

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 31 May 1995

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS
(MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT
BILL**

The **Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier)**: I move:

That the sitting of the House be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 9 440 residents of South Australia urging the House to allow people to shop and trade in the City of Adelaide on Sundays was presented by the Hon. G.A. Ingerson.

Petition received.

VEGETATION PROTECTION

A petition signed by 462 residents of South Australia urging the House to ensure that effective legislation is enacted to protect urban trees and/or bushland from destruction was presented by the Hon. G.A. Ingerson.

Petition received.

OFFENDER PENALTIES

A petition signed by 869 residents of South Australia requesting that the House take action to ensure that offenders receive penalties that reflect the community's perception of what is appropriate was presented by the Hon. M.H. Armitage.

Petition received.

EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia requesting the House to urge the State Government to stop any further reduction in the public education budget and to provide sufficient funds to restore class sizes and curriculum choices to previous levels was presented by the Hon. R.B. Such.

Petition received.

EUTHANASIA

Petitions signed by 1 541 residents of South Australia requesting that the House maintain the present homicide law, which excludes euthanasia, while maintaining the common law right of patients to refuse medical treatment were presented by Mesdames Hall and Kotz.

Petitions received.

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia requesting that the House oppose any measure to legislate for voluntary euthanasia was presented by Mrs Rosenberg.

Petition received.

LEAD LEVELS

The **Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Health)**: I wish to make a ministerial statement to inform the House on matters relating to environmental lead levels, as were raised in the media. As reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, I was briefed on lead levels on 6 July 1994. The briefing was prepared by the Public and Environmental Health Division of the South Australian Health Commission at my request, following electorate concerns that had been expressed to me with respect to lead. The brief summarised information that was already publicly available and did not request or recommend any action on the part of the Government or me as Minister. It was nothing more than a collection of facts which were well known at the time. Indeed, lead toxicity to humans, particularly in occupations, has been known since the turn of the century. Studies over the past two decades have demonstrated effects at much lower levels than previously recognised. It was these studies that led to initiatives to reduce the impact of lead on the general population.

The Government believes that the level of lead contamination in the South Australian community is falling, due to a decline in the three main sources of lead contamination. First, motor vehicle exhaust lead emissions are being significantly reduced through the increasing use of unleaded petrol. Between 1985 and 1991, air lead levels have decreased by 30 per cent. Sales of leaded petrol have fallen by 20 per cent in the past 18 months. A second source of lead is leaded paint, but lead has not been common in paint since the 1960s. As old paintwork is progressively replaced, this factor will continue to diminish. A third source of lead is industrial contamination such as at the Port Pirie smelter, and the Health Commission has been active, working with the smelter to reduce the level of lead in that community.

In any strategy to reduce lead contamination, it is vital that we have reliable data to assess any problems and to guide any response. To this end, South Australia is actively participating in the National Blood Lead Survey which involves testing the blood of children across the nation. Late last year, I sought specific information on the results of a small pilot study conducted under the national survey. The response was that blood lead results from the children from the city areas tested had a mean of 4.8 micrograms per decilitre. This is less than one third of the National Health and Medical Research Council action level for individual children of 15 micrograms per decilitre. I repeat: the blood level lead results from the children from the city areas tested had a mean of 4.8 micrograms per decilitre.

I point out to the House that, whilst the National Health Medical Research Council has issued an action level for children, there is no known safe level of lead. The Government understands that the results of the National Blood Lead Survey will be available in the next two to three months. At that stage we will consider what action may be necessary in the light of the survey results. We will do so conscious of the fact that there is a base level of lead contamination awareness in the community already. This awareness was strengthened by the lead alert campaign early in 1994. The Government will base any further action on lead on solid empirical data as would be expected to flow from the National Blood Lead Survey.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): I bring up the reports of the Public Works Committee on the Port Lincoln hospital redevelopment stage two and the Modbury private hospital development and move:

