to Ardrossan, will the growers receive a refund and, if so, when?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will examine the honourable member's question and bring down a considered reply. I was under the impression that the 2.5c to which the honourable member has referred and which has been spoken about in this House previously never came into effect. However, I will check the honourable member's question, as I am not certain what he means, and bring down a considered reply.

LAMB CARCASSES

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 15 about price guarantees on lamb carcasses?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has told me that, for the present season, price guarantees will again operate at the same rates as applied last season. However, they will be calculated in respect of each individual vessel in which meat is exported, instead of by the previous method of averaging prices for a series of vessels sailing from Australia in a specific month. It is considered that this system will operate more equitably, as each vessel will be treated separately and, if the price received for that shipment is not up to the guaranteed amount, the exporter will receive the benefit of the guarantee.

HOSPITAL INQUIRY

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether the Government has found it necessary to meet the cost of a special publication of the *South Australian Nurses' Journal* to publicize the committee on administration and communications

within Government hospitals appointed by the Government recently and, if the Government has found this necessary, will he ask his colleague what sum is involved and how many persons have given or have offered to give evidence before this committee up to the present?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

CITRUS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about the report submitted as a result of the investigation into the citrus industry?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague assumes that the honourable member referred in his question to the report of the investigation which was carried out recently into the citrus industry, and not to the report of the Citrus Organization Committee. He has no knowledge of a report by the committee. The report on the investigation into the citrus industry is comprehensive. The Minister has informed me that when he has completed a detailed study of its contents and the full implications of the investigator's recommendations, he intends to report to Cabinet. The report is not a public document and the Minister has no plans at this juncture to release the report.

WOOL EXPORTS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say what progress has been made in connection with the abolition of the 25½c charged on Australian wool exported to the United States? On page 20 of the policy speech of the Australian Labor Party delivered before the last State election, the Premier acknowledged that wool prices were at an alarmingly low level, stating that they were the lowest for 20 years. I guess that he also realizes that prices have dropped further since then. The Premier went on to say:

An approach will be made, through the Agriculture Advisory Council, to the Commonwealth Government to initiate talks with the United States Government dealing with the abolition of the 25½c tariff on Australian greasy wool.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get from the Minister of Agriculture a report on the Agricultural Council meeting and let the honourable member have it.

EGGS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider reducing the hen tax applied to egg producers on Eyre Peninsula? After December 31 this year the Port Lincoln Dairy Produce Company will not receive eggs. This will make it difficult for Eyre Peninsula producers to dispose of their product, as they will be able to use only local markets, so that they will be placed at a grave disadvantage compared with producers who can sell through the Egg Board.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

GOVERNMENT RENTALS

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say what change there has been in Government policy that enables him to inform the Public Service Association that there will be an increase in rents of Government-owned houses? In 1969, the Deputy Premier (then Deputy Leader of the Opposition), in moving a motion, said the Government had made a mistake in the first instance in increasing the rents at all (referring to the previous L.C.L. Administration). He moved:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take steps immediately to reduce rentals to the level that applied prior to June 2, 1969, on all departmentally-owned homes throughout the State and refund the money collected as a result of rental increases.

That motion was unanimously supported by members of the Labor Opposition in this House. The Secretary of the Public Service Association (Mr. Mitchell), when writing to the Premier, recently stated:

The motion was subsequently debated and defeated on November 12, 1969, on the casting vote of the Speaker. I understand that all members of the Opposition supported the motion.

His letter continues:

Having in mind the attitude expressed by your Party last year, I was disturbed today to receive advice from the Public Service Board that rents will be again increased from September 1, 1970.

The Premier, in reply, wrote to the Public Service Association, as follows:

The promulgation by the Public Service Board on August 13, 1970, of adjustments to the rents of certain Government-owned houses occupied by Government employees, effective from the commencement of the first week after September 1, 1970, referred to in your letter to me dated August 18, 1970, was approved by Cabinet prior to promulgation.

The Premier's letter continues:

While the Labor Party last year objected to base rate increases generally, and particularly

in relation to some forestry and country railway houses, it did not, and does not, oppose a system of automatic rental adjustments.

During the debate last year, the Deputy Premier said (on October 29, 1969):

I remind the House that, when Labor came into office in 1965, we saw fit not to implement the third stage of these increases and cancelled them. That is what we thought about the matter at the time, and our views have not changed since. We still believe it is not the Government's function to make money or to collect additional revenue through increasing the rentals paid by its employees.

Therefore, I ask the Premier what change there has been in Government policy that now prompts the Government to collect the additional revenue to which Labor members objected last year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the Government took office a general increase in the rents of Government houses had been approved by the previous Government. That increase related not only to a base-rate increase but also to periodic adjustments in accordance with changes in the general cost of living. The rental increases were then deferred by the incoming Government. They were to have taken effect on July 1, but they did not take effect. An examination was made of the position in which rentals paid in respect of certain Government houses were anomalous when compared with other rentals collected. After fully investigating the matter, the Government considered that a periodic adjustment was justified in some cases, and increasing anomalies would have occurred if such an adjustment had not been made. However, the adjustments were confined to certain areas of Government housing, and in other areas where it was considered that an advantage would be created by the proposals of the previous Government the increase was not applied. This has been made perfectly clear to the Public Service Association.

Mr. Hall: What change in policy has there been?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have explained it and, if the honourable member cannot understand it, I suggest that he read *Hansard* tomorrow.

UNIONISM

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport a question about the date of the memorandum that corrected the memorandum of September 2, which set out the ultimatum concerning unionism in the Public Service.

This afternoon the Minister has tabled a copy of the original memorandum of September 2 and he has also tabled the correcting memorandum, which is also dated September 2. The original has written across it "Cancelled" and it is signed by the Minister. The replacing memorandum is dated September 2, with no indication as to when the replacement was made. In his speech last week the Minister suggested that we should get to the facts and that a few days after the original memorandum had been issued he had corrected it. Yet, the Minister of Labour and Industry in his television discussion said that as late as September 24 the Minister of Roads and Transport had told him that he was not happy about the memorandum and was preparing an alteration. If the Minister of Roads and Transport wants to clear up this matter I think it is fair to ask, on behalf of the House, that all the facts should be tabled as to the date when the correcting memorandum was issued, otherwise we could go on day after day asking for a little more information, and as I point out—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to debate the issue.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to debate it, but I only wish, in explaining my statement, to point out that the Minister's whole defence last week was based on a document that he did not produce, and now that he has produced it he has not indicated the date on which the amendment was made.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: First, I did not think that I was trying to defend myself last week: I was merely stating facts. I do not think it is true to say that my defence was based on a certain document, and it is completely untrue to say that the document was not produced. I read from the document here, and it was available for each and every member of this House to peruse if he wished to do so. It was not until the Leader replied to the debate that he suddenly thought of it, and I think he was prompted by the member for Mitcham to say, "Why hasn't it been tabled?" That was the first time the document in question was referred to in the whole of the debate. All this tommy-rot about the date is just a feeble attempt to flog a dead horse, and I include here the Opposition's attempt last week to malign the Government and to censure me as a Minister, such an effort having failed.

Mr. Coumbe: What's the date?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: All members opposite had the opportunity last Wednesday afternoon to express their opinion. The member for Alexandra's contribution extended to the honourable member's standing in his place and saying, "I second the motion *pro forma*," and then sitting down. He is now trying to flog a dead horse. The situation as I explained it (and my remarks are recorded in *Hansard* for the honourable member and anyone else to read—

Mr. Hall: But not the date; that's what we want to know.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader would like to know whether I signed the document with my left hand or my right hand! Is that important, too? Does he wish to know whether it was signed in the morning, afternoon or the evening?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When the Opposition has finished I will refer it to page 1756 of *Hansard*. Referring to this matter last week, I said:

Realizing that the minute could be construed in the way the Leader has construed it, I discussed the matter with the Minister of Labour and Industry (who has openly stated this) and, as a result, soon after this minute was released on September 2, a further minute was issued. That minute deleted the sentence that states—

and it then goes on to quote the sentence. The minute I tabled this afternoon, together with the minute issued originally, carries the same date as that of the first minute because it was replacing it. That is normal practice in any business circles.

Mr. Hall: Back-dated?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course.

Mr. Hall: You signed them both on the same day?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader is just so dumb that it is not worth trying to explain it to him. After all, he did not ask the question; it was the member for Alexandra, so I will ignore the Leader. As I said a week ago, shortly after issuing the first minute I revised the minute, and the member for Alexandra apparently now has the copy of the original minute and the revised minute that I tabled this afternoon. The dates on those minutes are identical, because one replaced the other. I cannot say whether the revised minute was issued two days or four days afterwards, and I cannot say whether it was signed in the morning, afternoon or evening or whether the sun was shining or whether it

was raining. I think these details are wholly irrelevant to the matter. The Opposition's only concern is that there was a document to which it took exception, and members opposite are now disappointed that the document was revised before they could make political capital out of it. They are now scratching around like broody hens, trying to find some value in it. In fact, it is completely a dead horse.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Does the Minister of Labour and Industry deny that on Wednesday, September 30, he appeared on a television programme and gave the following assurance:

He—

that is Mr. Virgo—

referred it to me last Thursday—

that would be September 24—

and told me that he believed that the terms he'd used were bad and that he intended to withdraw it.

That is the Thursday to which the Minister is alleged to have referred, and it was more than three weeks after the issue of the original memorandum. Will the Minister say whether I have quoted correctly what he said on the television programme?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, I believe the honourable member may have quoted exactly what I said at that time, but I believe the House should be informed of the circumstances that led to the remarks I made that evening. As was pointed out last week, the situation that confronted me, as Minister, occurred as a result of an incident that arose from attacks made on the Minister of Local Government in his absence. I agreed to appear on a television programme with the Leader of the Opposition to make clear to the public that the Leader was putting the position improperly, because I knew full well that the Minister of Local Government had revised the instruction: he had spoken to me about it.

Mr. Nankivell: Why didn't you say so at the time?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I did.

Mr. Nankivell: No, you didn't.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think that the member for Alexandra has just quoted me as saying that I had spoken to the Minister of Local Government and that he had told me that he intended to revise the instruction. I was asked whether I could say whether he had revised it, and I replied "No";

but I said that, if he had not done so, it would certainly be done as soon as he returned because he had given me that indication. I attempted on that programme to make clear that the matter had been corrected before the Minister had gone away. To make that clear, I was trying to show that I was aware of this on the Thursday before the Minister went away. I am at a loss to understand whether or not members opposite want to make some sort of issue about the exact date. If they want to make an issue out of a matter that I think has been properly clarified, perhaps they will say what they wish me to tell them, and I shall be pleased to co-operate. I believe that this matter has been completely clarified. I agree with what my colleague said earlier: Opposition members are embarrassed. I regret that they are following up this matter in such a childish way but, if they wish to use up Question Time by asking questions of this type, I am pleased to co-operate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CIRCULAR

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Local Government have his department investigate the circular issued by certain district councils and corporations which are critical of the Government's impending amendments to the Local Government Act, and will he determine whether the cost of this partisan document is being borne by the Local Government Association, the councils concerned, or the ratepayers?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am rather disturbed to hear the comments made by two members opposite; I thought they would have been more responsible, because—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has been asked a question by the member for Mawson. Any interjections are completely out of order, and I ask the Minister to reply to the question asked by the member for Mawson.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Section 287 of the Local Government Act sets out the various matters to which councils may devote the expenditure of revenue, and included here is "promoting any Bill before Parliament which may be necessary or desirable for the benefit of the area". I understand that some councils have been notified that this gives them the legal right to do what has been done, but it seems to me that in this instance the councils concerned are not promoting a Bill before Parliament. Indeed, a Bill is not before

Parliament, and whether what is being done is desirable for the benefit of the area is questionable. Therefore, I suggest that if councils are acting on that premise they may be on rather shaky ground. Section 287(1)(kl) provides:

... in making any payment for any purpose approved by the council but other than a purpose specifically provided for in this Act: Provided that the total amount which may be paid as aforesaid during any financial year shall not exceed £200 or one per centum of the rate revenue for the previous financial year whichever is the greater.

We have to consider whether the councils have agreed to distributing this material and whether they are spending more money than is permitted under the Act. Also, I think Parliament ought to know that a suggestion has been made to councils that they devote from their rate revenue a sum payable to the Local Government Association for the purpose of providing a fund in order to wage a campaign against the present Government.

Mr. Jennings: A political levy!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think it could be called a political levy, but we will leave that matter for the member for Glenelg to deal with. I do not know whether he is a member of the Brighton council; if he is, he may be able to enlighten us on whether, in fact, the council has agreed to this. If it has, he may be able to tell us under what section it is acting, because I know that the Brighton council has sent out a pamphlet at the direction of the Local Government Association and it has received some fairly caustic replies. I hope that when the relevant Bill comes before the House the member for Glenelg will be prepared to produce all of these replies for the benefit of members.

Mr. GUNN: Is the Minister of Local Government against district councils keeping their ratepayers informed on matters of importance which may have an adverse effect on them?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know the purpose of the question, although I presume it is a follow-up of the reply I gave the member for Mawson. If that is the case, then the question is not based on fact, because the councils have gone much further than merely keeping their ratepayers informed of matters: they have suggested that ratepayers do certain things. I will always subscribe to full and frank information, but complete information, being provided. For this reason,

I strongly hold the view that all council meetings and council committee meetings should be held in the open in front of the ratepayers, but unfortunately most councils disagree with that view.

RACE MEETINGS

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether the increase in the number of metropolitan race meetings will mean that provincial clubs will lose some of their race days? If they will, will he ascertain whether the provincial clubs have been consulted, whether they have been notified of the suggested new programmes, and what is their reaction to this proposal? Yesterday's *News* contains an article stating that more mid-week race meetings are to be held in the metropolitan area. I presume that this will probably mean that at least near-metropolitan racing clubs will probably lose some of the days for meetings that have been allotted to them in the past.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Bill to which the honourable member refers will be a Bill to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act. That Bill is still being considered; when it has been considered fully it will be introduced. I cannot yet say when it will be introduced, and I do not feel at liberty to comment on its likely content until it is in a form in which it can be introduced.

MORGAN SLIPWAY

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether any decision has been made with regard to the proposed transfer from Morgan to Murray Bridge of the slipway? The Minister will recall that I have asked two previous questions about this matter, the Minister's last reply being that he would bring down a report. I have been approached again by people living in the area, who are particularly worried about this proposed transfer. Employees working on the slipway are worried about the effect the transfer of the slipway will have on the value of their houses, and business people are also worried.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer is "No".

DAINGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MARIHUANA)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from October 14. Page 1767.)

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): In his second reading explanation, the member for Bragg said that we must urgently close a loophole in the Act. To this effect, his Bill amends section

3 of the Act by widening the relevant definition and thus tightening up this part of the Act. I think that members on both sides will agree to that amendment. Opposition members will know that, in its policy speech, the Labor Party referred to strengthening the law in relation to dangerous drugs, and it intends to amend the Dangerous Drugs Act soon. I assure honourable members that next week a Bill will be introduced which, amongst other things, will include the very amendment that the member for Bragg seeks to make. Also, I assure members that the Government has given priority to this matter, and the Bill to be introduced includes more than this one amendment.

It seems that, over a period of years, this Act has been allowed to stagnate. Times have changed, and members realize that marihuana smoking and things of that nature are creeping into our society. If these matters are not dealt with carefully or controlled in some way, we will find that they can be most injurious to people. I am sure the member for Bragg did much work in preparing his Bill. Although his second reading explanation was short, it covered the subject fully. I commend him for his action, but I assure him that next week the Government will introduce a Bill which, amongst other amendments, will include the amendment he seeks to make. I am sure this will be suitable to him.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I cannot help but feel a sense of guilt that the present situation has existed for so long. As a practising pharmacist for over 20 years, I was never aware that this loophole in the law existed. I can, however, claim an excuse because there are over 500 other pharmacists in this State, and an even greater number when one considers those who have come and gone in the last 20 years, none of whom knew of this loophole; nor did the officers of the Central Board of Health. Another reason why the present situation has obtained for so long is that until publicity was given to the smoking of marihuana over the last few years very few of us knew what part of the plant was smoked. I certainly did not know until comparatively recently that virtually any part of it could be smoked.

As all members know, there has over the last few years been a frightening growth in the use of marihuana and in the number of people advocating its legalization. Such people say that it is a perfectly safe drug, indeed, much safer than, for example, alcohol. I do not want to argue that question because I do not

Therefore, the Labor Party had said quite plainly that it intended to increase this amount by \$6, except that in the fourth year the

increase would be only \$4, and the Party's reason for doing that would be "to avoid the current excessive costs for parents". Everybody believed that this would be done if the Labor Party was returned to office, but the next thing that we saw was the passage in the Treasurer's Financial Statement to this House that states:

The provision of an extra \$2 per annum in the book allowance for students in secondary schools will cost about \$170,000, taking the total cost this financial year to about \$1,770,000. From the beginning of 1971 the allowance will be \$18 in the first, second and third years, \$26 in the fourth year, and \$28 in the fifth year. This will be the first of three annual steps to increase allowances in accordance with the undertaking given in the policy statement before the recent election.

That was the first knowledge we had that this proposal would be given effect to in three stages. I repeat that the Labor Party recognized that there was a need for the secondary school book allowance to be increased to avoid the current excessive costs being experienced by parents. Everybody accepted that that statement, which was believed to be the official platform of the A.L.P. that would come into operation if that Party was returned to office, would be implemented in the next current year. What did the L.C.L. say in its policy speech? That Party's scale was the same, being \$6, except that it promised that in the fourth year it would give \$6 instead of \$4 proposed by the Labor Party. So that there can be no misunderstanding, I shall quote the full section from my Party's policy speech. We did not prevaricate in any way. We stated:

On re-election we will increase the book allowances for all secondary students in State and independent schools by \$6 a student over the full five-year course and liberalize allowances for school materials for deserving cases in primary schools.

Both Parties recognized that there was a need to give relief to parents. We said that we would introduce our proposal immediately, in the next school year after re-election. Although most schools do not start in a new year until February, I am using the calendar year, from January 1, for convenience in comparing the statements of both Parties. The Labor Party has now decided to introduce its policy in three stages, and I remind the House that at no time during the election campaign did I hear any statement by any Labor speaker, including statements made on radio and television, that that Party intended to bring in its policy in steps. I have asked several

parents about this matter and not one of them has told me that he or she knew anything about the Labor proposition to introduce its policy in steps. Everybody expected that, as from 1971, those who qualified for this book allowance would receive the increase of \$6.

The book allowance for secondary students has a rather interesting history. If we forget the early 1940's, when the \$6 allowance applied for some years and was taken off and later brought back, the first time that we had a reasonable book allowance in this State for secondary school students was when Sir Thomas Playford introduced it in the early 1960's. I shall quote from the official *Gazette*, converting to decimal currency for convenience. At that time an allowance of \$16 was provided for first year, second year and third year, the last of those years being the Intermediate year. For the fourth year, which was then the Leaving year, the amount was \$18, and in the fifth year, the old Leaving Honours year and now known as the Matriculation year or fifth year, it was \$20.

The allowance remained at that level until last year when, because of the alteration that occurred with the abolition of the Intermediate examination and the savings that became available from the scholarships that were discontinued at that time, the then Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) increased the allowances for the fourth and fifth years. The first, second, and third-year allowances remained as they were, and so we had, as from January 1, 1970, an allowance of \$16 for the first, second, and third years, of \$24 for the fourth year and of \$26 for the fifth year. The L.C.L. intended to increase that to \$22 for the first, second, and third years, to \$30 for the fourth year, and to \$32 for the fifth year, whilst the A.L.P. intended to increase the scale to \$22 for the first, second, and third years, to \$28 for the fourth year, and to \$32 for the fifth year.

The \$16 allowance for the first three years has not been increased for the last 10 years, and it should be increased. I have taken out figures concerning the number of students and parents who will be involved, because both Parties have admitted that hardship will be caused to parents, who will need relief. This is spelt out in the policy speech of the Labor Party. According to my estimate, in 1971, the next school year, about 91,000 students will attend State and private secondary schools. Of these, about 8,000 students will receive

free books, leaving an estimated 83,000 students who will receive a book allowance or who are eligible to qualify for a book allowance. Of these 83,000 students, it is expected that about 61,000 will be in the first, second, and third years; therefore, 22,000 will be in the fourth and fifth years.

We know from recent trends (of which I approve) that more children are attending high and technical high schools and that Matriculation classes are being established at more and more metropolitan schools. With the meritorious idea of extending these classes to as many country schools as possible, a larger number of students will be remaining longer at school and I thoroughly agree with this principle. I cannot predict the number of students beyond next year. Perhaps the Minister can, but I can speak only of 1971. Book allowances were introduced by a Liberal Government, they were increased at the beginning of this year by a Liberal Government, and if a Liberal Government had been returned at the last election it intended to increase the allowance from January 1, 1971, by another \$6.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did the word "immediately" appear in the policy speech?

Mr. COUNBE: Perhaps the Minister did not hear me: it states:

On re-election we will increase the book allowances for all secondary students in State and independent schools by \$6 per student over the full five-year course and liberalize allowances for school materials for deserving cases in primary schools.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That does not say when you would do it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If you had intended to do it immediately, I would have thought that you would put something in about it.

Mr. COUNBE: We had a difference about this when we were debating the Estimates. I made it clear then that the Liberal Government (and I, as Minister of Education) intended to introduce this allowance in full from January 1, 1971.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You can understand our doubts about such an important matter. Surely, if you intended to do something about it immediately, you would have said so.

Mr. COUNBE: During the election campaign both Parties said that they would introduce the extra \$6, and everyone in South Australia assumed that it would be introduced from January 1 next year.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you say that during the campaign?

Mr. COUNBE: I said it at my campaign meetings.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where?