That the reports be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the reports be printed.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I bring up the sixteenth report of the committee on compulsory motor vehicle inspections and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

CORONIAL INQUIRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Minister for Health. Why is the Health Commission making an application this afternoon to have Government evidence to the coronial inquest into the Garibaldi affair suppressed from the public and delivered in secret? Will the Minister immediately contact the Health Commission's lawyers and direct them to withdraw that request? The Minister voted against the Opposition's move to set up a specific public inquiry into the Garibaldi affair arguing that the coronial inquiry would be adequate. At the time, he said he had spoken to the Attorney-General about the timing of the coronial inquiry, saying that he would not want any suggestion that this inquiry will drag on and on in an attempt to avoid public scrutiny.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: This is an unfortunate example of the well known truism that where you get two lawyers together, you will get two different opinions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: What we have here is two statutory authorities, one being the Coroner and the other being the Ombudsman. As is well known to all members of the House, and perhaps other people—but nevertheless, in case it is not well known, I will outline it—the Coroner has issued a warrant for the documents in relation to the Garibaldi matters, and those documents are from the Health Commission. As I indicated at the time, we are only too happy to provide those documents to the Coroner. However, now there is a matter of dispute as to whether the documents include just the bit of paper or the information on that bit of paper. All reasonable people would believe that, if there was a warrant for the control of those documents to be taken by the Coroner—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is an important question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:—the information within those documents was also under the control of the Coroner. Following our inquiries, the Coroner has been absolutely explicit in saying that the Health Commission is not to release those documents. The stupidity of the argument can be highlighted with the example of a document containing something or other in respect of national security. Does the Leader of the Opposition believe that such a document in respect of national security ought to be kept secure while allowing as many photocopies as anyone might desire to be made and distributed? Of course not. What is important is the information on the document. I repeat—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:—the Health Commission is following the absolutely explicit edicts of the Coroner. What has ensued since then is that the Ombudsman has become involved at the behest of the Leader of the Opposition. The Ombudsman—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: At the behest of—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: At the behest of the Leader of the Opposition. Two statutory authorities are involved: the Coroner and the Ombudsman. I have spoken with the Attorney-General about this matter because it involves a legal matter—it is not a health matter; it is a legal matter—and the Attorney, following my discussion with him this morning, is to facilitate a meeting between the Coroner and the Ombudsman so that the matter can be sorted out. My role in this matter is to supply the documents when I am allowed to do so. I will do whatever is the result of the discussion between the Ombudsman and the Coroner, who are completely independent statutory authorities. I will do either what is the result of their decision or the decision of the court, which it may come to.

CAPITAL WORKS

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I am pleased to be able to ask the Premier today whether he will outline the Government's capital works program for the next financial year, and in particular the decision to give the green light to the Berri bridge.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Today I have released the broad details of the Government's capital works program for the next financial year. I am delighted to say that that program covers a total amount of \$1 150 million and, in addition to the normal capital works program, we are also embarking on an additional major program called Building a Better Future, using \$300 million of private sector funds to allow major new infrastructure to go ahead immediately in South Australia, and that is good news for South Australia. When the former Labor Government was faced with the State Bank disaster one of the first things it did was to cut back on capital expenditure in this State, and therefore many major community projects that should have gone ahead did not go ahead.

The Government is determined that this additional work be undertaken for the benefit of the community as quickly as possible. The Berri bridge is one of those projects that will now be funded using this \$300 million of private funds. The State Government will pick up the ultimate responsibility together with the income streams that will come out of these projects to repay the interest and the capital on those loans.

Therefore, different initiatives, such as BOO and others, will be set up on a separate basis, but most importantly the projects can proceed immediately. They are important projects that have an economic benefit to the State; in most cases they have a direct income stream.