Mr. COUNBE: At Prospect.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, I was there.

Mr. COUNBE: The member for Mitcham spoke at the same meeting and can vouch that I said it, and the honourable member can ask anyone else who was present whether I said it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Was that statement publicized?

Mr. COUNBE: I was reported in the press, but I do not know whether the report included those words. I said it, and every other member of my Party when speaking at a country meeting indicated that that was what would happen. However, we should get away from politics and consider the relief that can be afforded to parents, because in my motion I have specifically included the words "... book allowance is inadequate, and will not provide the relief expected by parents ...". This fact has been admitted by the Labor Party, which stated that it wanted to avoid the current excessive cost to parents. So, both Parties admit this, and I say advisedly that many parents are finding it a problem to meet the increased cost of secondary school text books. The further a child progresses in its secondary education the more expensive textbooks become, especially if the child is studying science. The present allowance is not sufficient and is causing considerable hardship to many parents. The Minister may claim that he has other priorities in his department. This may be the excuse for introducing this scheme in three stages. The first we or anyone else in the State knew about the three stages being introduced was when the Treasurer read his Financial Statement a month or so ago.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: So what? Surely you would expect it to be made then.

Mr. COUNBE: I do not follow the Minister.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was part of the Budget.

Mr. COUNBE: If the Government had decided to introduce it in three stages I would expect it to be contained in that statement. My point is that the first anyone knew of any departure from the policy, as understood by the people of this State and stated by both

Parties, was the statement made in this House by the Treasurer. That was the first time that we knew it would be \$2 this year instead of \$6. When we were discussing expenditures within the Education Department earlier in the year referring to a 14.7 per cent increase in expenditure by the Education Department, I had said that that percentage, which applied for 1970-71, compared with the 18.9 per cent increase of the previous year under the Liberal and Country League Government. At that time the Minister chided me and said, "Yes, but what about the fact that you didn't provide for the whole of the increase of the teacher allowance?" (that being about 9 per cent, from memory).

The Minister may recall that we were responsible for an 18.9 per cent increase over the budgeted figure. We met all the increase that we had to meet under the new teachers' award, part of that increase being retrospective, and the Minister is now relieved of that increase to some extent. Although we spent more, the State Budget finished up overall with a credit. We find that the whole line of the Minister of Education for the current year involves 16.2 per cent more than the actual expenditure for last year, whereas in the last year of office of the L.C.L. Government the increase regarding education generally was 17.8 per cent. Some exchanges occurred, during which some of the things I have said today were canvassed, and the Minister insisted on interjecting several times. However, facts speak for themselves. I have recited the history of this matter and referred to the policy speeches of both Parties. I have pointed out that there is a real need for immediate relief for parents.

The member for Peake, from his former experience of high schools, will be the first to agree with me that there is a real need for relief for many parents because of the high and increasing annual costs of the required textbooks which have to be met by parents. As I have said, this applies more so on the science and humanities side of the curricula, and many parents are finding this a considerable burden. One object of moving this motion is to provide more relief for the parents concerned than the present Government is prepared to give at this stage. Whereas the L.C.L. said that it would give \$6 next year, the A.L.P. is saying that it will give \$2 this coming year, \$2 the year after, and \$2 the year after that. That is how I understand it. In my opinion, the overriding consideration is the fact that

a burden is being felt by many parents in the community and that immediate relief should be given them.

Undoubtedly (I am the first to acknowledge this), the Minister has many other commitments in his department. Where in the matter of priorities do we give relief? It is for the Minister now to decide where he provides relief, that being his Government's prerogative. The Minister's Party having told the people of South Australia in its policy speech (no doubt attracting many voters) that it would provide a \$6 increase, people naturally expect that increase and for them now to receive only a \$2 increase, I suggest, is a confidence trick. Many people who will have been looking forward to receiving the \$6 increase will simply not get it. The Premier previously said that the \$2 increase in the coming year would amount to about \$170,000, and from that we can deduce, bearing in mind the number of students concerned to which I have referred, that the \$6 increase would amount to \$490,000 a year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Chicken feed!

Mr. CUMBE: I did not say that; it is a substantial amount. However, in order to give effect to the \$6 increase, surely some adjustments could have been made within the Education Department. At present, the parents concerned are not getting the relief that was acknowledged by the Labor Party in its policy speech and by the Liberal Party in our policy speech. There being no question that hardship exists among many parents, I moved the motion to try to highlight the need for increased book allowances, to provide relief for parents, and to show that, whereas my Party was prepared to introduce the \$6 increase as from the beginning of next year, the Labor Party is not prepared to do that; it is prepared to give only \$2 next year instead of \$6.

Many members have children at school, and we all represent constituents who have children at school. Indeed, I suppose every member has high schools and technical high schools in his district. Are Government members prepared to tell organizations connected with high schools and technical high schools in their districts, "Sorry, we promised \$6 at the election, but you're only going to get \$2. You will have to wait for the rest to come in the next year and in the year after"?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Stick to the facts.

Mr. CUMBE: These are the facts. I have quoted in full from both policy speeches on this matter.

Mr. Langley: Including the amount?

Mr. COURCEL: Yes, I quoted the whole amount in respect of this matter, although I did not go right down the list to include swimming pool allowances, etc. I am referring to the subject before the Chair.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Neither Party said in the policy speech that it would be done in 1971.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You carefully avoided saying it too.

Mr. COURCEL: I assure members that the previous Cabinet intended to do this, and I personally assure them that, had I remained Minister of Education, I would have done it; if anyone denies this they call me a liar.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If you had been fair dinkum you'd have spelt it out in the policy speech.

Mr. COURCEL: It was spelt out at subsequent meetings around the countryside. At least we would have kept our word in this regard and would not have quibbled about dividing by three. At least the Minister of Education can divide by three.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If you had given added expenditure in this way, what would you have taken away from?

Mr. COURCEL: I touched on this earlier. The Minister of Education has the duty to decide priorities in his department. The previous Government went out of office before the Budget papers were completed, as the Minister of Works well knows.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes.

Mr. COURCEL: It is easy to make adjustments one way or the other, as the Minister of Works knows, too.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I do a fair bit of that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: So does the Minister of Education.

Mr. COURCEL: Any Minister of Works has to make adjustments, and a Minister of Education has his fair share of problems. Apart from any political aspects that have been touched on, the real fact of the matter is that the Opposition believes that the amount of the allowance now being provided by the Government and the Minister is inadequate and certainly will not provide the relief expected by parents. What will be the position when a member goes into his district and tells the people that, instead of the \$6 that they were hoping to receive, they will receive only \$2?

This is making the grant on the never-never or on a hire-purchase plan: it is being paid by instalments.

I have tried to handle this matter as objectively as I can. I have quoted fully from both policy speeches. I have outlined the history of the matter, pointing out that these increases have been made up until now only by Liberal Governments. No increase in the secondary book allowance as such (and I am not talking about free books: that is a different matter altogether) was made by the Labor Government during its previous three years in office. This allowance was first introduced by Sir Thomas Playford and it was increased last year by the member for Davenport when she was Minister. Had the L.C.L. Government continued in office, the sum would have been increased by \$6 a student a year, with the usual half-rate applying to those students doing a repeat year.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion. The history of the book allowance in secondary schools has been outlined adequately by the member for Torrens. The last occasion on which the allowance was increased was towards the end of last year. As a result of the discontinuance of Intermediate scholarships when the Intermediate examination was eliminated, it was proposed that at that time there should be an increase in the book allowance. Unfortunately, the present Minister of Education apparently saw something sinister in this coincidence and moved that the regulations that would have implemented this increase be disallowed.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Get your facts right. I opposed the termination of the Intermediate scholarships. The only way to do that was to oppose the regulations.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall quote one or two relevant things said by the Minister. When the question of increasing the book allowance for fourth and fifth-year high school students was before the House on October 1, 1969, the Minister said:

We must, however, recognize that this type of assistance does not bring about as much improvement in standards of education as do other types of assistance.

I think those words are relevant in regard to an increase in the book allowance. I do not intend to debate this point now, but I think that even the Minister must concede that textbooks are essential in the process of education and that, in fact, the cost to parents of textbooks is a considerable burden at the beginning

of the school year. I believe this type of assistance to be highly desirable. Although we must recognize that there are grave difficulties in relation to the education system in South Australia, unless students can be provided with adequate equipment and books the educative process is not possible. With regard to scholarships, the Minister said:

The other thing that has happened is that no-one has bothered to think out appropriate ways of continuing the scholarships previously awarded on the basis of the Intermediate examination . . . Why could not something like that be done by the State in respect to the State scholarships as a supplement to the existing Commonwealth secondary scholarships scheme? In order to try to get the Government to work out some suitable way of doing this, I have moved my motion.

He was supported by his Leader, who said:

The Opposition contends that it is necessary to maintain the State bursaries and scholarships system, but to revise it so that it provides a benefit to keep at school the children of poorer families.

As they made those statements, one would have confidently expected them since to have had the time to work out some satisfactory scholarship scheme to put before the people. However, as the member for Torrens pointed out, the only proposal the Government has put forward that could be considered to give some relief to parents is similar indeed to that of the L.C.L., except that the increase in the allowance for Leaving students is \$4, whereas we intended to increase it by \$6. The previous Labor Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday) saw fit to abolish the bursaries awarded on the basis of the Leaving and the Leaving Honours examination when the new Matriculation certificate was implemented. Be that as it may, at present both Parties support relief to parents by way of an increase in the book allowance.

All the information I have, from my experience in one of the larger high schools for many years, indicates that a \$2 increase will not go far towards alleviating the costs that accrue to parents at the beginning of a school year. Having taken some trouble to inquire not only of that high school but also of others, I have found that if a parent chooses to buy all new books for his child's first year of secondary schooling, and if he pays what are termed amenities fees (that is, charges made by the schools for sporting and other amenities as well as for materials for craft, woodwork and so on, which can amount to as much as \$15), he can pay as much as \$50. When the book allowance is subtracted,

the net payment to be made by parents is about \$30. However, very few pay this amount, the average amount being paid by parents of first-year children being about \$25. This amount diminishes as the child advances through the school.

The amount paid by the parents of second-year children, over and above the book allowance (and this figure can easily be checked, if members cared to take that trouble), is about \$22. It is about the same in respect of third-year children, but, strange as it may seem, the average payment made by parents of fourth-year and fifth-year children is somewhat less, even though in the Matriculation year books are more expensive and more are often required. The excess amount to be paid by parents of fourth-year children is about \$20, while for those in the fifth year it reduces to about \$15 or \$16. Also, the amenities fee diminishes as students advance through the school, because all students in their first years at high school do some sort of art and craft work, for which a charge for materials is made, whereas this is not the case in the upper classes.

Moreover, remissions in these amenities charges are often made when students have brothers and sisters attending the school. Although this tends to reduce the amount to be paid by parents, it is obvious that the cost to parents is considerable. Indeed, I believe the cost to be borne by parents at the beginning of the school year sometimes causes hardship. Sometimes it is necessary for parents to make payments over an extended period, although this is not common. Free books are also available for the children of parents in straitened circumstances, and it appears that the number of children receiving free books is increasing year by year. In fact, in some schools in poorer districts as many as 25 per cent of the students receive free books. Relief is therefore given in this way to the parents of children in straitened circumstances.

The purpose of this motion is to give relief to the average parent. I am not suggesting that all parents pay the sums to which I have referred. From the evidence I have seen in the school of which I have first-hand knowledge, it is apparent that students wishing to buy secondhand books are given the opportunity to do so. The difficulty at present is that many new courses are being implemented, and the charge for first-year, second-year and third-year students is so high as they have to retain books for the three years. A new science course has

been instituted, and very few secondhand books are available for the course. Also, the practical science courses require books in which the results are collated, as a result of which the books are of no further use to other children coming up through the school.

However, adequate provision is generally made for the purchase of secondhand books. This position obtained some years ago in the high schools and what I am saying applies also to technical high schools, where the charge for craft work is somewhat greater, but the figures I have quoted would not be far off the mark in relation to the latter. About 10 years ago, when the allowances were less than they are now, the parents of many children received funds as a result of the Government's book allowance scheme. I remember some students, whose parents taught them to be thrifty, running around trying to purchase complete sets of second-hand books. In such circumstances it was possible for them to obtain a refund and therefore show a profit on the purchase of their books. I thought this was a fine reward for their thrift, which their parents had obviously engendered in them. However, this is not possible at present.

At the school I mentioned earlier, of which I have first-hand knowledge, it being the fourth largest high school in the State, only four of its 1,660 students have this year managed to obtain a refund on their book allowance, all four of them being in the Matriculation year. Strange as it may seem, the charge to parents is less burdensome for children in the upper section of the school. This may be due in some degree to the fact that the allowances for these two years were increased last year.

I do not care which Party a member represents: it is abundantly clear that a need exists for more substantial relief than the \$2 by which the Government intends to increase the allowance. The Treasurer has just returned from his sojourn in Canberra, well satisfied with the position in relation to receipts duties. In view of last year's Budget surplus, I submit that this is not an impossible proposal. The former Minister of Education has indicated that the Liberal Party was prepared to increase (and, indeed, would have increased) the book allowance on January 1, 1971. When one considers this matter, it is not just highly desirable but imperative that this action be taken. Despite what the Minister has said, this is one of the highest priorities to which he should be turning his attention: he should be providing relief to parents in the purchase of

school textbooks. In these circumstances, I consider it essential that this motion be supported and the expected relief given to parents when books are purchased at the beginning of the 1971 school year. I support the motion and am confident that the increase is most desirable and highly justified.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VOTING)

Second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

First, members realize that this Bill has already been passed by the other place. Clause 1 is purely a machinery clause that relates only to the title. Clause 2 amends section 21 (1) of the principal Act, which provides that the roll shall be printed wherever the Minister directs. The Bill seeks to insert after "directs" the words "but separate rolls shall be printed and used for any Council election to be held after the commencement of the Electoral Act Amendment Act, 1970". The purpose of this is explained by the words, and I believe strongly that it is important for us to have separate rolls for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council.

It is not long since the Act was altered, not by legislation but administratively. The Administration had the power to authorize or instruct that both rolls be brought into one. This was done recently, and now the rolls for the two Houses have been printed in one roll. On the House of Assembly roll, the letters "L.C." have been printed alongside the names of those entitled to vote for the Legislative Council and, when people go along to vote when a Council election and a House of Assembly election are being held on the same day, the poll clerk, when he sees those letters on the roll alongside a House of Assembly voter's name, gives the person ballot papers for both Houses. This tends to take away the voluntary vote as we would like to see it operate. I consider that most people (I do not say all of them) would say that they believed in voluntary voting if they were asked about it.

The effect of this amendment would be to have a separate roll. I know that it will be said that the printing of two rolls is more expensive, and that is a valid argument: I agree that it is more expensive, but the money saved by printing one roll instead of two would not be great. I shall not deal now with

the way in which money has been wasted by Governments in other fields, but if members want to take up this matter later in debate I may be able to rebut their arguments when I close this debate. I agree that some extra cost is involved in printing two rolls. However, I consider that the main reason for bringing the rolls of both Houses together was political, and I do not think any member would deny that. The Party opposite considered at that time that having one roll would bring it a little closer to winning more seats in the Legislative Council.

Clause 3 repeals section 118a of the principal Act. That section, which was inserted in 1942 and covers about two pages of the principal Act, in subsection (1) states:

It shall be the duty of every Assembly elector to record his vote at every election in the Assembly district for which he is enrolled.

That provision makes it a duty to vote; in other words, it provides for compulsory voting. It has been argued and suggested by interjection in this House that a Liberal and Country Party Government inserted this section. I will not deny that in 1942 an L.C.P. Government was in office, but it was the efforts of an Independent member, with much push and support from members other than L.C.P. members, that eventually won the day and brought about compulsory voting.

Mr. Clark: He should be complimented on it.

Mr. EVANS: People in this country argue that in other countries 18-year-olds are entitled to vote, but I want persons who say that to remember that that voting is on a voluntary basis. In extremely few countries where democracy is as we think it should be is there a compulsion to vote. If we are to argue for one part of democracy, we must accept the other part. In Australia, compulsory voting was introduced in Queensland in 1915. Our State moved to it in 1942 and the Commonwealth Government introduced it in 1924. It was introduced in the other States between 1915 and 1942, until there was compulsory voting throughout Australia.

Did the people bring it about, or did the politicians bring it about? I consider that it was introduced for no other than political purposes, to make it easier for Parties to operate. When I said that recently in this House, one member accused me of saying that one particular section of politics was being lazy. However, I did not intend that: I consider that compulsory voting makes it easier

for the politician. Also, compulsory voting makes elections cheaper and easier for the political Parties. However, the right to vote is not democratic if that right is also a duty, and we have that situation here.

Some persons claim that, with voluntary voting, we do not get 100 per cent of the people voting. This position proves that certain people object to being compelled to vote. Some consider it unnecessary to vote and others have no faith in any of the candidates in the particular district. No benefit is derived from asking or compelling those persons to put a blank ballot paper in the box, but we are telling them to do that. Those persons actually cast a vote under threat of a fine, and in 1969 we increased the fine that may be imposed on a person who cannot justify a failure to vote. When I have been campaigning and doorknocking, some persons have told me that they have no time for me or my Party or for the candidate opposing me or his Party. In other words, these persons are forced to vote or give an acceptable reason why they should not pay a fine. I do not think any member would say that this was justice or democracy.

If a person has any interest in politics, and voting is voluntary, he will cast a vote. I know there are instances where, throughout the areas in which there is voluntary voting, sometimes only a small percentage of the people vote. Surely this means that they are satisfied with what is going on in society. If discontent is rife in the community and a particular issue is upsetting people, a larger percentage of people will vote than will vote when things seem to be running smoothly and people are satisfied with the Administration. It has been said in other debates, but I say it again, that in England, Germany and Denmark about 79 per cent or 80 per cent of the people vote under a system of voluntary voting, and that is a better result in obtaining an effective vote than was received in the recent referendum in this State, in which there was a compulsory vote.

Therefore, we have proof that in other democracies a voluntary voting system works and is successful, and this is democracy. I do not know how any group of people can say that they govern for the people or govern to represent the wishes of the people if the only way they can get the opinion of people is by forcing them to vote. An intelligent vote is not obtained by that system, and I do not believe the average person in the street is given the right to vote.

Mr. McKee: What about the last election?

Mr. EVANS: It seems that the member for Pirie likes to interject. He seldom contributes anything to a debate except a stupid interjection that means nothing.

Mr. McKee: You are a little smart alec.

Mr. Rodda: That's not very nice.

Mr. McKee: Let him object if he wants to.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: With a voluntary vote people are given a chance to express their view if they wish to express it. I do not believe it should be a legal obligation for any person in our community to cast a vote. We can claim that it should be a moral obligation: that is different from being a legal obligation. Today, when we are teaching young people to think for themselves and not to follow what mum and dad used to do, we should accept the fact that when they reach an age at which they should be mature they can cast an intelligent vote and take an interest in politics. If they do not take an interest in politics, there is no benefit in forcing them to the polling booth. I believe the personal liberty of the individual is protected by his being given the chance to cast a voluntary vote. I ask members to consider seriously whether they think compulsion is democracy; whether they think voting should be a moral or a legal obligation; whether they think it right that a person who cannot support any candidate in an election should have to face the chance of a fine and a conviction; and whether they think that is democracy. I know that the member for Mitchell would think that, because he does not know the meaning of democracy. I move the second reading in all sincerity, and ask members to accept it in the same manner as another group in another Chamber accepted it.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL INDUSTRIES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Nankivell:

(For wording of motion, see page 1408.)
(Continued from September 16. Page 1414.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Government opposes the motion.

Mr. Venning: Oh!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: For the benefit of the member for Rocky River, I say

at the outset that we are not opposed to primary producers in this State receiving help in their present crisis.

Mr. Venning: What about doing something about it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member will listen, I think I can tell him. Can he tell me who is best able to remedy the parlous position in which primary producers find themselves today: the individual State Governments or the Commonwealth Government? Can he answer that question? Who is best able to help primary producers in their present position? I say that only the Commonwealth Government has the financial and technical resources to attempt to solve the problems facing primary producers. An examination of the speech made by the member for Mallee in moving this motion proves my point. He suggested that the Commonwealth Government was the only body capable of doing this, when he said:

Things should be done in the Commonwealth sphere where we know the resources lie to enable action to be taken.

So, on his own admission the honourable member is saying that the Commonwealth Government is the body to which we must turn for assistance for primary producers.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think you could quote him in context?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member can check to see whether I have or not. I am not in the habit of quoting the remarks of members out of context, and if he reads the speech he will realize that this is its theme.

Mr. Venning: Don't you think it should be a team effort?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member will let me develop my argument he will understand what I am getting at. Can he say how this team will work? I am trying to be objective and constructive, but I ask what is the use of this State's setting up a committee of inquiry that will have to ask farmers to supply it with much detail and, in many respects, with confidential information. The committee would have to consider the present financial position of farmers and many other matters, in order to establish—

Mr. Venning: It would have to go into everything.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Of course, and it would have to examine in minute detail the conditions of primary producers, and this

will involve confidential information as well. The committee could bring down a report recommending that certain action be taken, but we all know that most of the recommendations could be implemented only by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Venning: Not necessarily.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should say something about the present committee of inquiry that is concerned with primary producers in this State. What happens if the Commonwealth Government ignores the recommendations of the committee? We have absolutely no guarantee that any recommendations made would, in fact, be implemented by the Commonwealth Government, so that the whole effort could be wasted and the State left in the position of having to say to all those primary producers who volunteered information (much of it confidential), "Sorry, chaps, we can't carry out the committee's recommendations." I know what most of the farmers of this State would be saying: "Why did you waste our time, your time, and the State's finances in setting up a committee that you know wouldn't have most of its recommendations implemented?" (and this would be the case).

The member for Mallee said that the committee would highlight the situation in South Australia. The Commonwealth Government is in some measure aware of the difficulties facing Australian primary producers. Even the present South Australian Government, which has not received particularly good treatment at the hands of the Commonwealth Government, does not claim that that Government is totally ignorant of the problems facing rural producers not only in this State but also throughout Australia. I do not think anyone can claim that the Commonwealth Government is ignorant of the present conditions concerning primary producers. I suggest that honourable members themselves make direct approaches to the Commonwealth Government, informing it of the problems facing our primary producers. After all, members opposite are supposed to be members of the same political Party as the Party in Government in Canberra. I think they would be doing a more constructive job for the primary producers of this State if they made these approaches.

As many members opposite represent primary producers in this Parliament, they should be not only highlighting the problems of primary producers but also demanding that the Commonwealth Government appoint a

committee of inquiry to investigate the problems of rural producers in South Australia and, indeed, throughout Australia. If the member for Mallee had moved that in the opinion of this House the Commonwealth Government should set up a committee of inquiry to consider this aspect, I do not think any member would have had much objection to it.

Mr. Nankivell: I would have but, as I pointed out, what jurisdiction do we have?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Exactly; that is why I would not bother to move to amend the motion—because we have no jurisdiction, except to appeal to the Commonwealth Government and to ask it to do this. If one studies the speech of the member for Mallee in detail, one will see that the theme of the speech is that the problems facing primary producers are caused by events and conditions existing overseas and throughout Australia. Therefore, an inquiry into the problems existing in this State would be of little use unless the terms of reference were sufficiently wide to include a consideration of overseas and national conditions: I think the member for Mallee must admit that. We do not have the resources, especially the technical and manpower resources, to conduct an inquiry that has international implications.

Only the Commonwealth Government, through the Department of Primary Industry, the Department of Trade, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, is equipped to carry out this type of investigation and inquiry. The member for Mallee admits that he has taken most of his statistical information on the crisis facing primary producers from the *Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics*, a publication of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which, as we all know, is a Commonwealth body. Therefore, it seems perfectly obvious to me that, if statistics gathered on a Commonwealth basis by a Commonwealth organization are used, only a Commonwealth committee of inquiry will be truly effective in recommending courses of action designed to remedy the difficulties facing our primary producers.

I will now make a few specific references to some of the points made by the member for Mallee. First, he referred to the problem of the Rundle street farmer; I do not think he will deny having done this. This problem can be solved only at the Commonwealth level, by the Commonwealth Government's

making appropriate changes in the taxation laws of this country.

Mr. Gunn: What about land transfers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have made the point that I wanted to make, and the member for Eyre will realize that a transfer of land cannot be withheld capriciously. The Minister of Lands has no power to do this; as provided in the Crown Lands Act, he cannot capriciously withhold a transfer of land. Therefore, an incentive exists in regard to changing the taxation laws of this country, yet we see no effort in this regard by the member for Mallee, or any of his colleagues for that matter, who are so concerned about this problem. Why have not members opposite openly campaigned and pressured their fellow Commonwealth L.C.L. members (for example, Dr. Forbes, Mr. Giles and Mr. Kelly) into making representations to the Commonwealth Government in order to change these anomalous taxation laws? I consider that this is typical of the attitude of many members opposite: they talk about the matter but they will do nothing effective to see that it is changed, because they are a little afraid in this regard. They mouth pious platitudes about the evils of the Rundle Street farmer but they do nothing effective to end the situation.

The member for Rocky River knows that that is true: perhaps the financial interests of Rundle Street have dictated otherwise, and members opposite are not prepared to buck those interests.

Mr. Venning: That is not true.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Mallee referred to problems of marketing, especially of wool. Over recent months the Minister of Agriculture has been repeatedly emphasizing the need not only for South Australian but also Australian agricultural interests to become more aware of the change in agriculture from its being production-oriented to being market-oriented. The old idea of producing a commodity first and of then trying to sell that commodity has to change. The emphasis must now be on finding a market first and then supplying the most suitable commodity that we can produce for that market. However, for this new type of approach in agriculture to be successful the Commonwealth Government must be prevailed on to expand its marketing services. In some ways, the Commonwealth Government is already realizing the need for extended services in this area; I think a little over a month ago the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr.

Anthony) said that much greater efforts would be made to supply farmers directly with information regarding markets.

I think we must encourage the Commonwealth Government to continue its efforts in this new concept of market-oriented agriculture. Within the limited scope of this State's activity in the field of oversea marketing, members opposite will be pleased to note that the new trade commissioners to whom the Premier has recently referred and who have been or will be appointed to represent South Australia in strategic areas of Asia will provide a means of developing markets for our agricultural products in the countries concerned. I believe that already there are bright prospects, for instance, in regard to marketing our citrus in Japan.

Mr. Rodda: Will your representative be functioning in this regard in Tokyo?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Most certainly; I should think he would be interested in this and in developing any other outlet that he can find for primary products from this country. This applies not only in Tokyo but also in Hong Kong, Singapore, and Djakarta. I am certain that the honourable member would know that these representatives would be interested in this aspect. Finally, the member for Mallee referred to the danger of people looking on rural problems as being separate from the overall community. I fully agree with him that we cannot look on rural matters as being distinct from the interests of the overall community. We on this side have for a long time adopted the principle that all people in South Australia are, first and foremost, South Australians. Any distinction between rural and urban people is purely artificial. The well-being of the State demands that all people, whether urban or rural, must be prosperous in their endeavours. However, members opposite have not always thought of the people in the State as being equal. When they governed the State, they created a distinction: they considered rural people to be more valuable than people living in urban areas and, for over 30 years, the L.C.L. Government ruled by creating an electoral system that was blatantly based on this inequality.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has the matter to which the Minister has just referred any relation whatever to the motion being discussed?

The SPEAKER: The Minister must link up his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In fact, I was commenting on a statement made by the member for Mallee that we cannot separate rural and urban people, who have a common interest in the State. I am pointing out that for many years members opposite did not consider that people who lived in urban areas had the same value as people living in rural areas.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In fact, some people still think this. One can meet primary producers who say openly (although possibly they are not aware of what they are saying) that anyone who works in the city is over-paid, under-worked, and has too many privileges.

Mr. Rodda: They don't always say that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They may not say it always, but sometimes they think it. On the other hand, some people who live in the city think that primary producers are over-subsidized. People who say any of these things are wrong, because this is not the case. I should not have to say this, because all members realize that people living in both areas need one another and rely on one another: we are all part of a system.

Mr. Venning: Then why don't you help us?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We are prepared to help primary producers in any way we can, but we do not believe that the motion does anything to help them. As I have said, we do not have the resources to go into the sort of inquiry that would be necessary if we were to solve the problems of primary producers; some of these matters have an international flavour. Although this may provide members on both sides with an opportunity to air their knowledge about primary production, it would not have much other significant effect, as members know. We have already set up a committee of inquiry into the wheat quota system and in relation to the citrus industry. One of those inquiries is completed and the other is proceeding (that inquiry was set up by the previous Government). There are many areas in which primary producers can be helped. For instance, there is the wool marketing system set up by the Commonwealth Government, and we all know the parlous situation of the wool industry. I can tell members that, as a matter of urgency, the Government will introduce legislation shortly to give effect to what the Commonwealth Government believes may assist the

wool industry. We will get this complementary legislation off the ground urgently.

Mr. Nankivell: You couldn't do much else, could you?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suppose that, if we wanted to be difficult, we could but we realize the problems facing these people. We will introduce this legislation as a matter of urgency because we know that any delay will only make the present situation deteriorate quickly.

Mr. Rodda: Have you seen the report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not, and I do not know how it would help me. I know the proposal of the Commonwealth Government, and I am telling members that this Government will do everything to help.

Mr. Jennings: Some woolgrowers don't like it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not suppose a measure could be found that everyone would like. However, at least this appears to be an attempt to solve the serious problems of woolgrowers. I think that, of necessity, the problems of primary producers must be tackled on a national basis, and that any inquiry on a State basis would not do what we wanted it to do. In fact, such an inquiry would be largely a waste of time and money. Such an inquiry would be ineffective, because the Government could not guarantee to implement any recommendations the committee might make, and it would be the Commonwealth Government that would have to take any action.

I emphasize again the need for members to approach the Commonwealth Government, and this applies particularly to members opposite, as their colleagues are in power in Canberra. Not only should the Commonwealth be approached at Government level, but members should individually also do everything they can to impress on the Commonwealth the need to do all that it can to assist primary producers in the difficulties they face. Therefore, for no other reason than that we believe that what would flow from the motion would be ineffective, the Government opposes the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the motion, which was moved so capably by the member for Mallee, who has had great experience in the agricultural field. I agree with the Minister of Works on some of the things that he has said, but basically he has overlooked several facts. Most marketing

schemes must be set up by State legislation, and most agricultural policy is discussed at the Agricultural Council level. Therefore, most important matters can be discussed at a State level. An inquiry here would collect data from local farmers that would be of immense value to the Minister of Agriculture when he went to council meetings. The Minister said that Opposition members should take the direct course, approaching Commonwealth members. Many of us do that now. However, the inquiry would give us an opportunity to say something publicly. Our Party is not bound by something in a little book. We would be able to express our views, trying to emphasize the problems of primary producers in an effort to have them solved. Commonwealth members do not have nearly the close contact with their electors that State members have. Meeting people in the field, we know their problems.

I have been a member of a primary producers' union. I was even a member of a workers' union in my earlier days. I did not get on too well with that organization, which did not work hard enough for me: I had my wages reduced by 25 per cent in the 1930's. Hitherto, farmers have wanted to go their own way. In fact, 25 years ago a person was unpopular if he mentioned the word "subsidy". However, because of the economic pressures that have been brought to bear on them, the primary producers are now in trouble, and I have been told at meetings that the Government is not giving them a lead. If this is what they think, we should make an effort to help them locate their problem. Much benefit would accrue from the appointment of a good committee of inquiry. The Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics often conducts surveys on matters such as these, the findings of which, however, do not reach the farmers. Certain statements are made about future production or likely markets and, although this information is sent out in pamphlet form, I do not think it ever reaches the farmers, who are the people most concerned. If it does, the farmers have to make individual decisions on the facts supplied, which I do not think is possible.

The Minister of Works has said that the problems facing our primary producers must be dealt with together with problems facing the general economy. Although I have no doubt that this is so, the primary producers should have more representation at arbitration court hearings so that they can, as export earners, present a case on why certain things should not happen at certain times. They

should be able to emphasize what influence any suggestions made will have on them. Having to export, the same as do secondary industries, the primary producers have to face production costs, and these costs must be pegged to the price at which the products can be sold on the world markets. Usually, farmers are penalized every time there is a heating-up of the general economy. During boom periods when demand inflation occurs, certain action has to be taken to keep our supply of and demand for goods somewhere in harmony with one another so that costs will not increase. In attempting to do this, any action taken always seems to produce cost inflation. Invariably, the cost of petrol, for instance, is increased by, say, 3c to overcome demand inflation. At times it is suggested that interest rates generally should rise but, as a result of pressure from the primary producers, it is decided that interest rates for farmers will not be increased. However, not all farmers borrow money at overdraft rates, so many have their interest rate increased. At the same time, a general increase in interest rates is passed on to the primary producer, and this affects the farmer when he purchases his goods.

A senior official of the Reserve Bank has publicly opposed the imposition of high interest rates in an attempt to control an overheated economy. In trying to overcome demand inflation, it is not necessary to increase interest rates, which increase is definitely a form of cost inflation. There are other ways of solving the problem: if a closer watch were kept on the economy to ensure that pressures for demand inflation did not build up, we would not have to take action that would produce cost inflation. Our farmers are often penalized in relation to the export of their products. The Premier has recently been to Asia, where he said that our manufacturers are backward and do not show the initiative necessary to obtain markets there. However, it is difficult to do this if all the secondary industries in Australia have a high-cost structure because of the imposition of tariffs although, no doubt, tariffs are important in establishing secondary industries in a country. A similar situation to that in Australia at present obtained in Germany in the 19th century. At that time Bismarck had an idea, which was successfully implemented, to change Germany from a rural economy to a strong exporter of manufactured goods.

Australia has passed the stage where tariffs were first introduced to establish secondary

industries. That step was a most necessary one. However, we have made a mistake in this respect: once these industries were established they should have been weaned. That not having been done, we now have many pampered industries making very large profits and still hiding behind a high tariff barrier, which affects not only the secondary industries but also the primary industries. If we are to do anything to benefit the primary producers, we must tackle this problem. Bismarck gave only temporary protection to the German manufacturers: tariffs were reduced each year and eventually withdrawn within a specified time. We must get rid of this incubus, although any action taken in this regard will be opposed by both labour and management. This is a matter on which we must educate our employers and trade union leaders; they must accept the facts of life.

Mr. Groth: You blokes haven't got much chance of educating them.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member has his problems with the shops in his district. If he has a genuine desire to raise the living standards of the people he has represented in the past and is so badly representing at present in regard to their immediate needs, he will try to be a little more constructive. The Australian economy should be forestudied in an effort to try to increase our gross national product, a step which is most essential if the living standards of the Australian people are to continue to improve. The living standards of countries that we consider backward are rising more quickly than are our own and we will suffer shortly if we do not return to the fundamental principles involved in the running of a country.

Some companies are able, as a result of the protection they are being given, to make excessive profits and to make over-award payments. Indeed, as the member for Playford so ably stressed in his Budget speech, one group of workers is receiving greatly increased salaries compared with the employees of other industries that are not protected to such an extent. Such industries cannot afford to make over-award payments in this way. Also, discrepancies exist in relation to wages, about which employees are dissatisfied. Reduction of tariffs on these goods would mean that the farmers and everyone else who works (and most of us in Australia are workers), and one group I know is working much harder—

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you get an interpreter, Bill?

Mr. Rodda: You don't like that, do you?

Mr. Jennings: I can't understand what the hell he's talking about.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member is not worth worrying about. He could be well occupied doing something else, instead of being in the House. Reduction of tariffs would reduce the price level of goods in Australia, without reducing the standards of living. Of course, our standards of living would be improved if we got rid of some of the less efficient industries. One difficulty facing the farmers at present is that they always go to some palliative. Groups such as the League of Rights or the Social Credit group say that the problems of the farmers can be solved only if we have social credit. When I attended one of these meetings, the speaker told me that the Commonwealth Government had not issued any credit in the previous 12 months, whereas it had issued \$500,000,000 in that year.

Anyone who knows anything about the matter (and the member for Ross Smith will not interject now) knows that the amount varies. Last year the Commonwealth Government was able to issue only a small amount of national credit, and how can goods be subsidized when no credit can be used? This is not a solution of the problem and it is unfortunate that this propaganda is being spread by people who have not had training. The weakness in their argument is that they claim every \$100 of bank issue comes back to the bank as a cheque and cancels itself out. These people overlook the fact that these issues give the working man the right to bank the money, to spend it, or to use it in some other way.

Mr. Clark: I wish Bill Quirke was still here!

Mr. McANANEY: He is playing around with a Socialist scheme for the wheat industry, introduced by the Labor Party.

Mr. Clark: He would cut your argument to ribbons.

Mr. McANANEY: An infallible argument cannot be beaten. I disagree with the statements that the farmers must get bigger or get out. Some of our most inefficient farms are the bigger ones. The family farms, over a period of years, prove the most successful units and we must protect them. An expert committee of inquiry could assist greatly in that matter, because it could consider the effect on small industry, both primary and secondary, of the various capital taxes and it could also consider the ability of that unit to survive.

One of the farmer's biggest problems is succession duty. Although I do not agree with statements that these duties should be eliminated (because that would give too great an accumulation of wealth to a few people, and this is unnecessary), surely the agricultural advisers or those who advise the farmers on their financial affairs should encourage every family unit to develop a private company system of running a farm. Farmers must accept the need to be business people and to run their farms as businesses.

I have heard members in another place say that companies have a big advantage over the primary producer in this regard, but it is not expensive to develop and have a small company. This system allows the family unit to get away with paying extremely little succession or probate duty, particularly if the share capital in the company is kept small and other capital is invested as loans and mortgages in the company. Farmers must face the fact that even a two-man unit now is big business. Whereas 30 years or 40 years ago it was necessary to have only \$4,000 or \$6,000 worth of plant, now a farmer needs about \$30,000 worth of equipment and about \$20,000 worth of livestock, and to run a family unit he must have \$150,000 in cash or credit.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McANANEY: We are getting the dim-wits in again. Running a family farm is big business and outside money is needed for such a unit.

Mr. Jennings: What were the angles on that circular tank stand?

Mr. McANANEY: When I was on the farm, I had intelligent sheep to look at, which was better than some of the surroundings I have at present. Many lawyers and accountants give bad advice to farmers about how to run their businesses. One of the farmer's biggest problems is paying council rates. About 20 years or 30 years ago rates were reasonable as a form of collecting money for roadworks but, since the advent of the motor car, there are no roads used only by local traffic. I travelled on some of the back roads in the Meadows district last Sunday and found them being used by many tourists. The rates paid by local people should not have to be used to maintain these roads: people using them should pay for them. All money received from the petrol tax should be used to improve our roads, and this would mean that people driving motor vehicles on roads would pay for the upkeep of the roads.

I know that the Labor Party, which is now the Socialist Party, would not accept the principle that able-bodied people should pay for the services they get, but this aspect should be seriously considered. A farmer on an ordinary farm pays about \$500 a year in rates, whereas the local schoolteacher, business man, or professional man, who uses the roads more than farmers use them, pays only between \$30 and \$60. This is a definite hardship on one section of the community. The Minister of Works did not refer to land tax, but he no doubt realizes that the valuations placed on country land are too high when compared with its productive value. In my district my son's farm was assessed at perhaps twice its productive value.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How could we know that?

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister has great experience and knowledge but, if he pays \$80 an acre for land in a 14in. rainfall area, he will find that he has paid too much and will be scratching to get an easy living such as he is getting at present. Country land is now being valued at a figure higher than it is worth and higher than its present sale value. It was announced by the Labor Government that it would give a shot in the arm to the rural industry, but I think that it had the shot but missed the arm and hit the heart! Land tax should not be imposed on country land. Land near city areas, where it becomes more valuable because of the environment and because people live there, should be taxed, but in country areas any value added to the land is brought about by improvements made by the owner. The Labor Party has not announced what it will do about land tax: there will be an increase in the assessments and the tax will be increased on the larger estates. We know what the Socialist Government means by a living area. The late Frank Walsh, when Premier, introduced a Bill and said that a living area was \$10,000 worth of land. I think he considered the living area was the land that had on it the house in which the farmer lived rather than the property.

Something that must be stressed repeatedly to farmers is that when the natural law of supply and demand produces a price below a payable price any subsidy or guaranteed price must be followed by some form of control of production. Our farmers are the most efficient in the world and if they have an incentive to produce at a profit they will do so more efficiently than can be done in any other industry. However, with a subsidy or a

guaranteed price there must be some form of control of production. Also, this system must be considered when a scheme is introduced at State level. Every time a particular industry has asked for a marketing scheme, it has been introduced. When the wheat scheme was introduced it was inevitable that there must be some control of production. This would be common sense, because secondary industries have to do this. General Motors-Holden's, the oil industry, and other secondary industries are spoon-fed with regard to assistance or protection, but they are protected only for the amount of production they can sell. They are able to gauge market prospects and adjust their factory production to what they can sell. If they make a mistake and do not produce enough they lose profits, and if they produce too much they have to accept a loss on this over-production.

It seems that it is being suggested by the Commonwealth Government, in regard to primary production, that someone will forecast what the market will need and then about 250,000 farmers have to decide what share they will have. They can then decide whether they will remain primary producers or go into another industry, but it seems to me that this system will not work. When the market prospects are determined a definite lead must be given to the farmers so that over-production can be controlled so that the farmer will be able to adjust his production according to the additional information available to him. It was inevitable that when a guaranteed price for wine was introduced an over-production would occur. I think those engaged in the industry are becoming worried about the over-production that must ultimately come. Surely, when it is realized that, if there is controlled production, which is necessary if there is a guaranteed price, this is the time to determine the form of production control necessary, so that primary producers will have a definite lead and a guide and will make adjustments accordingly.

Mr. Curren: But you don't believe in control at any time; you've said that in the House on many occasions.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Chaffey knows I have been emphasizing this. When the wheat stabilization scheme was introduced about 20 years ago, I opposed it but supported orderly marketing, and during my active public life I have maintained this attitude to primary production matters and to matters affecting the interests of the community as a whole. The member for Chaffey, being

a Socialist, will appreciate that some of us set out to do something to help every man, woman and child in Australia. We know that if it had not been for the introduction of controlled wheat acreages in the United States and Canada we would have had to introduce controlled production in Australia. I think that, if sufficient numbers of intelligent people point out this fact to the farmers concerned, the farmers will accept it. Indeed, many of them already accept this fact, and I think the average farmer is a sensible person.

Members of unions generally are intelligent and reasonable, but they are badly led at the top by vocal people who will not get down to the basic facts of life. This situation may be applied also to farmers. The terms of reference for the committee inquiring into the wheat industry contain utter "bunkum"; the committee is asked to determine whether a farmer has some other activity on his farm, irrespective of whether or not he can handle it economically. It is asked to decide whether a measure of production should be taken away from one farmer and given to someone living in an area where the commodity cannot be produced at a competitive price. This is sheer Socialism. One should not rob Peter to pay Paul, although this is, in effect, what the committee set up by this Government will be doing; it shall determine who shall lose and who shall receive. Surely, we must allow the economical producers to survive. North of Renmark, the average yield is three or four bushels but, if the Government carries out its general socialistic principles, it will say that farmers in this area must be able to grow wheat irrespective of its value to the community, and it will take production away from someone in a good area, even though he can produce economically. This represents the difference between Socialism and intelligence. I sympathize with someone who, say, at 20 years or 21 years is a Socialist. I was at the university and I had a socialistic lecturer; I thought Socialism was all right, but if a person is still a Socialist when he is 30 years or 40 years of age he is hopeless and will never learn. I hope that the inquiry committee that has been set up will not be responsible for introducing something which is purely socialistic and which will deprive a man engaged in free competition of producing a commodity and of sharing equally in the markets available, as he has done previously. The dairying industry is another industry that is in trouble at present, and the situation will become worse if Britain joins the European Common Market.