In the case of the Berri bridge, I am delighted to announce that the Government has agreed in principle to this project now proceeding. The Government will sit down with the consortium that has been put together to see whether that is the consortium that should build the bridge. We are hoping that those negotiations take place quickly and come to a finality so that work on the bridge can start as quickly as possible.

There is a number of other major projects as part of this which will be constructed as well. When we look at some of them we can see the benefit. There is the Bolivar pipeline, which would allow the effluent water from Bolivar to be piped to the Two Wells area and then be used for the growing of horticultural crops specifically targeted at export markets, resulting in more export income for South Australia. There is a number of facilities at Technology Park in the development of an information technology industry which will have a huge benefit and positive impact on South Australia.

There is \$26 million for the Mount Gambier Hospital, so that can proceed as quickly as possible. New day care surgery facilities at Flinders Medical Centre will be able to proceed immediately under this proposal. The Government has already completed one such project, which is the Wood End School. That was opened two weeks ago. The amazing thing is that Wood End School was constructed within three months using private funds, and it was done at well below what was otherwise the estimated cost if it had gone through the traditional processes of the Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is all about jobs, getting projects done quickly, improving the economic development of South Australia and, importantly, saving the taxpayers' money. It is building communities in this State and putting in place the very important infrastructure that will return a direct benefit to those communities. Under the capital works program that I announced today, the Southern Expressway work will start this financial year. That is good news for the people of the southern suburbs, after having to wait 15 years for that project to start.

CORONIAL INQUIRY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question again is to the Minister for Health. Given that the Government said earlier this year that the coronial inquiry and evidence before it would be open to public and media scrutiny, is the real reason for the Government's attempting to suppress its evidence to the Coroner on the Garibaldi affair the fear that it will open the Government to prosecution by concerned parents because of the Minister's failure to deal adequately with the poisoned mettwurst crisis—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is now commenting.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and media scrutiny of the Minister's exercise of his ministerial authority during that crisis?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to ignore the latter part of the question, which was comment. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Government has no desire to suppress the information. As the Leader of the

Opposition knows only too well, when the information was conveyed to him that the Coroner's warrant had been served the information was given to him quite explicitly. I was informed this morning by the person who made the telephone call several months ago that the Leader of the Opposition was advised that he would be supplied with the documents as soon as the Coroner had finished with them.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It is a matter—

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. There are Standing Orders which relate to interjections, and the Leader of the Opposition continues to flout them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Standing Orders are quite definite. When members ask questions, they are not entitled to continue to ask further questions by way of interjection. That applies to all members. I warn members that the Standing Orders will be applied.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was making the point before I was so rudely interrupted that the Leader of the Opposition has been informed quite specifically that he would be given the documents whenever the Coroner's warrant expired. Is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that the Coroner's warrant has been applied to the documents at our request?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You are doing the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for the first time.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Is he suggesting—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader a second time.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that the Coroner has applied a warrant only because he has been requested to do so by the Government? If he is, he is totally impugning the integrity and independence of the Coroner. If that is what he is doing, let him go outside and say so. I am sure the Coroner would be absolutely delighted to hear and to have this point clarified, because undoubtedly this will now be reported. The Coroner will be left thinking to himself, 'I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition actually believes that my warrant was applied at the request of the Government.'

Of course, that is not the case. What happened was that, totally and independently, when the inquiry was set up, a warrant was applied to the documents. Everything that the Government has been advised is that that warrant applies totally to the documents. In every request that we have had for information or to release them, our response has been to ring the Coroner and to inquire from the Coroner what we should do, because we want to do nothing more or nothing less than to abide by the Coroner's warrant. Every time the Coroner's instruction has been, 'Do not release the documents; they are all covered by my warrant.' It is as simple as that. That is exactly what the Government is doing.

As I indicated before, the Ombudsman and the Coroner are two statutory authorities. They are having a meeting to determine which one of their views will be the winner, if you like, in this argument between two lawyers, and the Health Commission will follow whatever is the result of that contretemps between two statutory authorities.