At present, England is taking 67 per cent of the butter we produce.

Mr. Keneally: Should we recognize Red China?

Mr. McANANEY: I am against the three-quarters of an hour limit on speeches, because I am just getting warmed up to making a speech that may last three hours, and I might have been able to educate members on the other side. The Minister of Works has said that we cannot do anything at the State level. The egg-producing industry is in difficulty this year, because the number of chicken hatchings exceeds egg production, and there is over-production generally. The requests of the egg producers, who have approached respective State Ministers of Agriculture and also the Commonwealth Government, have been refused. The committee of inquiry to which I have referred could investigate the matter at the State level and advance a good case for the necessary control. The price of eggs paid by the Australian consumer is far too high and is well above the cost of production, but it has to make up for the large percentage of eggs produced in Australia and sold overseas at a nominal price of, say, 10c a dozen.

If Australian exported the wheat that fowls consumed, the country as a whole might be better off and there would not be the wear and tear on the poor old fowl that is straining itself. Some control of egg production ought to be introduced at this stage, so that those engaged in the industry can survive without any undue penalty being inflicted on the consumer. As the Minister of Works says, some Adelaide people think that farmers are pampered with subsidies, but this is a matter concerning which a committee of inquiry, which would consider all the relevant facts and figures, would make recommendations that would benefit the community. Secondary industry is supported by well over \$3,000,000,000 worth of tariff protection, and I think the total subsidies paid to primary producers this year will amount to about \$300,000,000. People overlook the fact that when the wheat stabilization scheme first came into operation the wheatgrowers of Australia subsidized the Australian consumers by nearly \$400,000,000. Any assistance in the Commonwealth Budget to wheatgrowers has not yet equalled that sum.

My plea is that we have a committee of inquiry to consider a wide range of matters, so that people can get together and discuss these problems. On the basis of fair and free competition and by using business methods

Australia will advance much more quickly than it is advancing at present. In view of the great natural resources that this country has, we should be ashamed of the progress we are making at present. It is only by people analysing the situation and looking at it in depth, forgetting parochialism and vocal primary producer leaders, vocal trade union leaders and vocal employers, that we will make use of the education the States are providing and come up with some intelligent solution to our problems.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the motion. No-one in this House is more competent to move a motion of this sort than the member for Mallee, who knows all about the problems of the man on the land. I was amazed this afternoon to hear the Minister of Works, a country member from the South-East, make the comments he did on behalf of his Party. Members opposite are not in sympathy with the problems of the man on the land.

Mr. Clark: Rubbish!

Mr. VENNING: They are nursing a chip. This was highlighted by the speech of the Minister this afternoon. He did not go too badly for a start but then, when he began to compare country people with city people, he revealed that the Labor Party is nursing a chip in this regard. I have here a copy of a speech made in New South Wales by the Leader of South Australia's Labor Party.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Did I not say that both points of view were wrong in relation to that comparison?

Mr. VENNING: The Minister highlighted an indication that this was the thinking behind it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But did I not say that both were wrong?

Mr. VENNING: In the *Brisbane Sunday Truth* of June 23, 1968, is the report of a speech delivered by the present Leader of this Government. It is headed "Goodbye to the rustics". It deals with a situation that the Minister this afternoon highlighted in connection with this motion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you quote from it?

Mr. VENNING: It is a long article and I do not want to waste the time of this House by going into the details of it; nor shall I deal with the problems of primary production this afternoon. I was amazed that the Deputy Leader of the Government should try to get

out from under by saying that he did not consider the State Government could do anything in this regard. I think that whatever the South Australian Government did would be of some assistance in this regard.

Mr. Keneally: What could it do?

Mr. VENNING: Just listen. The Minister of Agriculture in South Australia (although he is now in another place, it makes no difference; he can be informed) attends the meetings of the Australian Agricultural Council and meets all the Ministers of Agriculture in the Commonwealth to discuss various rural problems. Through our Minister we could have conveyed to the Commonwealth Government the thinking of South Australia.

The Minister, in endeavouring to get out from under, showed some weakness, because I should have thought the Government of this State had an easy way out: it could have said, "Yes; we will go along with the motion with the idea that some help may be gained from it", but the Minister this afternoon made it clear that his Government would not support the motion. Perhaps it was because it originated on this side of the House and the thinking of members opposite might have been that whatever came from this side could have no merit. I do not know, but I am sorry they did not support the members on this side, who are behind the member for Mallee in his motion. My feelings go further than this. When one reads the Premier's policy speech, one realizes that he almost missed mentioning rural problems. Some of them got in on the next to last page.

Mr. Keneally: There was a separate speech on rural matters.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, I know, but the Premier's comments on rural problems just got in on the next to last page. Whilst it has made all the apologies in the world and has said the State is limited in what it can do to assist the rural industry in its problems, the Government has been in power for five months and so far has done nothing. It set up this committee to examine wheat quotas but we all know what effect that will have—none at all. It may look at some of the aspects of wheat quotas, but that is only a blind. The growers want to see something of consequence. Such things as assistance with succession duties, land tax, Crown land rents, and rail freights are items that the State Government can do something about. This afternoon, in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Roads and Transport

said that a loading of 90c a ton was imposed on grain moved from silos built on railway property. When areas were affected by drought and growers wanted grain from the silos in order to feed stock there was still a loading imposed of 15c a ton—a real imposition.

Today, the Minister of Roads and Transport said that these anomalies existed when we were in Government and that they had operated for a long time, although many people in the State did not know they existed. I was speaking to the previous Minister of Roads and Transport some time ago and he was amazed to know that this imposition existed. It is unfair that primary producers, by paying for this grain movement, are assisting, to a large extent, in financing the State. We have a co-operative in this State that builds silos on railway property, pays rates and taxes, pays fees, and is expected, in some circumstances when road transport is used, to pay a loading of 90c a ton on grain. These are some matters in which the State Government could assist rural industries.

We know only too well that when this Government came into office in 1965 one of the first things it did was to increase rail freights on grain, in some areas up to 33½ per cent. Sir Thomas Playford had assisted outlying rural areas of this State by reducing rail freights, but the Labor Government increased these charges in many areas, to such an extent that up to 6c a bushel increase in freight was deducted from the return to the grower. The Government states that the ways it can help primary producers are limited, but it should consider the situation and be genuine about it, because I am sure it could find many ways of helping if it were willing to do so. It is evident to me that the Government is passing the buck to the Commonwealth Government and expecting that Government to completely solve the problems. True, the Premier has communicated with the Commonwealth Government, whose reply stated that, when the State had given assistance to the extent of \$1,500,000, the Commonwealth would assist the State with finance.

I should have thought that one of the first things the Premier would do after receiving that information would be to create an organization to implement this assistance, but I wonder how the State intends to handle the situation if it spends the \$1,500,000 and how it expects to administer the money received from the Commonwealth Government. We find an inadequate Act existing at present: what

the Government should do is support this motion and do something to bring the legislation up to date so that it can handle this Commonwealth assistance. Although we all realize that the present seasonal outlook has improved somewhat compared with what it was a few weeks ago, at present rural industries throughout the Commonwealth are experiencing many problems. In 1966-67 there was a world shortage of wheat and farmers throughout the Commonwealth were asked to produce more and to become more efficient. It seems that overnight the situation has changed so that we now have an over-production of grain and other commodities, not only in Australia but throughout the world. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

CLEVE BUILDING

Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 6:

Mr. McKee to move:

That by-law No. 27 of the District Council of Cleve in respect of building alignment made on August 14, 1969, and laid on the table of this House on July 14, 1970, be disallowed.

Mr. McKEE (Pirie) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT REGULATIONS: LAND SUBDIVISION

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McKee:

That the Order of the Day, Other Business, relating to the disallowance of regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1969, in respect of the control of land subdivision, be read and discharged.

(Continued from September 16. Page 1416.)

Mr. McKEE (Pirie): On September 16, I moved that this Order of the Day be read and discharged, as this was the decision reached by the Subordinate Legislation Committee after having considered evidence from private individuals, officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and officers of the State Planning Office. However, the member for Alexandra asked that the motion be adjourned, and he was supported by the member for Mitcham. I acceded to this request, as the member for Mitcham said that he needed more time to consider the matter.

However, that was not the reason given by the member for Alexandra, who said:

I am in no mood to support the motion to discharge it. As I have explained previously, a representative of the Opposition in the House of Assembly is not on the Subordinate Legislation Committee, so my Party has not the advantage of knowing what its deliberations are.

It is a pity that the member for Alexandra is not in the Chamber at present to hear what I have to say. On numerous occasions regulations come before the Subordinate Legislation Committee that deal with matters affecting the honourable member's district. The committee has been courteous enough to inform the honourable member in respect of such regulations, but he has not had the courtesy even to reply, and this has happened more than once; he has completely ignored correspondence from the committee. His actions are what one would expect from a very spoilt child. His general whingeing attitude ever since he has been in Opposition has been clearly demonstrated in this House in respect of matters that have come before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I believe he is showing his bitterness and hatred towards the people of the State because they tossed his Party out of office. They did that at the first opportunity they received, after having been suppressed for many years by the gerrymander. As soon as the people got the opportunity, out went the Liberal and Country League Government.

Mr. Rodda: I think you're being most unfair.

Mr. McKEE: Opposing this motion is the vicious and spiteful way the member for Alexandra has chosen to get square with the people of the State for rejecting his Party at the last election.

Mr. Rodda: Break it up!

Mr. McKEE: If changes had not been made to the honourable member's district boundaries, he would not have been here himself: the people would have tossed him out as well.

Mr. RODDA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What have the honourable member's comments to do with this motion? This is a personal attack on one of my colleagues.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Pirie to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. McKEE: In taking objection to this motion, the member for Alexandra has been annoyed and bitter because he claims that his

Party in this House has no representation on the committee. I do not think that is reason for his attitude: I think his bitterness is towards the people. Any member who opposes this motion can only be hoping to pollute the State's water supply. Therefore, members who support the member for Alexandra in this vicious move will be helping to pollute the State's water supply.

Mr. Evans: We gave you the chance to debate this.

Mr. McKEE: The situation relating to the pollution of the watershed in this State has been brought under notice, the Engineering and Water Supply Department having evidence to prove how important this is. In lengthy evidence, departmental officers said that the State could not possibly afford, either financially or physically, to have these storages polluted. Anyone who opposes this motion is setting out to do exactly that—to pollute the State's water supply. Recently legislation was passed in Japan providing that anyone charged with causing pollution of any form could be gaoled for up to seven years. The member for Alexandra is fortunate that he is not in Japan, and it is our misfortune that he is not there.

Mr. BURDON seconded the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney (teller), Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF WOODVILLE WEST LAKES LOAN) BILL
Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VOTING AGE)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes three amendments to the principal Act. First, it lowers the voting age of House of Assembly electors from 21 years to 18 years. Secondly, it removes the present restriction imposed on ministers of religion whereby they are not at present eligible to be elected to either House of Parliament and, thirdly, by way of Statute law revision, it alters an obsolete reference to the Affirmations Act of 1896 by substituting for it a reference to the Oaths Act, 1936. The proposed granting of franchise to the age group between 18 years and 21 years is consistent with the policy of this Government, whereby persons within that age group are recognized as a force in the community as potentially responsible citizens. This policy has been endorsed by this Parliament in 1966 by those amendments to the Wills Act and the Law of Property Act that enable persons of 18 years and over to make valid wills and enter into certain classes of binding contract relating to property and loans.

It is the Government's policy that the general age of majority should be reduced to 18 years. The Government's view is that the modern person of 18 years of age possesses the knowledge, sense of responsibility and maturity to carry the responsibilities of adult citizenship, and in particular (having regard to the provisions of this Bill) the right to vote. As was said during the recent election campaign by me and others, we are dealing here with the best educated generation in our history, a generation of young people possessing a degree of political consciousness that has never been exceeded by young people at any time in the past. It is sometimes claimed that this political consciousness is misdirected and is directed into avenues that lie outside the normal processes of the formation of opinion and demonstration of that opinion in a democratic community, and this is an added reason why young people possessing this degree of political consciousness and sophistication should be given the full opportunity to exercise the rights of citizenship and the rights to express their views and to influence the Government of the country in the normal democratic way by exercising the franchise.

The proposal incorporated in this Bill was made part of the policy speech of the present Premier at the recent election, and the intention of the Government to introduce the legislation was included in His Excellency's Speech at the commencement of this session. Since

that time we have had expressions of opinion and, indeed, decision by the Governments of the other States and the Commonwealth. At a meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General that took place in July, the Attorneys from each of the States indicated that they would recommend to their respective Governments that legislation be introduced to lower the voting age in those States to 18 years and the Attorney-General for the Commonwealth gave a similar indication.

At the meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General that took place last week in Perth, all of the Attorneys indicated that they had either introduced legislation (as in the case of New South Wales) or would be doing so soon to lower the voting age to 18 years, and the Commonwealth indicated that it, too, had plans of a like nature, although I do not think the Commonwealth Attorney-General gave any indication of the time table of the Commonwealth in the matter. Therefore, the principle that the right to vote should be conferred on people at the age of 18 years has now won recognition throughout the Commonwealth of Australia and, indeed, is spreading very rapidly through the whole of the western democratic world.

The present restriction on Ministers of religion whereby they are not eligible to be elected to either House of Parliament is impractical and outmoded in these modern times. I had made some arrangements to investigate the historical origin of this prohibition but, unfortunately, because of a staff problem, I have not yet had the results of that investigation. Therefore, I personally do not know in what circumstances this prohibition came into our law. Certainly, it is an unusual one, and I think it is unique. There seems to be no reason in logic or principle why ministers of religion should not have the same rights as other citizens to be elected to the Parliament of the State if they win the support of the electors for that purpose.

The following is a short explanation of the clauses of the Bill: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 33 of the principal Act which sets out the qualifications for House of Assembly electors. The amendment lowers the voting age for the House of Assembly from 21 years to 18 years. Clause 4 amends section 42 of the principal Act. This is a Statute Law Revision amendment altering the citation of "The Affirmations Act, 1896" to "the Oaths Act, 1936, as amended". Clause

5 amends section 44 of the principal Act which provides, *inter alia*, that no clergyman or officiating minister shall be eligible for election as a member of Parliament. The amendment deletes the reference to a clergyman and officiating minister.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ENROLMENT)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

One of its main objects is to provide a simple method of enrolling House of Assembly electors as Legislative Council electors under the Electoral Act. This is consequential on the policy of the Government that a person entitled to vote at an Assembly election should be qualified to have his name placed on the appropriate Council roll. The Bill also provides for compulsory voting at Legislative Council elections and makes certain amendments that are consistent with the Government's policy to confer voting and other rights on the 18-year-old to 21-year-old age group. The Electoral Act at the moment provides that electors who are entitled to vote for both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council must make separate claims to have their names placed on the respective electoral rolls. In view of the proposed extension of the Legislative Council franchise to that of the House of Assembly, the necessity to make separate claims for enrolment is obviated, and therefore the Bill provides a simple procedure whereby the Returning Officer for the State may place the name of an Assembly elector on the appropriate electoral roll for the Legislative Council without requiring a claim to be submitted.

The Government believes that this is a simple and expedient way of providing the machinery needed to carry the extended Legislative Council franchise into effect. At present the Act provides for compulsory voting only at House of Assembly elections. This Bill provides for compulsory voting by all electors, whether for the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council. This provision is consistent with the overall aim of the Government to afford each citizen of this State equal voting rights in relation to both Houses, with the various obligations attendant thereon. The Bill

also provides for the reduction from 21 years to 18 years of the minimum age of a person who may be an authorized witness for postal voting or who may be a presiding officer or assistant presiding officer at polling places. This reduction is made in conjunction with the various Bills introduced or to be introduced by this Government for the general reduction of the age of majority, and so needs no further explanation. Lastly, the Bill contains several consequential amendments to the Electoral Act resulting from the two proposed amendments to the Constitution Act, namely, the extension of Legislative Council franchise already referred to, and the reduction of the voting age from 21 years to 18 years.

The philosophy underlying the Bill is that the law ought to encourage citizens to exercise their voting rights to the maximum degree, and the widest vote is necessary, as I said in the debate yesterday, for the ascertainment in a meaningful way of the democratic consensus. If it is accepted as a valid viewpoint that the law should encourage the widest possible participation in the democratic process by the exercise of votes, it follows that the enrolment process should be designed to facilitate to the maximum degree the opportunity of people who are entitled to vote to be enrolled to enable them to exercise that right. Hence the provision for the single claim for enrolment in respect of both Houses of Parliament.

Turning to the provision relating to compulsory voting for the Legislative Council, I point out that I have suggested in a previous debate and I suggest again that there is no basis for distinguishing between the two Houses of Parliament. If compulsory voting is a desirable and appropriate procedure in respect of the House of Assembly, it is also an appropriate procedure in respect of the Legislative Council. I believe that no satisfactory argument has been advanced in the debates that have already taken place in the House on this subject for distinguishing between the two Houses. Indeed those who have endeavoured, by moving amendments to another Bill, to persuade the House that there should be voluntary voting for the Legislative Council (and I refer particularly to the Leader and the member for Mitcham) have been driven in logic to say that they favour voluntary voting for the House of Assembly as well as for the Legislative Council, because in my opinion it is not possible to make any valid distinction between the two Houses. The basic justification and reason for com-

pulsory voting provisions is that the franchise is both a right and an obligation.

I think it was the member for Mitcham who expressed some regret that he had not asked me at a certain stage of a previous debate whether I regarded the franchise as an obligation or as a privilege, and this remark has provided me with the opportunity to express my opinion on the point now. I believe that the franchise is a right and also an obligation. It is not a privilege if by privilege is understood something that marks off a section of the population from the generality of the population. A privilege is something enjoyed by a particular and favoured section of the community that the rest of the community does not enjoy and is not entitled to enjoy. To treat the franchise, which is the basic democratic right, as being a privilege is to misunderstand the whole nature of democratic society and democratic institutions. However, the franchise is a right, and a most valued right; it is probably the most important and valuable civic right that a citizen enjoys. Because it is a valued right and because it is such an important right and such an integral part of the whole structure of democratic institutions, it is also an obligation.

Any important right of citizenship carries with it an obligation, and the obligation carried by this right is the obligation to exercise the right, and this is something that has been recognized in the Australian community over a long period of years. The Australian community has come to understand, as part of the very institutions by which we are governed, that the citizen ought to exercise his right and that this obligation or duty he has is one that is properly enforceable by law, just as the other duties of citizenship are properly enforceable by law. The community has found no difficulty over a long period of years in understanding and appreciating that the only way in which a true democratic consensus can be obtained is for all citizens to be compelled by the process of law to face the issues that arise at an election and to exercise their franchise. This is one of the real democratic insights that have been arrived at in this country, a real insight that has distinguished it and put it in advance of many other parts of the world.

It is with more than considerable regret that I find that certain members of this House (perhaps smarting under electoral defeat under the present system) are now prepared to turn their backs on this great advance and adopt what is a retrograde and reactionary attitude; they are prepared to abandon the progress that

has been made in this country by the adoption of compulsory voting as part of the democratic institution. In doing that, they are turning their backs upon the insights not only of the community as a whole but also of their own Party, which has consistently for many years, in both the Commonwealth Parliament and the Parliaments of the other States (and in this Parliament) adopted and supported the principle of compulsory voting. One wonders why it is that at this particular moment, following an election in which the members of the Liberal Opposition suffered defeat, they have discovered some great objection to compulsory voting, from the point of view of democratic principle.

I now turn to the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the fixing of the commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 28 of the principal Act, which provides, *inter alia*, that names shall be placed on the electoral rolls only pursuant to claims made by electors. The amendment renders this provision subject to the other provisions of the Act and also makes a consequential amendment by deleting a reference to qualifications of Legislative Council electors. Clause 4 enacts two new sections (32a and 32b). Section 32a provides that, notwithstanding any other provisions in the Act, the Returning Officer for the State may enrol a person who is on the Assembly roll, or whose name is transferred from one subdivisional Assembly roll to another, on the appropriate Legislative Council roll, without requiring a claim to be submitted. The section further provides that the Returning Officer must notify the elector of his enrolment on the Council roll. Section 32b provides that the Returning Officer may remove from the Council roll the name of any person whose name has been removed from the Assembly roll.

Clause 5 amends section 38 of the Act, which deals with alteration of electoral rolls, by deleting a reference to qualifications of Legislative Council electors. Clause 6 amends section 40 of the Act, which provides for the notification by the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages of all names and addresses, etc., and marriages of people of and over the age of 21 years by deleting the reference to that age and substituting a reference to the age of 18 years. Clause 7 amends section 80 of the Act, which provides for the qualifications attaching to authorized witnesses for postal voting by deleting the reference to the age of

21 years and substituting a reference to the age of 18 years.

Clause 8 amends section 88 of the principal Act, which deals with the qualifications attaching to presiding and assistant presiding officers at polling places, by deleting the reference to the age of 21 years and substituting a reference to the age of 18 years. Clause 9 amends section 105 of the Act, which deals with the questions to be asked of electors by the presiding officer in an election, by deleting the reference to the age of 21 years and substituting a reference to the age of 18 years.

Clause 10 amends section 110a of the Act, which deals with a person's right to vote although his name does not appear on one of the certified lists of voters, by deleting the references to "Assembly" and "Assembly district", thus leaving the section to apply generally to all districts, whether Assembly or Council. This clause also strikes out paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of the section dealing with the case of a person whose name has been omitted from a certified list although he had presented a claim form to the registrar for enrolment on an Assembly subdivisional roll, and substitutes a new paragraph in its place which will apply equally to Assembly and Council certified lists.

The new paragraph requires a presiding officer to ensure that a name should have appeared on the certified list before a voter is permitted to vote. Clause 11 amends section 118a of the Act, which provides for compulsory voting in the House of Assembly, by deleting references to "Assembly" and "Assembly district", thus rendering the section generally applicable to elections for both Houses.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEES)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1970. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I am sure that all honourable members will share the Government's concern at the rising road accident toll in this State, and the introduction of this Bill is clear evidence of our intention to do all in our power to reduce the appalling loss of life and human suffering that result from road accidents. Although considerable investigation into the causes of

accidents still remains to be undertaken, it is clear that the skill and competence and, might I add, the good sense of the driver all play a large part in the reduction of accidents. Accordingly, the Government is at present considering a massive and far-reaching programme of driver-improvement proposed by the Road Safety Council of this State. Such a programme is estimated to cost about \$77,000 in its first year and \$60,000 a year thereafter. This is one example of how the proper use of funds may help in the alleviation of the problem.

The prime object of this Bill is, therefore, to create a source of revenue for this most important work. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 76 of the Motor Vehicles Act and increases the fee payable in respect of a driver's licence from \$2 to \$3. This increase will impact driver's licences for any licence period which commences after January 1 next year. The fee of \$1 for a learner's permit has not been increased and neither have the concessional rates for incapacitated persons, which remain at \$1. In addition, a new fee for pensioners has been introduced and the licence fee for them has been held at \$2. A pensioner has been defined as a person who is entitled to concession travel on public transport by virtue of being in receipt of a Commonwealth pension.

As members will be aware, the net recovery from licence and registration fees under the Motor Vehicles Act goes into the Highways Fund pursuant to section 31 (3) of the Highways Act. Accordingly, provision is being made by amendment to that Act to ensure that not more than 50c of each dollar of the increase proposed by this Bill will be paid to the Treasurer where it will be available for appropriation by Parliament for road safety purposes. The maximum amount that will be so available in any one year will be about \$250,000. The provision for future appropriation of moneys to be spent on road safety has been made to accord with sound Treasury practice, and it will ensure that specific Parliamentary approval is obtained for the expenditure.

The remainder of the net increased recovery will, of course, remain in the Highways Fund where it will be available for, amongst other things, road construction and improvement, both being activities that bear on road safety. In addition, active consideration will be given to some extension of the planned installation of automatic railway crossing systems and grade

separation. However, while the value of grade separation as a safety measure is clearly recognized, it must be remembered that projects of this nature are enormously expensive undertakings—a single project can cost up to \$500,000. Hence expenditure in this area must be viewed against road needs generally. Finally, from the additional funds available it may also be possible to increase the number of intersections controlled by traffic lights.

Clause 3 imposes a fee of \$1 for the practical driving test imposed on the holder of a learner's permit before a driver's licence may be issued. In the terms of the Highways Act the revenue from this impost will not find its way into the Highways Fund but will flow to general revenue and will to some extent offset the very heavy expenditure of the Police Department in this area.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1969. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the principal Act in two respects: (a) it considerably enlarges the purposes for which expenditure may be incurred against the Highways Fund; and (b) it extends the powers of the Commissioner in relation to road planning and research. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 20a of the principal Act which deals with the acquisition of land by the Commissioner of Highways. In substance, it permits the Commissioner, subject to the approval of the Minister, to acquire land for any purpose which is necessary or desirable to facilitate any scheme of road construction that may be undertaken by the Commissioner in the future.

Clause 3 deals with the acquisition of land by the Commissioner in what are known as "hardship cases", that is, cases where property values are adversely affected by proposed road development plans. Experience has shown that this adverse effect continues notwithstanding the fact that the proposals may have been deferred or modified. The substance of the provision appears as proposed new section 20ba, which is self-explanatory. Proposed subsection (1) enables the Minister to grant a certificate in respect of land and makes it clear that the

grant is in the discretion of the Minister. Proposed subsection (2) sets out the matters in relation to which the Minister must be satisfied before he grants the certificate. Proposed subsection (3) provides that once a certificate is granted the Commissioner shall acquire the land and the Commissioner's ordinary powers of acquisition may be used for this purpose.

At this stage I must draw the attention of members to the fact that, regrettably, in the advance copies of the Bill before them clauses 4 and 5 have been transposed: clause 4 should read as clause 5, and clause 5 as clause 4. I apologize for this, but it is one of those errors that occur, and no-one is really to blame. Clause 4 re-enacts section 23 of the principal Act and gives the Commissioner an additional power to undertake road planning and research. The scope of this power is indicated at new subsection (2). The enactment of this provision should ensure that this State can take full advantage of any Commonwealth assistance that may be provided for road planning and research. Clause 5 is consequential on the amendments effected by clause 7.

Clause 6 amends section 31 of the principal Act which relates to payments to the Highways Fund and is consequential on the amendments provided by clause 7. Clause 7 amends section 32 of the principal Act. The amendments proposed by paragraphs (a) and (b) in common with the amendments proposed by clauses 5 and 7 are to deal with the situation created by the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1969, of the Commonwealth which provides Commonwealth funds for road purposes in this State. Under this Act, the Commonwealth grant can now only be expended on the operations and categories of roads specified therein. In order to ensure that a balanced programme of operations and road construction in this State is continued, it is necessary to provide for expenditure from the Highways Fund in areas in which Commonwealth funds may not be expended.

Proposed new paragraphs (i) and (j) set out as amendment (c) in this clause will enable the Highways Fund to receive relatively short-term loans to deal with demands that may vary from year to year, thus spreading the burden of these demands more evenly. Thus paragraph (j) provides for assistance in rehousing of persons dispossessed of housing as a consequence of works carried out or proposed to be carried out by the Commissioner. Since the amounts required for expen-

diture of this nature would vary from year to year, funds to satisfy this expenditure could be provided by relatively short-term loans. Proposed new paragraph (k) merely provides that amounts already paid out of special appropriations for the purchase of land in cases similar to those mentioned in relation to clause 3 can be recouped from the Highways Fund. Proposed new paragraph (l) will authorize release from the Highways Fund of portion of the revenue that will accrue to it from the increase in certain licence fees, and the amendment proposed by paragraph (d) will enable the moneys released to be directed towards the general purposes of road safety. Clause 8 repeals section 33 of the principal Act which is no longer appropriate and is consequential on the enlarged area of expenditure from the Highways Fund.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTRY)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The number of Ministers of the Crown is at present limited to nine and the Executive has consisted of this number of Ministers since 1965. In a developing State such as South Australia, the responsibilities of administration vested in Ministers is such that each of the present Ministers has a work load in excess of what should normally be expected of any one person. The effect of this Bill will be to increase the number of Ministers in the Cabinet from nine to 10, with not more than seven Ministers at one time being members of the House of Assembly. In the other States of Australia the Ministries consist of the following numbers: New South Wales, 16 (plus two Assistant Ministers); Victoria, 15; Queensland, 13; Western Australia, 12; and Tasmania, nine. The increase in the Ministry provided by this Bill will therefore leave South Australia with the smallest Ministry in numbers of all the mainland States, and the smallest in proportion to population. Clause 2 makes the proposed increase in the Ministry possible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page .)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): There is high political interest in this Bill.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: On your side.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I could amend that and say that there is high political interest among members of the public (probably more interest than in any other Bill that has been introduced by the new Government since it came to office). In view of the developments of the last few weeks, it is tempting to dwell only on the political aspects of the measure, but I intend to put that temptation aside, at least until the end of my speech, and to deal with several other matters contained in the Bill. The measure is divided into two parts, I suppose we could say. The first part of the Bill, which so far has received little comment from those who have spoken, deals with the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission. The second part of the Bill provides for the repeal of the Early Closing Act and the insertion of a new Part XV, dealing with trading hours.

I should like first to say something about what I will call the industrial provisions of the Bill. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of an unspecified number of Deputy Presidents. Members will recall that, when the Industrial Code was enacted in 1967, there was provision for only a President. In 1969, during the term of office of the previous Government, we provided for the appointment of one deputy. This Bill provides for the appointment of an unspecified number of deputies. Of itself, I suppose that that is unobjectionable. The Minister did not really support it in his explanation, but what he left unsaid is far more significant than what he said.

It is widely rumoured (indeed, it is more than a rumour: I think it is accepted) that the intention of the present Government is to transfer from the Local and District Criminal Courts to the Industrial Court the workmen's compensation jurisdiction. This has been Labor Party policy for several years, although I have never understood why and the reasons have never been disclosed. With great respect to those who form the staff of the Industrial Court, I cannot believe for a moment that the jurisdiction will be any more capably handled by that court than it is handled under the present arrangements which are themselves the result of legislation introduced by the previous Government. We provided in the Intermediate

Courts legislation last year that workmen's compensation jurisdiction should be handled by the Local and District Criminal Courts judges, and that is being done at present, I believe, very well; I am certain that all members of the legal profession would agree with me in that. It is generally believed that one of the prices the new Attorney-General had to pay to get his Party to accept the Intermediate Courts scheme, which had been fought by the then Opposition when I introduced the proposal in the House, was to agree to the transfer of this jurisdiction to the Industrial Court. I have more than a suspicion (it is almost a certainty) that the real reason for the provision here for the appointment of Deputy Presidents is to allow this to be done in due course. I do not agree with this intention, but as it is not contained in the Bill I shall not argue it further.

Mr. Coumbe: Will it make any difference?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not think it will make the slightest difference. This jurisdiction is being capably handled now and will still be capably handled; it will be just a change without any real purpose in it. That is the real reason for the provision for additional Deputy Presidents. The next point I refer to concerns the position of the Industrial Magistrate. New section 9b in clause 6 of the Bill is a reproduction of the present section 126a of the Code and is in very similar terms. As is known to many members, the present Industrial Magistrate is Mr. Keith Hilton, who is also the Industrial Registrar. He is a man who has not been admitted as a legal practitioner in this State, but he does have a law degree and has had much experience. He is carrying out the duties assigned to him at present as Industrial Magistrate competently and to general satisfaction, and I have no complaint about that. I am rather perturbed with the provisions in clause 7 of the Bill, which enacts a new section 10 providing, in new subsection (2), as follows:

The Industrial Court shall be constituted of—

(a) two or more judges;

(b) a judge; or

(c) the industrial magistrate, as the President may direct.

That final phrase is a safeguard, because we hope that the President will direct the constitution of the court as may be appropriate to the matters that come before it. I point out to the Attorney-General that the Industrial Court, pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Code, has a wide jurisdiction and wide powers. It is undesirable, even if it is only

in theory, that the Industrial Magistrate should have those powers bestowed on him, and him alone, even if only at the direction of the President. Yet that is what in terms this clause will allow to be done, and one result will be that it will be possible for the Industrial Magistrate to hear appeals from courts of summary jurisdiction. In other words, one magistrate could hear appeals from the decisions of another magistrate or other magistrates. This is undesirable, and I regret that the Bill has been drawn in this way. I hope the Minister will reconsider this and that perhaps the clause can be amended.

I come now to clauses 19 and 20, which deal with the declaration of the State living wage. I have no quarrel with these provisions: in fact, I think they are desirable. Last year, when we were faced with the decision of the Commonwealth court, I, as acting Minister of Labour and Industry for the member for Torrens, had to make well over 100 separate applications to the court for the application of the Commonwealth decision to State awards. One of my friends in the trade union movement told me that as a result I would not be opposed at the next election. I was disappointed—I was opposed! He was a highly placed official of the Trades Hall, where I have many friends.

These clauses are clearly desirable, because it was a very cumbersome process to go through if workers under State awards were to receive the benefits of the Commonwealth decision. They plainly had to receive them, and immediately. I was glad to be able to co-operate in that way. Those are the only points I make on what I call the industrial provisions of the Bill but, before I get on to the wider question of trading hours and as we are dealing with the Bill itself, there are some detailed matters in it which I can canvass now. They are all, I think, in clause 45, which is the most important clause dealing with trading hours. First of all, we have new sections 221 and 222. They are the ones I have particularly in mind and they deal with hairdressers. I have had representations from hairdressers about the 15-minute period of grace in which I think they are now allowed to finish off a customer after closing time.

Mrs. Steele: That is proper.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I must say that the member for Davenport's hair always looks delightful, as does that of the member for Tea Tree Gully. The styles are different but they are both attractive. Perhaps I could say

the same about the member for Heysen, too. I used that term loosely without reflecting on the various members of this House.

Mr. McKee: Haven't you anything to say?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am told that, with modern techniques of rinsing and drying and whatever girls have to put on their hair nowadays, a quarter of an hour is not long enough to finish a customer. The Minister and I are probably not well versed in these matters.

Mr. McKee: You speak for yourself.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am told that sometimes one customer, client, or whatever the proper term may be, takes up to two hours or more. Luckily, I do not suffer from this in our family. My wife goes to the hairdresser mercifully rather infrequently only to have it cut, I am told.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You don't pay much attention then, do you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am told that sometimes girls stay for a much longer time at a hairdresser's, and that the period of grace, 15 minutes allowed here, is not sufficiently long.

Mr. Rodda: What about Susie? Does she have a clip?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, our present bitch Mollie has long hair but we deal with it ourselves. I suggest to the Minister that it may be appropriate to amend new section 222 (6).

Mr. Rodda: What will people in Salisbury say about this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have not reached the wider question yet. It may be wise to amend this new subsection to make the period of 15 minutes apply to paragraph (a) but to provide that in completing the hairdressing of a customer we allow an unlimited length of time, providing the customer was in the shop for a specified period before closing time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You just said it takes two hours.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so, but I think it would more appropriately fit modern techniques of hairdressing. Although I refer to this matter now, perhaps we could deal with it later, and I hope that I will not suffer the same embarrassment again. I will mug up on the question of women's haircuts before we get to it next time. New section 226 deals with the sale of petrol, oil, and lubricants. This provision I think (and I am open to correction here) is substantially the same as the provision in the Early Closing Act at

present. I find it difficult to understand the declared intention of the Government, in view of its overall intention with regard to trading hours, to leave petrol selling as it stands at present.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It does not cause any problems.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see. This new section leaves the matter entirely at the discretion of the Minister, and in Committee I will ask him to set out clearly what is intended here and whether it is intended that service stations in the present metropolitan area should continue to operate as they operate now, and whether those in the outer areas should also continue to operate as they operate at present.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I can tell you now that the answer will be "Yes".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This seems to weaken very greatly the arguments that the Minister has put on more general matters. Finally, I come to a matter on which I think something should be said: we have in new section 227 the provisions for the constitution or abolition of shopping districts. The scheme contained in this new section had been suggested to me when I was Minister and I think that, overall, it is good.

Mr. McKee: Then why didn't you do something about it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I really did not have very much time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You had a Bill before the House that had nothing in it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will come to that.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I hope you do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that, overall, it is a good scheme, and I certainly have not been able to think of a better one. However, there are a couple of points in it that merit examination. New section 227 (4) provides:

The council must attempt to ascertain the views of shopkeepers, shop assistants and other interested persons . . .

The order of priorities in this provision is significant: the general public, the customers, come third. Nevertheless, that does not matter.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Wouldn't the general public be represented by the council?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But the council has to attempt to ascertain the views of the people on the subject of the application, and the application must be accompanied by a statement of those views. This is very broad and

vague, and I suppose it has not been possible to frame it any more definitely. However, it does seem to be unsatisfactorily broad to say that the council must attempt to ascertain the views. I cannot see why we have to leave it at an attempt: I cannot see why we cannot say that the council must ascertain the views of the people in the district.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It might not get a reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I mention that in passing. New section 227 (5) is open to more specific objection; it provides:

The Minister may direct the council to conduct such further inquiries or polls as he thinks necessary or expedient . . .

Presumably, this will be done at the expense of the council in each case. This means that the Minister will lay down (and it is entirely at the Minister's discretion, as the provision is drawn) what the council has to do, but the council has to find the manpower and the finance to do it. This could be quite a burdensome provision on councils, too, and I draw attention to it because of that potential disadvantage. Perhaps members who are experienced in local government will care to give some thought to these things. Finally, we come to the third and fourth schedules, entitled "Exempted Shops" and "Exempted Goods". The Minister, my successor, has jeered at me many times because of the Bill—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I did not jeer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is how it sounds to me. The Minister has jeered at me many times because of the Bill I introduced last November, but I am glad to see that the schedule he has here is, in the case of exempted shops, exactly the same as the schedule I introduced in my Bill.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But these were prepared by the previous Labor Government. We were waiting for you to do something about it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The fourth schedule includes candles, cards, fireworks, panty hose and stockings. It is in precisely the same form as the schedule I introduced last year, so at least my Bill had some merit in it after all. I consider that in 100 years' time, or perhaps in 10 years or 20 years' time, people will think that we were mad to legislate in such a way as this.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How long will we have to wait?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Many people think the Government is mad now. It is a most extraordinary way to legislate—to set out 100 or so items and say that a person can sell those but nothing else. I know that this has a long history and that we are stuck with it, but it is really an absurdity when Parliament has to concern itself with whether one can, after a certain hour of the day, buy oysters or panty hose or eye pluckers or whatever women use on their eyebrows. However, that is just by the way. The fact is that the list of exempted goods will be so wide as to allow a far larger number of shops to open, quite apart from the shops or the classes of shops that are themselves exempted, than at the present time. This is a factor to be borne in mind in considering the overall problems that we have.

With regard to those overall problems that are so vexing us all, particularly members opposite, I should like to say something about trading hours. I acknowledge, as I think every member must acknowledge, the extreme difficulty of this problem. It is a problem that should not have been allowed to develop as it has over the years: it should have been tackled a long time ago, and the metropolitan area of Adelaide should have been extended as it grew. With every month that has passed, the problem has become more difficult to solve; there is no doubt about that. We faced this problem and, presumably, the previous Government during the period 1965 to 1968 faced it but did nothing about it, so both Parties must take some responsibility for this.

Mr. Payne: What about back as far as 1960?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not for a moment try to defend the lack of action by the Government then.

Mr. Payne: That Government had 30 years in which to do something.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Mitchell wants to rub that one home, he is entitled to do so. He likes to make these points. Having acknowledged this, let us move on to the point that it is quite obviously utterly unfair that people within a certain area should not be able to trade when they wish while their competitors outside that area, which has become entirely artificial, are allowed to trade. In other words, the lack of uniformity is quite unjust and cannot be defended, and it should not have been allowed to develop to the stage that it has.

As the Minister knows and as he has reminded me many times (and as I have freely

acknowledged), I did not find a solution to this problem, nor did the member for Torrens, during the time that we were in office. I was rather attracted to a scheme which I think I have mentioned in the House before but which has not commended itself to the present Government, nor (if I may say so in fairness to all) did it commend itself to those to whom I mentioned it while I was in office. This scheme, which I still think is the best solution to the problem, involves the laying down of periods of time during which shops could open; it could be quite a long period, probably 50 or 60 hours during the week, with perhaps no hours on Saturday or, if this was desirable, no Sunday and no Saturday afternoon or Saturday night opening. We would then say to shopkeepers, "All right, within those brackets of hours you may open for up to 40 hours," or whatever it may be, "and that means that if you are going to be open on Friday night you will have to be closed on Monday morning," or something of that nature.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That would appeal to the workers in the industry no end!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it would be a matter on which the retailers, the union, and those who are not in the union (as we know, a high proportion of those who work in the retail trade are not unionists) would have to agree, but once the shopkeeper had decided when he would open he would have to notify the Department of Labour and Industry, and he would be bound for a certain period to those hours. That would, I believe, allow flexibility, and it would mean that we could control the hours within limits; we could lay down times when shops were not to be open, but it would allow some flexibility, and it would also prevent over-long hours of opening or trading for any one business.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you find anyone who would support you on that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I found some but, I admit, not many.

Mr. Clark: Some oversea countries have a similar practice.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I thought it had much to commend it but, from his rather antagonistic interjections, the Minister is obviously not attracted by it. Perhaps if he followed this line a bit further and worked it out, he would not have had the problem he has now.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It is not a problem.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was the line of approach that most appealed to me, but I admit the difficulty of the problem, and I admit that there is no perfect solution to it. Whatever we do, someone will be hurt, and someone will be angry about it, but we just cannot help that. My belief is that in spite of the problem of increased costs there should be freer trading hours.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Irrespective of the cost?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I said that in spite of increased costs I would prefer that, and I should like to see 9 p.m. closing (I am talking now in the context of the present situation) on Fridays uniformly throughout the whole area.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Would you admit that costs could be increased by as much as 7 per cent?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I believe that that is the figure that it would reach. I should not be firm on that, but I would accept it; that is the estimate that has been given to me. If the Minister would like to know, I voted that way at his referendum. I may say that my wife balanced me out by voting the other way, so that as a family unit we did not contribute.

Mr. Jennings: Well, then, she is the more intelligent member of the family.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take it from that that the member for Ross Smith voted "No"—

Mr. Jennings: I did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —because he regards himself as intelligent. My wife and I balanced ourselves out, and therefore did not contribute overall to the "Yes" majority in the District of Fisher, in which we live at present. What I have outlined is what I should like to do; that is what I think is the solution. There should be uniformity, and I believe in freer trading hours and, therefore, in allowing shops to open until 9 p.m. But the sad fact is (and all members of this House will agree that the fact is sad, but members on the other side cannot say so) that we had a referendum, and we are stuck with the result of it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If people were not prepared to pay the extra costs and voted "No", why is it sad?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am now talking politically. We have had a referendum, we are stuck with the result, and no-one knows that better than the Minister knows it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not agree with the Minister in his reference to democracy in the second reading explanation—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I am not surprised at that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —in which he said:

However, in a democracy it is necessary that the will of the majority expressed at the ballot box be accepted, and this is what we have done.