STATE CLOTHING CORPORATION

Mr ASHENDEN (Wright): Will the Treasurer provide an update on the sale of the State Clothing Corporation?

Earlier this year the Treasurer announced that efforts were being made by the Asset Management Task Force to sell the State Clothing Corporation, which has a warehouse at Ridleyton and a factory at Whyalla.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am pleased that the process of the sale has been concluded. I will relate to the House that it has been a time consuming and complicated process. Members would appreciate that the Government was making every endeavour and effort to provide Whyalla with opportunities that might otherwise have been lost had we closed the doors when we came into government. I have already stated to the House that it was one of the Government's imperatives to provide opportunities in Whyalla, which certainly needs those opportunities. That has been one of the complications in the process and it is one that the Asset Management Task Force worked on very diligently under the terms of reference which were agreed between the Chairman of that group and me.

There was a successful outcome. State Apparel, which is a new company formed by the management of the Dixon Clothing Company Pty Ltd, was the successful tenderer. That company has taken over the operations of the Ridleyton warehouse which supplies uniforms to Government and, of course, the Whyalla clothing factory. I reflect on the amount of energy that has been spent in the process and put on the record not my concerns but my disappointment with the outcome in one sense. Whilst it has been successfully completed—and to all intents and purposes it has gone to a person who intends to enhance both operations—the Government was attempting to have continual employment for those people who were still with the State Clothing factory at Whyalla. When they were given the choice of continuing employment and/or re-employment with the Government or a TSP, unfortunately those employees did not take up the employment opportunity.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: There were three—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The information that was provided to me was that the employees who had received an offer had not taken it up.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The honourable member might know that two were on workers' compensation and I think four got an offer.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: However, one of the pleasing aspects was that, when the Government put it on the market (and everybody is aware of our desire to see employment opportunity in Whyalla), a number of the local businesses, particularly the largest business in town, made a commitment to Whyalla to source some of their clothing with State Apparel. I am hopeful that that will occur and that Whyalla will be the beneficiary of that process. The Government hopes that it will be a very successful conclusion to the sale of State Clothing.

EWS OUTSOURCING

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Will the Premier give the House an assurance that no contract for the private management of the metropolitan operations of the EWS will be awarded to any company whose senior European executives are either under investigation or face charges or illegal activity, including

bribes to public officials, until those proceedings have been concluded and, if not, why not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I would have thought that the Opposition would tread very warily in relation to this subject. They well recall earlier that they raised allegations and one of those allegations has subsequently been tried: the person making the allegation is currently in gaol in France, not the person about whom the allegations were made. The member for Hart well knows that, because he has met both these companies overseas, he has contacts overseas and he can pursue the matter himself.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Absolutely. He had the chance to clarify for the Opposition all questions related to the integrity of the directors of those companies. As to any ongoing comments that might be raised about this matter, I can assure the House and the public of South Australia that we will pursue in the diligence process—after the bids are in—when we look at the proposals put before the Government, the absolute integrity of the companies with which we will do business.

In addition, the member for Hart knows that a select committee is proposed in another place, which the Government will be supporting, and he can ask those questions in the select committee. He can ask questions of the companies, he can open up dialogue with the companies, rather than doing what the Opposition is attempting to achieve, that is, a downgrading of the price committed in these bids. The Opposition is attempting to stall the process and reduce the price. It does not want the bids and the process to be successful for South Australia but, as much as the Opposition wants to draw red herrings across the trail, I assure the House with absolute determination that this contract will be put in place in the best interests of South Australians, and it will be a good deal for South Australia now and in the future.