As I understand democracy, one of its hallmarks is tolerance of the views of minorities, but there is no room in the solution contained in the Bill for toleration of the views of minorities.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Isn't that a pretty general fact of life in almost every field?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not think so, and it need not necessarily be the case here. In his explanation, the Minister referred to the results of the referendum set out in the *Government Gazette* on October 8, where it is shown that 10 of the 32 districts gave a "Yes" majority, some of them by an enormous margin: for example, Elizabeth, which was 9,376 to 2,442, and so on. I believe that, in accordance with the tenets of democracy, we should pay some attention to that result. Let me remind members of the following statement made by the Premier before the referendum was held (and this appears at page 754 of *Hansard*):

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.

Yet that is exactly what the Government is intending to do in this Bill. There has been little argument about the fact that we are already taking away the right of those who now have it to trade on Saturday afternoons and Sundays.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you agree to that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am prepared to accept it, but I do not believe we should take away the right to trade on Friday night in those areas where trading at that time has become a way of life. I believe that, if we are to accept this Bill (and I am prepared to accept it at the second reading stage in the hope that the amendments on the file, including my own, will be accepted), it is only a temporary solution. Finally, in the few minutes I have left, I wish

to deal with three lessons that have come out of this whole unhappy business; it has been particularly unhappy for the Government.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Not at all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The first lesson is that a referendum is a fool of a way to try to govern or legislate for a community, and I think the Government would now agree with me in that; it is a stupid way of legislating. In my view, members of Parliament are elected to take this responsibility. If people do not like what members do during their term of office, the people can chuck them out at the next election.

Mr. Clark: That's fair enough, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: To run back to the people when there is a nut that is a bit too hard to crack, to ask, "What would you like to do?" and then to ask an unsatisfactory question is a very silly way to govern. When we realize that the cost of this referendum, for the result we have got, is over \$70,000 we see that it is to all intents and purposes a complete waste of money. For a much smaller outlay, the Government could have obtained a much more accurate result by going to Mr. Roy Morgan and asking him to conduct a public opinion poll. Not until a few weeks before the referendum was held did I see the results of the public opinion poll conducted in December, 1969. I knew at the time that it had been carried out, but I did not get the results of it until some time just before the referendum.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But the questions asked were completely different.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know that they were: the results of the public opinion poll were reflected fairly well in the referendum result. I think that, if the Government had known about this before it plunged into the referendum, it might not have done so, for this survey showed the views on closing time throughout the year. A total of 61.2 per cent said the present hours were satisfactory, only 36.4 per cent said they should be later, 1.3 per cent did not care and our friends the "undecided" were 1.1 per cent.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: In what district were the people questioned?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the Minister knew all about this.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then why ask me? However, if we dissect the 36.4 who wanted later closing, we find that only 20.3 per cent

wanted closing at 9 p.m. on Fridays and 11.30 a.m. on Saturdays. When I saw these results, I realized that the optimistic forecasts of the Minister were not likely to be borne out. Before I saw the results, I thought there would be a "Yes" vote, but the Government would have done better, from the point of view of the cost involved, if it had commissioned another public opinion poll and been prepared to be guided by that. So the first lesson we learn is that referendums are wasteful, unsatisfactory, and, in my view, not the way to proceed.

The second point is that there is no doubt in anybody's mind, if there ever was before (and there was not in mine), that the Australian Labor Party is dominated from outside. The photographs which appeared in the *Advertiser* a week ago last Saturday reminded me very much of the photographs taken of Mr. Calwell and Mr. Whitlam skulking in the bushes at Canberra waiting for the Federal executive to give a decision on the North-West Cape some years ago, which confirmed to the public of Australia that the Australian Labor Party was controlled by the 30 faceless men. The Premier and the member for Tea Tree Gully were rushing into the hideout at Klemzig and were photographed through a telephoto lens, showing perfectly clearly the impasse in which the Labor Party found itself; it had to sneak away and hold some meetings with the trade union movement to find out what it was going to do.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That is nonsense.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No member opposite has denied this. We have had silence on this. All through the preceding week the Minister denied that anything would happen on the Saturday morning. He knew nothing about any meeting, but he was there. The third lesson that comes out of this is that the A.L.P. members are not agents free to represent their electors. When the chips are down they have to support their Party irrespective of their own or their electors' wishes.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you going to vote according to your electors' wishes—the 55 per cent of them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I shall do that. The amendments I will support will allow me to do that, and they will allow the member for Playford and others the same freedom as I have. We have the spectacle of the member for Playford, who was triumphantly elected to this place not long ago, saying publicly that it

might cost him his seat, yet we know he has been told by his trade union friends that it is not a question of whether he will lose his seat: if he does not toe the line, he will lose his preselection.

Mr. McRae: I will show you when I speak!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members opposite are bound to support their Party whether or not they believe in it, whether or not it is in accord with the specifically declared wishes of their electors. They are bound hand and foot. They cannot come into this place and vote according to their conscience or the wishes of their electors. We have said that time and time again in this place. This is one more example of that fact.

I have stated the three lessons that I put before members opposite. I know they will not learn, because they never learn from experience. If they did they would not repeat the mistakes that they make time and time again. Mr. Speaker, do not have any more referendums; do not allow the Parliamentary Party to be dominated from outside by the trade union movement as it is now, and, Mr. Speaker, for heavens sake allow members in the A.L.P. more freedom to exercise their vote and franchise in accordance with their own convictions and those of their electors.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Mr. Millhouse announced that he was not going to be political—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! The member must be referred to by his correct title: the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Jennings: I know what I would call him, then.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: I do not indulge in name calling. The member for Mitcham said that he would not be political in his address. I think he was a little bitchy from time to time, but I will deal with that matter as we go. As he did, I intend to deal with the whole Bill—because we are considering the Industrial Code Amendment Bill (and it behoves members to consider all the provisions)—before I discuss some of the points the honourable member made towards the end of his speech. I congratulate the Minister and the Government for including clauses 6 and 7. These provisions provide for more than one Deputy President. The member for Mitcham apparently thought that some person appointed Deputy President would specialize in a certain

jurisdiction. I remind him (and he should know this from his experience as a Minister) that at present we have only one Deputy President of the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission. The member for Torrens knows this.

This is the only State of the Commonwealth where the Deputy President of the court and the commission is also the Public Service Arbitrator. Let me remind the House (and I know it will not be contradicted by Opposition members) that that gentleman has a heavy load to carry, but he carries it very well. I cannot believe that members opposite will prevent the appointment of a further Deputy President to enable the proper carrying out of the roles of the court, the commission, and the Public Service Arbitrator.

Mr. Coumbe: I don't think that was suggested.

Mr. McRAE: I found myself in some difficulty after hearing the member for Mitcham's comments. At one stage in this State, under a Liberal Government, Mr. Justice Williams (as he is now), then President of the State Industrial Court and Commission, had the triple role of President of the Court, President of the Commission, and Public Service Arbitrator. What a crushing load he had to carry. I know that two former Ministers agree with me on this matter, and I cannot believe that they would disagree to this proposal. I know that they would both agree that the time has come to acknowledge the real status of our court and commission in industrial matters. It is a status that is acknowledged in New South Wales and Western Australia, but for some peculiar reason it is being consistently attacked in this State. I do not like to see that. I do not suggest that either of the honourable gentlemen was attacking the status of our court and commission, but unfortunately some attacks are being made, and the persons who are making these attacks are behaving foolishly.

I believe this is a most important court and commission, and its role cannot be underestimated. We need the best men to take these roles, and I fully support the attempt now being made to take some of the load off the shoulders of these men. Although I have not always agreed with the views of the present Deputy President of the Industrial Commission, particularly in relation to procedure, I am the first to acknowledge that he is a very hard-working, fair and unbiased man. For that reason I am pleased to see this provision.

The next provision in the same clause deals with the role of the Industrial Magistrate. Once again, I was very much surprised to hear certain remarks that were made by the member for Mitcham, on which I will have to comment. As I understand the Bill, the opportunity is being given to persons who are alleged to be guilty of breaches of the Industrial Code in its wide aspect (covering, as it does, breaches of awards, factory regulations, safety provisions and shopping hours) to be heard and dealt with by an Industrial Magistrate. Now, I do not really believe that either the member for Mitcham or the member for Torrens would quarrel with that. The current situation is such that wellknown companies and reputable employers, who are being charged with perhaps technical breaches of factory regulations, are being forced to have their cases heard by magistrates who, excellent as they are, are the first to admit that they know nothing of the industrial regulations and are the first to admit that they have never been on a factory floor to see some of this machinery operating.

I think it is excellent that the situation has now been reached when these alleged offences can be heard by a person who knows not only the law but also the workings of industry. Once again, I am sure that the two gentlemen will agree with me that that is a good thing. It has been seriously suggested around the city (and I find this terribly hard to believe) that, in relation to offences under this legislation, we ought to be indicting people to the Criminal Court. I am horrified at the very suggestion that we ought to be indicting such people along with rapists, murderers, and people with violent tendencies. I do not say that these breaches are to be condoned at all, but I do say that they cannot compare in any way with breaches of the criminal law. I am permitted to say that the Secretary of the South Australian Employers Federation only this evening expressed to me his personal dissatisfaction at the thought that such a rumour could be true, and I am permitted to say by the same gentleman, who is known throughout the Commonwealth for his experience in industrial matters (and to both the honourable gentlemen), that he would very much like to see, on behalf of his organization, the situation proposed by the Bill.

Mr. Coumbe: When did you hear that rumour?

Mr. McRAE: I spoke to the honourable gentleman a short time ago and I have his

full authority to make this statement. These rumours are current around the city at present, and I shall be only too pleased if they are not true. Clause 19 deals with the application of the national wage case decision to our State living wage. Everyone would agree that the proposal in the Bill is excellent. It will give the proper flexibility that has been lacking for some time. It will also avoid the situation in which the last incumbent of the office of Minister of Labour and Industry found himself a short time ago—a very uncomfortable position in which he had to deal piecemeal with over 100 awards and attempt to insert what was known as an economic loading, well knowing that such a provision could be unlawful. Therefore, I am glad that that situation has been overcome.

I am also glad that clause 20 provides that the minimum wage as set in the National Wage Case can be applied into our State wage structure. As I have often argued, we are going to find ourselves in a ludicrous position if we advance from a two-tier or three-tier wage structure into a four-tier or a five-tier structure and finally have an unlimited number of tiers in our wage structure. Therefore, this provision, as well as affording some pleasure to me, will be of great benefit to the State.

I find myself looking at the provision in clause 38 with some feeling. That deals with the situation of some unfortunate organizations (once again I think the member for Torrens, the former Minister, agrees with me) which, because they had some members in the Commonwealth Public Service, were unable to gain registration in our court and commission. This matter has now been dealt with, and that certainly gives me pleasure. I also agree with the member for Mitcham that the provision relating to the new definition of the metropolitan area is a realistic and much needed provision, both in industrial matters and also in relation to shopping hours.

I now turn to a matter that has certainly created a very lively interest in my district and its surrounding areas. I refer to the matter of shopping hours. The provision relating to Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading I thoroughly approve of, and I always have. My personal position, which I shall make clear, was this: I did not agree that there was any justification whatsoever for trading after 5.30 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday. I did agree (and I argued this strongly) that there was good reason to

permit trading in my district between 5.30 p.m. and 9 p.m. on Friday.

Mr. Gunn: You have the opportunity to support it.

Mr. McRAE: I shall deal with that question presently. I also agreed that it was proper that there should be trading on Saturday morning. I could not agree that there was any valid reason for trading on Saturday afternoon or Sunday. Indeed, I suggest that the difficulty in which we find ourselves today was largely caused by certain unscrupulous persons who took advantage of the provisions of the Act to trade on Saturday afternoon and Sunday. These were companies in the retail meat, the hardware and the furniture areas who, regardless of any rules of common decency, opened for trade in certain selected areas on Saturday afternoon and Sunday. In doing that, they had no thought for the welfare of their own industry and of the community. In fact, by their action they put the whole community in an intolerable position. I will not engage in any name calling of these companies, but I point out that that is the fact. If certain backbenchers opposite cared to check with the former Ministers, they would find that that was very likely the opinion of the former Ministers.

The provision in relation to the closing of shops in the outer metropolitan area on Friday nights is not what I personally would have wanted; nor is it what my district wanted. In fact, for the edification of everyone opposite, the vote in my district was 77.2 per cent for the retention of Friday night shopping.

Mr. Millhouse: Why aren't you going to support it?

Mr. McRAE: I am about to tell the House. The question put bluntly to me by my own constituents is whether or not I support the current Bill in relation to that specific clause, and I have announced that I shall support it. I have also announced the reason for this, without trying to hide it, as, for example, Dr. Eastick knows (he was at the meeting at the Octagon on Monday evening), and I am not ashamed of the reason. The reason that I support that provision, even though it is not what I would want, and even though it is not what my constituents would want, is the pledge that I have given to the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Mathwin: Is that why you never cross the floor?

Mr. McRAE: If the member for Glenelg will let me continue, I fully acknowledge that there must be a further question.

Mr. Gunn: That would be about the secret meeting.

Mr. McRAE: I will deal with that alleged secret meeting in a moment. The other question that must be put is as follows: is this position a valid one? I acknowledge that this is one of the most striking instances in which a Labor member is faced with a glaring example of the wishes of his constituents on an issue, as against his pledge given to the Party. In fact, I asked myself whether I could maintain a valid position in this matter and, whether or not members care to believe it, I assure them that I spent much time thinking about my position, trying to ascertain what was the correct position to take, and trying to be honourable about the whole situation. My decision was based seriously in this way: I was elected as the member for Playford as a member of the A.L.P. I would not have been elected as an Independent and I would certainly not have been elected as a member of the Liberal and Country League.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: Nor would I have been elected as a member of any other political Party. As I see it, I was elected only on the basis that I would support the Labor Party platform in its entirety and support the majority decision of Caucus. The position of A.L.P. members is so well known that I can only assume that this was known to persons in my district at the time of the May election. It has been suggested that I can support the Government generally, but not on this issue. However, I find that suggestion totally irrational, and I cannot adopt that attitude. It has also been suggested that I could abstain from voting, but I would find that even worse: I find it utterly untenable. As I saw it, as a man who for many years has strongly believed in the purposes of the A.L.P., there were only two choices open to me: either I supported this clause of the Bill on the basis of the pledge or, alternatively, I resigned the seat completely and got out of the whole political scene. I must say that I seriously considered the latter course; whether or not members opposite believe it, I try to be a man of conscience.

A decision to resign the seat would assume that the constituents of Playford, because of one matter on which they disagreed very strongly with the rest of the population, would want their member to resign, disregarding all other matters covered in the A.L.P. platform. I cannot accept that that would be their wish.

This idea of a pledge is something for which I have not resiled. I put it to my electors publicly and as clearly and as fearlessly as possible at the Octagon on Monday evening, and I do not resile from it now.

The idea of a pledge is nothing new. Frankly, I am amused when I hear claims from members opposite that they have a much greater freedom of action than have Labor members. It is true that no member of the Labor Party is free to vote in Parliament contrary to the majority decision of Caucus, except on social questions. It is also theoretically true that Liberal members are free to vote according to conscience; that is to say, I accept that they are not pledged candidates. However, I find it most remarkable that their conscience and the vote of Caucus always coincide. The occasions on which Liberal Party members have voted against the instructions of their Whip have been few indeed. A certain amount of research indicates to me that over about the past 40 years no Liberal Party or Conservative Party member in Australia has voted in such a way as to bring down a Liberal or Conservative Government. For all practical purposes the Liberal Party has adopted an attitude that is in every way as disciplined as that of the A.L.P.

Mr. Hall: No.

Mr. McRAE: The Leader guffaws at that. Let me quote one example (and it was a striking example) of the case of Mr. St. John, who, when he was elected to the Commonwealth Parliament, was a wellknown and honoured member of the Liberal Party; he was a distinguished man indeed. On many issues he took up an attitude of conscience, to the embarrassment of the Government. It is true when members opposite say that Mr. St. John did in fact vote contrary to the wishes of the majority of the Liberal Party, but he was adequately dealt with on preselection: he was well and truly knocked down. Let no member opposite try to convince the people otherwise. The discipline exercised inside the Liberal Party is every bit as strict as that exercised inside the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: Members opposite can shout but, if they disobey the directions of their Whip, they will get knocked down on preselection. It is a gutless position they are adopting, because I am free to say what I like now. I accept the will of the majority if it is contrary to my point of view. I say that publicly and I said it on Monday last. I make no secret of it, but members opposite hide

behind a masquerade of some sort of freedom. They well know that the Party, one way or another, will crack the whip in the end. People it does not like it soon gets rid of.

It is sometimes suggested that Party discipline (and it is obvious that there is a system of Party discipline of some kind, even if members opposite will not agree with me as far as I go) and acceptance of the rule of the majority has caused some declining standards from a golden age in the past. People say, "Let us look at the House of Commons at Westminster as it was 100 or 200 years ago, and we will put this up as a model of what things should be." That is the usual argument put forward. Let me assure members that the very people who use that argument forget that in the House of Commons until recently, although there were many hundreds of members, only a few ever spoke or took an active part in the debates. Members opposite who have done any reading or research know that that is true. The situation was reached where the result of a Bill or the fate of a Government was not known from day to day. Many members of the House of Commons were elected in pocket boroughs; they came to Westminster on their own choice, and at their whim they would put Governments in or out. That was the instability of the nineteenth century system.

So the Conservative, Liberal and Socialist Parties at the beginning of the twentieth century introduced the caucus system. This very distaste for Party politics, the sort of attitude that maintains that Party politics have degraded Parliament, does not really indicate that a person is a democrat: on the contrary, it indicates that he is frightened of democracy.

Let me give a comparison. We know the philosophy of the members of the other place in this Parliament. We are often told by members opposite that members of the other place do not attend their Caucus meetings. They share a philosophy, however, and that philosophy is to make sure that at all times some men will be more equal than others. That is the only thing one can be sure of, but it is a pretty good thing to be sure of because it will defeat most of the democratic measures put forward in relation to franchise, compulsory voting, age of voting, and other such matters. I am suggesting that that type of system is far worse than the system that I acknowledge I am bound by. I am proud to be bound by it, and I make no secret of that.

To me the relevant issues for my constituents fall under three heads: First, was I well informed on the issues? Secondly, did I promote their cause to the best of my ability? Thirdly, have I been honest and open to them at all times? On the first question of information, I think I can honestly say that from the time I was elected I took every opportunity, by way of discussion with the Salisbury corporation, the Elizabeth corporation, the Retail Traders Association, individual companies, and a wide range of constituents, to make myself aware of their views and of the difficulties with which I and they were faced. On the second point, did I to the best of my ability promote their cause? Once again I can say, "Yes", to the limit of my ability within the opportunities open to me by press, radio, television, public meetings, and any other means I could think of, I tried hard to put their point of view.

I had difficulties with the local newspaper, the *Messenger Press*. It would not print anything, no doubt because it was frightened of certain of its advertisers. But I must say that the other media were fairly generous within their limits. I have no complaints about that treatment and have nothing to be worried about. I did my best to promote the cause of my constituents, and I think I can say that the Government members involved did every bit as much as the Leader in trying to put this case across to the people. Following the referendum there was considerable debate as to interpretation. Once again, I make no secret that I tried in every way to put the view across that one could sectionalize the result.

The third point is whether I have at every stage been honest and open with my constituents. I hope that I have been: certainly at every stage I have been open to scrutiny. On Monday evening I was called to a meeting, about which I shall speak briefly later. I was asked certain definite questions in the usual straightforward manner that the people adopt in the District of Playford, and I suffered a certain amount of punishment. Nevertheless, I was open and left no doubt in the minds of my constituents that I stood by the pledge that I had taken. Whether my constituents agree that that argument was rational or not, at least it was put to them.

Both the Leader of the Opposition and Dr. Eastick know that in their presence I challenged everyone present to dispute the logic of what I was saying and put to them that, if they did not agree with my logic, they had their

remedy in the ballot box. On the question of being open, I think I cannot be challenged. On the question of honesty, that is a subjective matter, but in my view I have tried to be completely honest.

I must make one or two points on the meeting at the Octagon Theatre, because the matter was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. First, during the short time I have been in this Parliament I have always been impressed by my predecessor in that area, Mr. Clark, who is known throughout the area as a very honourable gentleman, and, indeed, I know that he is. Last night there was a certain confusion between the Leader and Mr. Clark on what was said at the meeting. In deference to them both, I should like to comment shortly. True, Mr. Clark made a reference, using the word "key", in regard to members in another place. By the same token, I personally had the impression that what Mr. Clark was intending to convey—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not refer to members by their names. He must refer to them by their districts. The Standing Orders are specific on that.

Mr. McRAE: By the same token, I was quite convinced that the member for Elizabeth intended to convey that he was disappointed that the electors of the district had not seen fit to put the members in another place in the position that we were in. I must confess that in the uproar this sort of thing can be misunderstood. So, I hope the interchange across the House last night, in which words like "liar" and "hypocrite" were used, was caused in the confusion of the moment. I certainly could not accept that the member for Elizabeth was a hypocrite or anything like it, nor could I accept that the Leader was a liar. This sort of situation arose in the heat of the moment, and it was something that could easily arise.

I must also refer to the position of Mr. Duffield. I accept Mr. Duffield's position: he, as Mayor of the Corporation of Elizabeth, does have a duty to advance the interests of his city as best he can and, in doing that according to his conscience, I do not dispute it. By the same token, I do not get involved in any disputes inside the corporation as to payment of expenses or who has authority or power to do certain things. Those matters are entirely for the corporation.

By the same token, although I accept Mr. Duffield as being genuine, it cannot be denied

that the meeting was heavily politically loaded. In fact, unfortunately it was a rather squalid affair, because Mr. Duffield unfortunately, genuine though he was, did not understand that, on his own Party philosophy (and he is openly a member of the Liberal Party, and proud of it), four other persons should have been present. I refer to the honourable gentlemen who represent the Midland District in the Legislative Council; they were not present. He also failed to understand that it was an affront to the people of the area that, whereas he invited the Leader, he did not invite the Premier. We had an extraordinary interchange earlier, in which someone actually suggested that the Premier should have attended at the Octagon Theatre as a sort of mendicant and tried to scramble his way through the milling throng so that he might be heard at some stage.

I must also refer to the motion that was put. I would not like to think that this motion was in any way in contempt of Parliament; in any event, it did not upset me. However, I cannot avoid commenting that the motion, which someone attempted to put, was something like a preamble to the Constitution. It seems to me that the gentleman who moved it must surely have sought his solicitor's advice before bringing it up or, alternatively, he was a man of consummate drafting skill, because I am sure the Parliamentary Draftsman would have been proud of it. Therefore, I could not help feeling that there was some type of political under-tone there.

Mr. Payne: Do you think that it was put up?

Mr. McRAE: I am very careful in making personal attacks, and I do not suggest that it was put up: I prefer to look at the philosophies behind these things. It is apparent to me that it would be of great advantage to Elizabeth and Para Hills to continue the sectional advantage they have now, if it was possible for them to retain it. I would be a fool to say otherwise, and Mr. Duffield would be a fool to strive otherwise, because this differential advantage has proved to be of such great benefit to the traders and the people in the area. However, on what the Leader himself has said, it has become apparent that uniformity is the only answer in this. Whether all the shops are open or all the shops are shut, we must have uniformity.

Unfortunately, many people have disregarded what would have happened on the Leader's suggestion. He suggested quite openly that

there should be open slather. Let us assume that the restriction was taken away to the extent that everyone could trade on Friday night. It would be utter foolishness to suggest that Elizabeth and Para Hills would still retain any sort of advantage if that state of affairs existed. The plain fact of the matter is that if that were the case the people in the town centre but even more so the people in the Vale, the south and the east (forgotten people in this whole issue) would be the ones to suffer very badly indeed. Many shopkeepers have personally advanced that attitude to me. No-one can say that the constituents of Playford are happy, and I do not say that I am happy, either.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you do something about it?

Mr. Jennings: He is doing something about it.

Mr. McRAE: I am sure that the constituents of Playford, being the good people that they are, will understand the problems that have confronted various Governments. I cannot help commenting on the ironical situation that has been reached. Really, what is happening is that a Labor Government is going out of its way to tackle a problem that was far too hot for its predecessors to tackle. The irony of the situation is that the people we are helping, namely, the shopkeepers and the retail traders, are the very people who put their hands in their pockets to support the Liberal cause. However, we are going this far and I, as a convinced supporter of the Labor movement, am going this far to maintain my honour in the situation to help these very people.

I suggest that the Liberal Party will find itself in a most interesting position here. The Leader has a personal attitude and, to be quite fair to him, I admit that he said that this was a personal attitude only. As a personal attitude, he advocated unrestricted trading. Nevertheless, he conceded that the only solution was uniformity, otherwise he foresaw great problems. By the same token, he also suggests a sectionalization of the referendum, and that surely is quite contrary to the basic logic with which he was trying to proceed. I suggest that the real situation is something like I will now indicate. The Opposition well knows that the Bill will proceed through this House unamended and that it will also proceed through the Legislative Council unamended. It will proceed through the Legislative Council unamended because the invisible men up there, ably prompted by the retail traders who will

be protecting them, will not oppose the Bill but, in the meantime, every form of political capital will be made out of this issue.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute to go.

Mr. McRAE: However, I am not unduly worried about the position. As I see it, the constituents of Playford are not insensitive to logic; indeed, I should hate to hear anyone in my presence say that they were. There will be repercussions, and I hope that, particularly in the employment area, the Minister will consider these matters, especially in relation to casual workers. Although I should have liked to say several other things in the time allotted to me, I suggest finally that the date of operation be January 1 next, in the hope that in the close-down period something can be done.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): It is no affront to the member for Playford that I will not dwell at this stage on his contribution, but he may rest assured that I shall be dealing with many aspects of it a little later. First, I see the document of October 14 as a most ill-conceived document. However, what I and many others want to know is the nature of the documents that had been prepared before October 14. The Bill has, as its mother, a lack of courage on the part of the Government in that it ran away from the promise it made in its policy speech to the effect that it would retain 9 o'clock shopping on Friday nights in those areas where it currently existed. The Government ran away from the responsibility of making a decision; we had to have a referendum, which up until now has cost about \$72,000, and the accounts are not yet finalized. As its father, the Bill undoubtedly had the Klemzig terror!

Mr. Rodda: It was conceived in that high grass.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. As I have said publicly, I refer to the Bill also as the "outer-area curfew Bill", and I will take no part in a curfew on Friday nights in the districts of Playford, Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler, Christies Beach and elsewhere; yet a curfew is specifically what the Bill aims to provide. Another aspect of this document of October 14 is its magnitude and the number of issues it contains. The member for Playford dealt with many aspects of the Bill as they relate to Industrial Commission and Industrial Court matters. Earlier this evening, two Bills were introduced to amend the same Act, and these

follow the Bill with which we dealt last evening and which also amends the same Act. We are examining the Constitution Act bit by bit, yet in this case a Bill of this size has been introduced covering many aspects of the Industrial Code. Was this another way of getting the Government off the hook in that the Government hoped that the real issue affecting the people would be lost in a Bill of this size? After all, we are here to represent people and their interests. If this matter is not a social issue, I came into Parliament under a false pretence.

A few moments ago the member for Playford said that he was well aware of his responsibility to his constituents but that unfortunately he was obliged to keep his pledge. I have some knowledge of an area close to my own that is affected by the Bill, which will hit hard many people living there. It is well known that many high school children, and young people attending teachers colleges and universities, who live in the Salisbury and Elizabeth areas, take the casual jobs that have been available to them.

Mr. Groth: What are you talking about? There are five casuals in Salisbury. You should do some homework on this.

Dr. EASTICK: I assure the honourable member that there are more than five casuals involved in this area, and I can lay on the table evidence of this in due course.

Mr. Groth: You won't have to in relation to Salisbury because there are only five. I have done my homework on it.

Dr. EASTICK: We can compare notes later. Throughout this area there is a real involvement of young people in this casual employment, which they use to obtain essential pocket money.

Mr. Groth: That isn't true and you know it.

Dr. EASTICK: Also, many wives use the casual employment available.

Mr. Groth: That's also not true. Sit down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: These people make use of the extra money, which they can earn from the work available, for many purposes not the least of which is to make payments off their heavy hire-purchase commitments for motor vehicles and so on. I know this from having worked with these people for 15 years, particularly since 1959, when I went to work regularly in that area every week. These financial involvements worry many people and, because

of this, I suggest that the plea made by the member for Playford for a cooling-off period until January 1 is not realistic.

I suggest that there should be a cooling-off period of at least 12 months to 15 months to enable these people to extract themselves from the situation in which they are now placed, a situation they got into believing that, all things being equal, they would maintain their casual employment. Apart from this, they had had it indicated to them—and the Premier this afternoon was unable to say that there had been any alteration in the material that had been made available to the people in Britain before they migrated here—that they could come to the Elizabeth area and expect night shopping on Fridays and that, among other things, they could in many cases obtain casual employment. If there has been no change in the information given them (and a check on the literature that the Premier has told me is available from the Tourist Bureau will prove my point), what about the people who are now on their way from Britain with this information and will arrive over the next six months?

Mr. Payne: Do you reckon that 9 p.m. shopping on Fridays is the only reason why people emigrate from Britain?

Dr. EASTICK: If the honourable member lived amongst them, he would realize that this was a very real issue. The member for Elizabeth and the member for Playford know that what I say is true. I do not intend to dwell at any length on the speech of the member for Ross Smith. I do not need to attempt to match or emulate his contribution, because I am neither a contender for the tenth place nor a contender for the vacant secretaryship of Actors Equity, but I want to say something about what the member for Playford said. I was almost prepared to accept the sincerity of what he was saying. In fact, I make no bones about saying that his contribution in its early stages this evening in relation to the courts, the Deputy President and other issues was most heartening and sincere. However, then he started to do some soul-searching; he told us how truthful he was and how he had faced up to the issues before him. I do not doubt that what he said here and what he said last Monday night was real soul-searching, and he had the courage to say what position he found himself in. However, let us not be fooled, because as recently as one evening last week he twisted the truth dramatically when he said he did not know anything

about members from another place being in Elizabeth. He is the advocate for a worthy football club (Central Districts) but he says he does not realize (or he does not want to realize or admit) that the patron of the club (Hon. Les Hart) who has done a great amount of work for it for a long time, is well-known in Elizabeth because of this work.

Mr. Slater: A patron is only a figurehead.

Dr. EASTICK: He is an active patron, who has turned up regularly to follow its fortunes. It is hard to accept the soul-searching attitude that the member for Playford provided us with because, despite his statements about the direction that was apparent on this side of the House during this session, we know the number of divisions that have been held this session. On how many occasions, some as recently as yesterday evening, have there been members of the Opposition sitting with and voting with the members of the Government? On how many issues in this same session of Parliament have any members of the Government transferred their allegiance and voted with members of the Opposition? Not once. But that does not apply to members of the Opposition. Unfortunately, the member for Playford became tangled in a tirade about Whips, and the directions of Whips, and Mr. St. John. It seemed to be the Whip who directed people on this side, but later it was the financial members outside. Then we had the history of the House of Commons. I want to consider what the people of South Australia, whom the members for Elizabeth, Playford and I represent, think about this.

They expressed their opinions well on Monday evening and, apart from some suggestions by the member for Playford about the political hokey-pokey that was supposed to have gone on in relation to the conduct of that meeting, the honourable member will know that he is drawing red herrings across the trail. He said that it should have been the Premier of the State who was invited. What a discourtesy that would have been on the part of the mayor to the junior Minister of the front bench if he, the Minister responsible for the Bill that was being discussed, had been discarded and the Premier called in over him. The mayor did the proper thing (the same as I would have done if I had been in the same position), and invited the responsible Minister and the members of the district in whose House the Bill was being discussed.

Mrs. Byrne: Why didn't he invite the Legislative Council members?

Dr. EASTICK: If the honourable member had cared to listen, the Bill was being discussed in this House. Perhaps members of the Legislative Council will receive such an invitation later if the people believe that that is necessary. It was a strange situation, having listened during last week and this week to the abolitionist attitude of Government members on what should happen to members in another place, to find suddenly that Government members, when presenting their case to the people of Elizabeth, were crying for help from the Upper House.

Mrs. Byrne: That's not true.

Dr. EASTICK: That is dead true.

Mrs. Byrne: I was there, and that is not true.

Mr. Langley: Did you get a chance to speak?

Dr. EASTICK: I did, and so did each member representing the areas contiguous to Elizabeth. The member for Playford said that members on this side would be sorry for the difficult position in which they had placed themselves and for the pressure that would be placed on them by the Retail Traders Association. I can be as soul-searching as the member for Playford can be. I represent the people of the District of Light; they will tell me which way I will vote, and I will vote as the majority of them tell me.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You may regret having made that statement.

Dr. EASTICK: That may well be. I entered Parliament to represent the people of the District of Light, and those people who were given the chance to vote on the question in the referendum voted two to one for late closing. Also, the Chamber of Commerce, which is represented in that part of the District of Light, indicated to me strongly its wishes in this matter. It is a pity (and I say this without hesitation, damning as it may seem to be) that there are not more statesmen and fewer politicians.

I turn now to discuss one or two other aspects of this Bill. There are many broad issues in this Bill. New section 226 suggests that motor spirits and spare parts could be sold from a petrol station anywhere in the defined area at all times of the day. This seems to be a departure from the attitude that has prevailed in the past, and in Committee I shall want to know more about this matter. Under existing section 224, the sale and delivery of goods could be made over a five-mile area, provided one went by the shortest practicable

route. A ludicrous situation could arise where an establishment was on one side of a creek and the delivery point was on the other, a distance of five miles by road, whereas a swing bridge connected the two points. A person could go by the shortest practicable route and deliver the goods just across the river.

The third schedule lists a series of exemptions, but I cannot find any clear definition of the description of which shops will be exempted. It is often difficult at first glance to know whether a shop is a delicatessen, a card shop, or a grocery combined with a delicatessen. I am concerned to know how widespread the opening of shops will be by virtue of the third schedule. I would be inconsistent if I did not foreshadow an amendment to delete the Municipality of Gawler from the extended metropolitan area. I cannot see why the people of Gawler should pay country prices for their beer, cartage, bread, and many other things, yet be drawn into the metropolitan area defined in this Bill. I give my pledge that at the appropriate time I shall seek amendments to the Bill, and I will support several amendments that have already been foreshadowed.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the Bill wholeheartedly. The Government is tackling a very important matter that previous Liberal Governments have not been courageous enough to tackle or even consider. Because the Early Closing Act had not been substantially amended for many years, it was undoubtedly outdated. It was in 1926 that the present metropolitan area was defined, and Liberal Governments over the years allowed the position to deteriorate until it was necessary to tackle the problem urgently. The Labor Government has done exactly this.

This Bill gives effect to the overall decision of the referendum held on September 19, in which 190,460 "No" votes were cast and 176,970 "Yes" votes were cast. Not only was there a majority "No" vote overall, but of the 32 House of Assembly districts involved wholly or in part 22 voted "No" and only 10 voted "Yes". The districts that voted "Yes" were Alexandra, Elizabeth, Fisher, Florey, Goyder, Light, Mawson, Playford, Salisbury, and Tea Tree Gully.

Six of the districts of the 22 that voted "No" are represented in this House by members of the Opposition. Those districts are Bragg, Davenport, Glenelg, Hanson, Mitcham, and Heysen. I trust that those Liberal members

will be guided by the wishes of their constituents as expressed in the referendum result. I suggest that even the Liberal Party can accept such a majority as 22 to 10. In introducing this Bill, the Government is giving effect to the decision of the people at the referendum. However, since that referendum was held the whole matter has been stirred up by certain people, particularly the Mayor of Elizabeth (Mr. Duffield), who has been particularly outspoken, and the Mayor of Salisbury (Mr. Bowey).

Mr. Payne: Both of whom are Liberal Party members.

Mr. SLATER: I believe that Mr. Duffield is a florist, but we certainly would not hand him any bouquets for his attitude in this matter. I believe that these Liberal Party members are motivated in their actions not by ethical considerations or by any genuine concern for the welfare of the people within their districts but by Party-political considerations.

Mr. Duffield was the L.C.L. candidate for Playford at the last State election. The member for Ross Smith indicated last evening, as I am doing now, that Mr. Duffield's interest in this matter is purely political. The public meeting at the Octagon Theatre at Elizabeth on Monday night was designed to stir up the situation and to try to rouse the emotions of the people in that area. Mr. Duffield is still following this line. A report in yesterday's newspaper, referring to Mr. Duffield, states:

He said he would twist some arms when the Government's legislation on shopping hours reached the Upper House.

The councillors for that municipality are twisting Mr. Duffield's arm at present, because a press report today states:

Seven members of the Elizabeth council criticized the Mayor, Mr. Duffield, on his stand over the controversial shopping hours legislation. Mr. Duffield announced that he was calling a public meeting for last Monday without first seeking and obtaining the approval of the council.

I believe that people in the community are sufficiently fair-minded to understand that one section should not have unfair trading opportunities over another, particularly when one section of business activity is seriously affected as a result of the lack of equitable trading opportunities. Although people living in the fringe areas as they are described have become accustomed to late shopping hours, I repeat that this situation should never have been allowed to develop over the years. Indeed, the member for Mitcham said that the position should

never have been allowed to deteriorate to the disadvantage of traders in the inner metropolitan area and the public generally.

The Bill will provide for uniform trading hours and this will be in the interests of all sections of the community, particularly those employed in the retail industry. Uniform trading hours is fair and equitable for all, and any alternative must be considered unsatisfactory. I believe that all fair-minded people will compliment the Government on trying to resolve the present situation, which is grossly unfair and rapidly becoming worse. The Leader, in openly supporting the "Yes" vote, showed the political naivety and lack of experience that he accused some members of this side, particularly newer members, of possessing. It was largely as a result of his part in the campaign for a "Yes" vote that there was a majority "No" vote. If the people of Elizabeth have anyone to blame for losing the privileges that they originally had, they should blame the Leader of the Opposition because, as I say, he is the person who was largely responsible for the "No" vote majority.

Referring to the so-called secret meeting that has been mentioned by some members of the Opposition, I point out that Labor Party policy is always to consult with members on matters affecting the welfare of the Party and the public in general.

Mr. Ryan: In other words, we never ignore them.

Mr. SLATER: We never ignore them. Unlike members of the Liberal Party who pass resolutions at their conferences and then completely ignore them, we do not do this. I was not at the meeting concerned, because I was absent in another State, but I believe that the meeting was called to discuss matters bearing on the policy of the Party, not only this measure. I am the Secretary of the club in whose premises the meeting was held, these premises being used consistently by the A.L.P. for Party meetings.

Mr. Wells: Anyone would think it was a secret lair.

Mr. SLATER: It is not a secret lair at all. The Florey Electorate Committee meets at the Enfield District Club, as also do the Gilles Electorate Committee and the Sturt Electorate Committee. These premises are used extensively for Party meetings. The Bill relates not only to trading hours but also to an extension of exempted goods (over 70 items in all), and it also provides for the list of exempted shops

to be brought up to date. In addition, it defines the new metropolitan area, and clearly provides fair and equitable trading opportunities for many years to come. As the member for Playford has said, this will be a realistic era and will result in an equitable situation regarding both industrial and trading matters. I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): It is easily seen where the interest in this Bill lies. Only the member for Mitcham has seen fit to refer to the first part of the Bill, which deals with amendments affecting the Industrial Court. The member for Mitcham was well able to speak on those clauses, which relate to the appointments of Deputy Presidents and other matters affecting the court. No-one is better suited to deal with those matters than is the member for Mitcham, because he was for a time Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. McKee: He is also a broken-down lawyer.

Mrs. STEELE: I beg to disagree with the honourable member. The member for Mitcham is anything but a broken-down lawyer: he is a very able lawyer. I reiterate that he is the only member who has spoken in the debate so far who has seen fit to refer to the first part of the Bill. Other members have dealt with the clauses of the Bill which are uppermost in the minds of the people and which apply the result of the recent referendum. The only thing that disappointed me about what the member for Mitcham said was his apparent lack of knowledge of women's hairdressing. In a household dominated by females he will have to do much better in future if he is to win the approval of his womenfolk. He will probably find out before long that it takes longer than he thinks at a hairdresser's shop, and that such shops should be able to stay open for longer than is suggested in the Bill. However, that is a trivial matter to which I refer only facetiously.

The Government is presently in a dilemma of its own making. It is solely responsible for this because, when the Bill for the shopping hours referendum was before the House, I well remember that most Opposition members recommended to the Government that the question it was intending to ask in the referendum was not wide enough, and that one question was not sufficient to obtain a true picture of what was desired by the cross-section of the people who were affected by this matter.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What was said was that the referendum was unnecessary and that everyone would vote "Yes".

Mrs. STEELE: No; Opposition members suggested that three questions should be asked of the people so that a true picture of public opinion could be obtained. I remember that one question suggested was whether or not the people wanted to maintain the *status quo*. That suggestion was turned down by the Government, which went ahead with its intention to ask straight out whether or not people wanted Friday night shopping. Everyone knows that, until the retail traders came into the picture with their well organized campaign on which they spent a lot of money, the Government itself had thought that the "Yes" vote would prevail.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you agree with your Leader that it was an unfair campaign?

Mrs. STEELE: Until the retail traders came into the picture, there was no doubt in the public's mind that the question would be answered in the affirmative, that the people would probably vote in favour of Friday night shopping. Many of the reasons advanced in the retail traders' campaign were not factual, but they frightened the people into voting the way they did. We all know (and other members have alluded to it) that the Government found itself in a dilemma, as is shown by the fact that some time elapsed after the result of the referendum was known before it introduced this Bill into the House. The referendum was held on September 19, yet the Bill was not introduced until October 14, even though this was a matter that the Government was eager to resolve. It was significant, as has been pointed out tonight by previous speakers from this side, that the Bill was printed only on the day it was introduced into this House, after that very eventful Saturday when the meeting was held at Klemzig.

It is not only members on this side who have dwelt largely on the implications of that meeting at Klemzig: it is the members of the public themselves who have poured much ridicule on the Government for the fact that it was beholden to outside domination to bring in a Bill of this kind dealing with the shopping hours we are now considering. This decision of the Government has, as we know, placed many of its members in an invidious position. We all appreciate the dilemma in which they now find themselves. I should at this stage like to say how much I admired the

speech of the member for Playford, who I believe has come out of the debate this evening very well, because I think he has tried to put before us honestly his attitude in the situation in which he finds himself. Nevertheless, the Government has to a certain extent jeopardized the position of those members who are so vitally affected.