BUSINESS ASIA CONVENTION

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development advise how the Business Asia seminar, which was held recently in Adelaide, fared financially? Two weeks ago I was fortunate enough to attend the seminar held biannually by the Economic Development Authority. I believe that the previous seminar held in November 1993 and hosted by the former Government cost in excess of \$750 000.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Business Asia was held recently as part of the Government strategy to reposition South Australia in the Asian market place, the consumer market of the world in the future, given that during the 1980s we certainly lost our place in that market place in that we were outperformed by every other State in Australia, including the Northern Territory, in positioning goods and services out of the respective States and Territories for those market places. So we have a lot of ground to make up. Our strategy includes not only upgrading of the offices and personnel in Asia but also putting in place performance agreements, business plans and requirements for our representatives in those markets to report to us regularly on their outcomes, on their performance and on what they are delivering for South Australian based companies.

That is in stark contrast to what applied previously, where we simply paid the overseas representatives and had minimum contact with them, let alone checking their performance and their delivery of services to South Australian companies wanting to access those markets. In addition as part of that strategy, we have assisted a range of small to medium enterprises in South Australia to go to such trade fairs and exhibitions as HOFFEX in Singapore and Hong Kong and infrastructure forums in Jakarta. It is important in pursuing aggressively a strategy to reposition South Australia in the market place that we do it consistently. You cannot go in for five minutes of glory, pull out and then hope that the benefits will flow. It will be a long, determined and necessarily consistent haul for South Australia to open up those opportunities.

Business Asia is part of that strategy of developing an export culture and encouraging the Asian regions to take a fresh look at us. As Minister Habibie said during his visit to South Australia, at the dinner hosted by the Premier, they view Australia as a big mining operation, large farms and great beaches—full stop. They have not had a close look at or assessed the modern research development and technology advancements that this State and this country are offering that region. Whereas in the past Minister Habibie has had a 'look north' strategy to Germany, Japan and America, he is now quoting publicly that he needs a 'look south' strategy from Indonesia into Australia. Business Asia helps us to reposition and have a part of the action in marketing what we have—the goods and services out of South Australia—that can supply that demand.

As the honourable member indicated in his remarks, Business Asia 93—the first such event—cost in excess of \$750 000. I am pleased to tell the House that, despite the fact that we had some 20 overseas guest presenters, including the Hong Kong Trade Development Corporation and Singapore Trade Development Council—major players in investment infrastructure in Asia and China—the cost was nil. In fact, there will be a small profit from Business Asia. If ever there was a stark contrast in how to do things, this would be it. The Labor Government threw money at it—\$750 000—whereas we achieved the same objective while making a small profit on presenting through Business Asia 95. Out of that we obtained a commitment from the Hong Kong Shanghai Bank confirming that it would be opening an office in Adelaide. It has 3 000 branches world wide, with 600 in Asia.

We had from the Federal Environment Protection Authority a commitment of \$50 000 to the EWS-led project to clean up the Ciliwung River. Whether it is the Police Force, Mayfields with its locomotives, SACON's operations involving heritage protection and preservation of buildings, or furthering the Northern Territory-South Australia expo and trade, it is all linked in to a concerted effort and a strategy to open up market opportunities to South Australia so that we can bring contracts into this State to compensate for its small economy.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Does the Premier still stand by his pre-election promise repeated before the introduction of casemix last July to halve hospital waiting lists in his first term of office? In his policy speech of 28 November 1993 the Premier said:

Public hospitals will receive an extra \$6 million a year to begin the task of halving waiting lists in our first term.

Earlier this year, major public hospitals, including Flinders Medical Centre, Noarlunga and the Queen Elizabeth, announced the cancellation of most elective surgery until the end of the financial year as a consequence of the Brown Government's financial squeeze.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. I ask the Premier to ignore the last part of the question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I hope the honourable member reads the budget papers in detail tomorrow, indicating that the Government is making significant headway in reducing hospital waiting lists. In fact, in our first 12 months we have achieved a 10 per cent reduction in those waiting lists. More importantly, we have halved the number of people who have waited 12 months or more for elective surgery. There is clear proof that the promise I made during the election campaign is being met by this Government, achieving 10 per cent off the waiting lists in the first year and halving the 12 month waiting list for elective surgery. That is a very good result in anyone's language.