On Friday afternoon last week, I think it was, I went for the first time to look at the new Tea Tree Gully shopping plaza. I was most impressed by it but I could not help thinking of the disappointment of the people living in that area, so capably represented by the member for Tea Tree Gully, who works very hard in her district. I could not help thinking of the disappointment of those people, who would be saying, "Here is this vast complex at Tea Tree Gully with facilities that were obviously planned for late night shopping in an area that is growing and in which the people can avail themselves of this facility. Now, it will be just an ordinary shopping centre." I am sure that this is the cause of great disappointment for the people living in that district.

The same thing applies to people living in the Elizabeth district. It is perfectly true that many people there look forward to their late shopping as a family diversion, being able to go out on Friday nights and shop in the various complexes available to them. It seems to me that the Government has stated that it is implementing the wishes of the people who voted in favour of no Friday evening shopping, following a campaign that was successful largely because of the efforts waged by the Retail Traders Association. However, in doing this the Government has not been beholden to the people most affected by the curtailment of late shopping but has bent to the will of the unions, which more or less dictated what the Government's attitude is to be.

People who now enjoy the advantages of late night shopping are those who do not have much entertainment in the areas surrounding Elizabeth, and they consider this an opportunity to enjoy an evening out that does not cost them much money, and one on which women are able to shop with their husbands and families. These people have now been denied the opportunity to do this. I believe that, if the Government had asked the proper kind of questions of the people in the referendum, these areas would have been excluded from the provisions of the Bill, and this would have been a way out for everyone. The result has been inconclusive and has not been consistent with

the amount spent on the referendum, which was about \$70,000.

Throughout the debate the Minister of Labour and Industry has been twitting me across the floor about what I am going to do because of the result of the vote in the District of Davenport. For his benefit may I say that the total of the "Yes" vote was 6,433 and for the "No" vote it was 6,811, a majority for the "No" vote of 378. As the Minister will realize, this is not a large majority and, in keeping with the number of informal votes cast throughout the area covered by the referendum, there was an inordinately high number of 1,234 informal votes. In addition, the many people who did not vote in the referendum have to be considered.

As was stated in the *Advertiser* on the Monday following the referendum, the result in Davenport was one of the closest in the inner suburbs. On that Saturday on which the referendum was held, I spent some time sitting in my motor car some distance from the polling booth, speaking to people coming to vote. Not just one person but scores of people came up and said, "Mrs. Steele, this is the most ridiculous referendum we have had to vote in. The Government if it wanted to get a true indication of what the people thought on this issue should have put more than one question on the referendum paper."

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Such as Sunday trading and that sort of thing!

Mrs. STEELE: The Government should have posed the question: "Do you want unlimited trading or the *status quo*, or do you want Friday night shopping to be cut out?"

Members interjecting:

Mrs. STEELE: I am simply telling the Minister what my constituents told me on the day of the poll and since.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. STEELE: Since the day of the poll many people have said exactly the same thing to me. I have gone out of my way to ask them what they thought about the result of the referendum. I do not think the people in the Davenport District for one moment wanted Friday night shopping for themselves but, at the same time, they were not worried about people who already had Friday night shopping keeping what they had, as I said. On the day of the poll and afterwards scores of people told me that they thought the questions were inadequate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mrs. STEELE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The people told me that they were not given the opportunity to express effectively or conclusively their attitude to Friday night shopping. I wrote down the comments that they made. In general, the number of informal votes cast showed the confusion and disgust with which people regarded the choice of questions on the ballot-paper. A leading article following the referendum said:

The overall effect, as shown by the referendum, was that nobody wanted change. The fringe areas wanted to be left as they were with Friday night shopping, and other areas were content to do without it.

That was exactly how the people in the Davenport District felt on this question. The Government made a mistake in the kind of question it asked the people. If it had wanted a true indication of how they thought, it should have made the questions more comprehensive and direct; if it had done that, the people would have given clearer answers on what they thought about the vexed question of Friday night shopping.

Mr. McKEE (Pirie): I suppose members opposite are wondering why I have risen to speak on this issue because, after all, it does not really affect my district.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McKEE: I am starting to draw a bit of fire already. Every member has an obligation to say where he stands on this issue. Therefore, rather than register a silent vote, I think I should say where I stand, and, at the same time, I should like to congratulate the Government on its stand on this issue. The previous Government very cunningly avoided this issue for some time. I believe that that Government was most unwise in avoiding it, because I consider that this contributed greatly to its defeat at the last election.

The member for Davenport apparently has not done much homework on this matter. Obviously, she has been brainwashed into supporting her Leader and, of course, as she has come up through the Playford gerrymander she still has a great desire to support the minority. The Playford Governments and previous L.C.L. Governments survived in this House for many years on a minority vote, and they never had any regard for the will of the majority of the people. The member for Davenport has probably made the same mis-

take that Sir Thomas Playford made during the referendum on State lotteries. He said that giving people lotteries was like putting poison in the hands of children. However, he got a terrible shock when the referendum revealed that 70 per cent of the people in his own district supported the introduction of lotteries. The same thing has happened to the member for Davenport, and when she faces her electors she will have about as much show as a soap bubble in a mincer. Even though about 40 per cent of the people in her district live outside the shopping area of Davenport, people in her district still recorded a "No" vote.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: She just can't win!

Mr. McKEE: No. It is obvious that she has not given much thought to the situation. However, I feel sorry for her, because obviously she has been completely brainwashed. As her Leader is now out of the Chamber, she has gone down to talk to the member for Mitcham, who is in a similar situation. She said that the member for Mitcham was an eminent and capable lawyer. Well, several people have told me that anybody who felt like a little spell in Gladstone or some other gaol would say, "I will engage Robin Millhouse." Apparently every time he approached a client he would say, "I will get you out within 12 months."

I believe that the Leader played a major role in the defeat of the "Yes" vote. I understand that many people favoured late shopping but that when the Leader said publicly that he intended to support the "Yes" vote they change their minds immediately. Obviously, the Leader gave the "Yes" vote the kiss of death: if the "Yes" vote ever had a chance, the Leader killed it immediately when he attempted to influence people to vote that way.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What does the L.C.L. headquarters say about his role in the campaign?

Mr. McKEE: I do not think it is game to comment.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Oh yes, it did have something to say.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that it has been trying to plant him over in Canberra.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair. Also, there are too many interjections.

Mr. McKEE: Of course, there were several reasons why the "Yes" vote was defeated, including the fact that the people just could not support the Leader on principle, because they knew that, when he was in office and had an opportunity to do something about this, he made no attempt to do anything. The Leader never had the courage to attack the problem, but immediately we decided to do something about it, what did he do? He jumped on his soap box and decided to make political capital out of the issue.

Had the result of the referendum been reversed, the Leader would have played politics in the areas where a "Yes" vote and not, as was actually the case, a "No" vote was stronger. The issue is obviously a political football that has gone flat, the Leader having, in fact, kicked it with his knee. These tactics are not supported by the majority of the people, particularly when they recall that the Leader had an opportunity to do something about the matter when he was in Government. The former Government was politically afraid of the issue. The former Minister of Labour and Industry, who is sitting in his place looking rather dejected and making no comments, will recall that several questions were asked of him during his term as Minister, and if members read *Hansard* they will be able to see the fairy story nonsense and evasions that the member for Torrens put up regarding this issue simply because his Party was politically afraid of it. It should never have been afraid, because members opposite were gone, anyhow! The correct thing for them to do would have been to say, "We haven't any chance of staying here, and we know something must be done about it, so we will do the right thing by the people." However, they were clutching at straws in an effort to stay in office. The Leader claims that he has all sorts of solution to this problem but, if he had them at the time, why did he not do anything about it? He is now setting out to please everyone, "No" voters and "Yes" voters alike. I offer the Leader one suggestion: he ought to go to see his doctor and get himself certified. If he thinks he can please everyone, there is only one place for him to go.

Mr. Coumbe: Port Pirie!

Mr. Jennings: If he resigned, it would please everyone.

Mr. McKEE: No, it is not a matter of resigning. If the member for Torrens is putting himself in the same class as that of the Leader, I suggest that he join him, and he

knows where the doctor would send him; in fact, the doctor would put him in a straight jacket. I suggest that members opposite are flogging a political horse that is very dead, and the whip has dropped off the handle. I think they are sufficiently cunning as to know that this issue would be a shaky peg on which to hang their hat at the next election.

Mr. Venning: Ha, ha!

Mr. McKEE: The member for Rocky River should do a bit of ha-ha-ing with the jackasses at the Crystal Brook River. I challenge members opposite to take this up as an election issue.

Mr. Venning: I hope that the people don't forget at the next election, and then you'll be right out.

Mr. McKEE: If members opposite do not already know, I will tell them that it is traditional for the Australian people and for any fair-minded people (and I include in this English migrants, because I know they are fair-minded people) to accept the decision of the majority. No doubt some people in areas that voted to retain late shopping will be disappointed, but I believe the issue has been exaggerated: I am sure that the vast majority of people in those areas will accept their defeat in a sportsmanlike way. That is more than I can expect from the members for Eyre, Fisher, Davenport and Light. From time to time, those members talk about fair play and the principles of democracy. However, they cunningly and snidely campaigned against former members for their districts who wore the same political guernsey, and they defeated those members at preselections. In a press interview after the declaration of the poll in the Eyre District, the former member for Eyre claimed that the Liberal and Country League's method of preselecting candidates had been conducted in an unfair manner, and he claimed that it was rigged.

Mr. Gunn: Are you prepared to repeat that outside the Chamber?

Mr. McKEE: Anywhere. People in the areas affected by the Bill will accept what has happened in a sportsmanlike way, because they will accept what the people have expressed at the ballot box. This Government will be admired by people in those districts for taking the stand it has taken, and the L.C.L. will stand condemned for trying to defeat democracy.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I cannot be berated by members opposite about what I support, because the Government gave only

a few of my highly intelligent constituents a vote. It did not think my constituents were even worth considering.

Mr. Burdon: Did you get a vote?

Mr. McANANEY: I live in the country and get no consideration from the Government. I do not intend to make a long speech: I merely want to say that I believe there should be shopping on six days a week, as I said before the referendum, and I definitely oppose Sunday trading. However, whatever we have, we must have uniformity. The Labor Party has become completely bewildered over this issue. In its policy speech it said that it would not take away late closing from areas that enjoyed it. Subsequently, the Minister of Works said that there would be a 70 per cent "Yes" vote at the referendum; no-one in his right senses would have assessed the "Yes" vote as high as that, in view of the Gallup polls that had been taken. Therefore, it would appear that the Labor Party has taken the people of South Australia for a ride. Although I agree that shopping hours in the country will not be affected, I point out that, after petitions, the hours for shopping in several country areas have been altered. This shows that, at least in the country areas, the shopping hours should be what the people want. If shops can open six days a week, there is no compulsion—they are not compelled to open. If shops open on Saturday afternoons, as a certain shop in Strathalbyn does, they have to pay award rates and they will not be able to sell their goods as cheaply as shops do that do not open at times when overtime is payable. We talk about freedom, and this is the ideal situation. The difficulty in South Australia is that we cannot do what people in most civilized countries do, where the workers are more sensible. They are not controlled by the unions, and they can have days off and suitable rosters and so can serve the people. The general attitude in South Australia is that service to the people comes second.

Although I think the shopping hours should be extended, I do not believe we should discriminate between areas in the city. The Labor Party, by its decision to deprive country people of late night shopping, will have to face the consequences at a future election. I cannot see why, on the way to Tea Tree Gully, on one side of the road shops cannot be opened while on the other side they can be. I cannot support that, although I am against the restricted hours provided for in the Bill. That will amaze the honourable member who said that we on this

side voted strictly on Party lines and did what we were told to do. On this side we make up our own minds. At the Eagle on the Hill, a garage on one side of the road is not allowed to open but a garage on the other side can open. That seems to be completely unjust. I do not like supporting this Bill, but we must have uniformity. I do not agree with the restrictive attitude of the Labor Party when it compels people to close their shops when there is a demand in their areas for a shopping service. It is typical Labor Party legislation. It is compulsion—"You cannot do this; you must do that." On this side we can vote as we like.

We believe that shopkeepers should have the right to stay open if they so desire. I think I have made my position on this Bill clear. I am opposed to the general attitude of the Socialist Party in restricting the freedom of the individual.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I support the Bill. I shall devote my time to speaking about something which has been skirted around this evening and which has never been fully explained, that is, what I consider to be one of the most infamous meetings I have attended in my life—and I have attended many meetings. I was at the Octagon on Monday evening and witnessed what happened. The Mayor of Elizabeth (Mr. Duffield) had invited four A.L.P. members to attend a public meeting (as he called it) to place their point of view before the residents of Elizabeth. The members consented to appear at this meeting; they considered not that it was a courageous thing to do but that it was the proper thing for them to do, and so they attended.

Immediately they said they would attend the Mayor of Elizabeth had the temerity to make a statement that was published in the press that he would not accept anything but a medical certificate to account for the absence of any of these members. What ego! What a colossal cheek this man had to demand a medical certificate for absence! The Leader of the Opposition was invited to attend, and he said that he would attend. This was a wise move, and I believe it was the proper thing for him to do. However, I believe that in the absence of the Minister who had a commitment—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I had two commitments.

Mr. WELLS: —two commitments, as the Minister has just said, made before the announcement of the meeting, at least a substitute should have been sought, and this should

have been none other than the Premier of this State. However, he was completely ignored.

Mr. Mathwin: Why didn't he nominate?

Mr. WELLS: I do not know what the honourable member does in his neck of the woods, but one does not gate-crash. If one is invited one attends, and if one is not invited one stays home.

Mr. Venning: Why didn't—

Mr. WELLS: I know it is hard for the member for Rocky River to understand things quickly but, if he will give me 10 minutes of his time after the House adjourns, I will explain things to him. The meeting was disappointing in the first place because, despite the story that people would be hanging from their toenails from the rafters, the hall was no more than half full. The crowd demonstrated its hostility in the first place. The members assembled on the stage (four A.L.P. members with the Leader) and as each was introduced he was received with a burst of applause.

The member for Elizabeth was the first speaker. He had a reasonable hearing, but the hearing became rougher as time went on. Then, the member for Playford spoke and got a pretty rough hearing. The Leader of the Opposition was then called on and he got a roughing up, but it was nowhere near as intense as that meted out to Labor Party members.

Mr. Rodda: Why didn't they put you on?

Mr. WELLS: I could not get on the platform. I have said this outside the House and I will say it here so that it can be recorded in *Hansard*: the Leader spoke with impeccable fairness. He put the case for his Party: the *status quo* should prevail. I did not agree with his remarks at all, but I believe he was very fair: he indulged in no political gimmicks and he made no attempt by way of innuendo to destroy the Labor Party. However, this meeting was nothing but a gigantic set-up of four Labor Party members; its purpose was to ridicule them and to attempt to destroy the people's confidence in them.

I completely reject the suggestion that this meeting was representative of the people of Elizabeth. I should qualify my statement by saying that I know many people in Elizabeth and surrounding areas; I know them socially, through sporting activities, industrial activities and political activities, and they are all very fine people. The people in this area are tolerant, sympathetic, warm-hearted, and, above all,

courteous. However, the people at this meeting displayed not one of these attributes, and it was a disgusting thing for me to see and hear members, who were invited as the guests of the Mayor, prevented from doing what they were invited to do—putting their viewpoint on the result of the referendum and the Government's activities in respect of it. Instead, they were slow hand-clapped and they had to compete with stamping. I was embarrassed not for the Labor Party members or the Leader, who was on the platform with them, but I was embarrassed for the people themselves.

The speakers were not permitted to put their viewpoint over. If the audience showed no mercy for the male members on the platform, at least it should have shown courtesy toward the female member there, the member for Tea Tree Gully. She would weigh only seven stone wringing wet, but she put her viewpoint as far as she was permitted to do so. She explained her position and said what she intended to do. All members of the Labor Party team faced up to the question. All denied that a sectional majority was an instruction to them and all said that they would not vote against Government policy, which was based on an overall majority decision arrived at as a result of a referendum. So the meeting proceeded to that point—a gigantic set-up. Then a gentleman from the floor wanted to move a motion.

Mr. McKee: He would be a Liberal.

Mr. WELLS: I do not know the gentleman's political affiliations, but just listen to the motion:

We, the representatives of the people of Elizabeth—

only 700, mind you, in a district of about 16,000 or 17,000, and even they were not all from Elizabeth—

instruct the two members from our area, Playford and Elizabeth, to vote against the Government in respect of the Bill, and if they do not do so we demand that they resign immediately.

What absolute arrogance and cheek!

Mr. Rodda: How did the member for Salisbury stand up to it?

Mr. WELLS: He stood up very well. I have already acknowledged the Leader's courtesy and fairness. I now want to acknowledge the courage of the four people from my Party who went to that meeting in good faith and were set up. Nevertheless, they attended and did the job for the Party which they would be expected to do and which we

know they are capable of doing. Of course, the Legislative Councillors for the district were not there; they knew the meeting was on, but they stayed away because they could have been embarrassed. The Labor voters in that area stand four-square behind my Party, and they will continue to do so despite any efforts to fragment their support. They stand behind my Party because they realize that it is a Party they can trust. It is a Party that was called on to determine a situation by a referendum, and it carried out that task. This is what the people admire.

What sort of a position would the Government have been in, and what a holiday the Opposition would have had, if there had been any move away from the actual decision of the referendum. People could have said, "Here is a Party you can't trust; it asks you what you want, and when you tell it what you want it won't implement your decision." According to the Opposition, we just cannot win. Some members of the Opposition say now that the *status quo* should be maintained.

I want to say something now about the contribution made by the member for Light. The honourable member said, in a holier than thou attitude, "I stand by what the people in my district tell me to do and the rest of my Party members do likewise." What will the Opposition do in this matter? I think an effort will be made to introduce amendments to the Bill. My party has declared its position; the people have spoken, and we have implemented their decision. The member for Light is in a separate category, but what about the people who got a distinct "No" vote in their area? Do they vote as their constituents tell them to vote, or do they vote on Party lines? I should like to wager that they vote on Party lines or in some way try to evade the issue.

Much has been said about the mysterious meeting that was held, but the member for Gilles explained this. There is no secret about the fact that we have an A.L.P. Club where we hold our political meetings. We have a lease from the local council to occupy the premises, and it is a beautiful little place. It is amazing the number of times we have members of the Liberal Party coming along; they are invited and go in as guests of the member, have a convivial drink and are welcome. They like the club, too.

What was the secret meeting that took place today among Legislative Council members? The Liberal Party members in the Legislative Council held a meeting behind

closed doors. They were not going to disclose anything at all, but the fact is that they say they do not meet. According to the sources of information, available to me anyway, they did not discuss the Early Closing Act or this Bill at all: they merely determined the sequence of speakers. They could have invited us to the meeting if that is all that took place. Members opposite have made caustic remarks about the A.L.P. pledge. The fact is that a member seeking Parliamentary office must sign a pledge with his nomination to abide by the Party platform and by the majority decision of Caucus and to fulfil the programme and policies of the Party. I think that this is a desirable principle, and any person having signed a pledge who does not live up to it is not worth his salt. If I may, I offer a word of advice to the Opposition: we are a powerful political Party—

Mr. McKee: The biggest in the country.

Mr. WELLS: That is correct, and growing every day. Members opposite see us on this side as a Government. Why? Because the people of this State say, "Here is a Party, each and every member of which pledges to uphold the policy put before us. Therefore, we can trust them." The L.C.L. has no such pledge; if it did have, perhaps people would be able to say something similar about members opposite, instead of saying, "There is no pledge; they please themselves. How in the blazes can we trust them, when one can go this way and one can go that way?"

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): Although, on behalf of members on this side, I must thank the member for Florey for his advice, I assure him that members on this side have no intention whatever of heeding it. Although this may be a sign of immaturity, I think we have already seen other signs of immaturity this evening. The referendum, which misfired right from the start, has been a damp squib. The exercise, the results of which are piously being followed by the Minister and all members opposite, was a complete farce, and this is just not the opinion of members on this side: I believe that it is the opinion of the majority of the people who voted at the referendum.

Over 50,000 people did not even turn up, and many others resented having to vote. Of course, the answer was that this was the result of the question asked. No question such as "Do you want conditions to stay as they are at present?" was asked. This was very much a one-sided referendum with no opportunity being given to the people to

express their true wishes. I go further: this referendum was completely farcical when one considers whether it was necessary to have a referendum. Members opposite often refer to the mandate they have for certain things and to the good majority that they have in this House, which has often been used. In this case, why did they have to have a referendum on this subject? Why did they not have the courage of their convictions, if they had any? Of course, we know that their conviction was that the referendum would go the other way. Regardless of that, if they are in power by the will of the people why bother to have a referendum anyway?

Although I believe that uniformity of some sort is desirable, I can see that the situation outlined in the Bill will impose great difficulties on the people concerned. I agree with the member for Light in his assessment of the situation, and I bow to his superior knowledge in this case because he is much closer to the scene where all the opinion is boiling over.

I really cannot accept that the meeting the other evening was manufactured. Many people will indeed suffer hardship as a result of the provisions in the Bill. Many people depend on income they receive from extra work that is available as a result of the late shopping hours, using this income to meet their financial

commitments, hire purchase payments and to provide the other little extras that most parents like to give their children. The Bill will take away the freedoms that people have enjoyed for many years.

The performance of those members representing areas involved has been interesting and illuminating, but certainly not unexpected. The reaction of those members is typically what we would expect of people bound by the strict discipline of the Labor Party. In so far as they are fighting a rearguard action, I suppose in this regard they should be commended, but it is really not impressing anyone. Whatever is the result of this sorry exercise, the referendum will always be remembered by the people of South Australia, and the Labor Government will receive no thanks or credit from the majority of those people. Although Government members may be counting on the fact that traditionally the memory of the people is short, I think this is one occasion where they will be proved wrong at the next election.

Mr. GROTH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 22, at 2 p.m.