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Health inform the House of any progress on the Government's objective of reducing waiting lists at public hospitals?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am delighted to flesh out the response that the Premier just gave, because the answer to this question is fantastic news for South Australia. We all know that year after year the waiting lists under Labor inexorably climbed, which meant that some women could not bend down to pick things off the floor because their hips were not being operated upon. What did the Labor Government do? Absolutely nothing. Immediately upon coming to Government, we made the hospitals focus on efficiency by the casemix funding mechanism and, as the Premier indicated, we have had a 10 per cent decrease in the number of people on those waiting lists in one year. When the Labor Party left office there were about 9 500 people on the waiting lists; now there are about 8 000 people, which is a 9.7 per cent decrease in 12 months. This is at the beginning of a four year strategy, when the hospitals have not been used to being efficient because the previous Government let them waste the taxpayers' money. That is really what it was. I see the members of the Opposition apparently smirking.

The simple facts are that we have made requisite budgetary restrictions on the hospitals and the output has increased. There is only one conclusion to be drawn: money was wasted under the previous Administration. Last week, a new set of waiting list figures was released showing that, over the year to the end of March, as both the Premier and I have indicated, waiting lists were down by 7 per cent. But it gets better. In the year to the end of March the waiting lists at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—and I know that the members for Lee, Hanson, Peake and various other members will be particularly interested in this figure—have fallen by 22 per cent. Why, I ask, on behalf of all the sick people of South Australia, did the Labor Government not introduce these sorts of measures a decade ago? Why did it allow the lists inexorably to go up? Why did it not introduce a few simple efficiency measures and see a decrease of 22 per cent at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? At the Women's and Children's Hospital, the waiting lists are down by 16 per cent. At the Royal Adelaide Hospital, they are down by 14 per cent.

Let us talk about Flinders Medical Centre, because this is the *cause celebre* of the member for Elizabeth at the moment.

The honourable member is reported in *Hansard* yesterday quoting all sorts of scare tactics—'There's an excess of 2 000 patients now waiting for surgery', and so on. Let us not deal in fiction but talk about fact. I know the member for Elizabeth has a lot of trouble with the facts, but here are the facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: In March 1994, shortly after we had taken over and before the casemix funding mechanism started to right the wrongs of the last decade, there were 1 955 patients on the Flinders Medical Centre waiting lists; in March 1995, there were 1 849—a fall of 5 per cent, all of this from a hospital that, according to the member for Elizabeth, is on its knees and is about to fall over. It is simply a farce. All of our strategies are working. It is as simple as that. Waiting lists are down. The taxpayer is benefiting—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has had more than a fair go.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As I indicated, the waiting lists are down extraordinarily, and that is a great credit to everybody working in the system, and the taxpayer is benefiting—surely a win-win situation.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Elizabeth.

HEALTH BUDGET

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order, the honourable member will ask her question. She has set a bad example by continuing to interject when the Minister was answering. She will obviously not do it again.

Ms STEVENS: My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Why has the Government planned to underspend its health capital works budget for 1994-95 by over \$12 million? Why were some of the works postponed this year recycled as new works in a press release issued by the Premier today? Recent Health Commission financial statements indicate that the capital program is expected to be underspent by \$12.3 million at the end of the financial year, partly due to what is described as 'planned slippage' of new works. Projects with planned slippage—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS: —will include the accident and emergency upgrade at Flinders Medical Centre, the Lyell McEwin stage 3A, the Breast X-ray Service equipment, Marion Community Health Centre, IMVS redevelopment, SAMHS area project, and Mount Gambier new hospital and community health centre.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: There are some prime examples in that list which just make the point that unfortunately members opposite, when they were in Government, were in an absolute time warp. The prime example of that is the last item in the list quoted by the honourable member involving the Mount Gambier hospital. As the member for Gordon knows only too well, this is something that was promised by every single Labor Government over the past X years—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Custance will come to order as well.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The simple fact is that that would have been a larger ask for the public sector. This Government is no longer in that time warp. We are prepared to explore effective and efficient ways of financing these things so that the benefit to the public is maximised. As everybody in Mount Gambier knows—and I am surprised that the member for Elizabeth does not know this because she was recently there in her much publicised trip in the Deputy Leader's car. I am surprised that she—the member for Elizabeth (I apologise for using the personal pronoun)—does not know that in fact the hospital is to be financed by the private sector, and we are very close to announcing the successful tenderer. We are making great advances in the provision of much needed infrastructure, well recognised as being needed for years, because it was promised by every previous Labor Government, but we are providing it at a cheaper cost more effectively.

CONSERVATION COUNCIL

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of his assessment of the Conservation Council of South Australia's score card, published in the Messenger Press, criticising the Government's environmental performance? I note that the Conservation Council has compiled a report card suggesting that the Government is only half-hearted in its environmental efforts.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, I have noticed the score card in the Messenger Press, and I might say that I am rather disappointed in the way this has been put together, particularly so because they have left off many of the most important subjects. Really, if it is going to do this sort of thing and give us all report cards it needs to get its facts right. The issues about which I am concerned and the areas it has left out include subjects such as our drive to clean up the Murray River, the huge efforts in land rehabilitation, the money being invested to stop marine pollution, improvements in waste management, the formulation of new litter strategies, the inroads into recycling, the efforts to improve water quality, undertakings by local industry to improve their environmental performance, and our new efforts in national parks. All of these matters have gone unnoticed in this so-called 'report card', which I would suggest fails dismally.

Over the weekend I was also disappointed to learn of a comment made by the Conservation Council expressing concern about the lack of action on the part of this Government regarding our dealing with stormwater, particularly in view of the concerted work to clean up the quality of stormwater in South Australia. I only need to refer to the introduction and passage through both Houses of the catchment management legislation and the establishment of management boards for both the Torrens River and the Patawalonga.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I suggest that members opposite not make too many comments about some of these subjects, because they have ignored most of them in this State for decades. On the matter of stormwater, let me remind the House and the Conservation Council that the Government has just released a new stormwater code of practice that will become the basis of new anti-pollution laws covering

householders, business and industry. It is through that code that significant improvements are being made in the quality of discharge to creeks, rivers and most importantly to marine life, impacting positively on our riverine and coastal environment.

I might say that I am getting a little bit tired of this knock-knock attitude of almost every initiative that is being taken. We are giving a very high priority in this State to establishing a recycle hub and a major environment centre concentrating on recycling in particular. We are seeking industry to relocate to our new recycle park, to give us green industry, green jobs and new green export opportunities. I would hope that the Conservation Council takes note of some of those initiatives. Finally, I am particularly keen to work closely with the Conservation Council, and it is important that that should happen. Let me also say that knockers should start waking up to the real efforts being undertaken regarding the environment in this State. Efforts in the past have been ignored, overlooked or not even taken on by previous Governments.

CHILD ABUSE

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Will the Premier take urgent action to address the apparent confusion and lack of communication between his Minister for Health and his Minister for Family and Community Services over the future of abused children who have been admitted to hospital? On Monday, the *Advertiser* reported that some abused children are forced to stay at hospitals after their medical treatment has finished because of bureaucratic delays or because Government agencies cannot find them a foster home. A spokesperson for the Minister for Family and Community Services was then reported as saying that the Minister had not been told of the delays. Prior to the election of the Brown Government the portfolios of health and family and community services were held by the same Minister, and cost shifting between the two departments was not a problem.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Again, I would like to put some facts on the table: about 10 days ago I met with the chairpersons of all medical staff societies of all of the major public hospitals in relation to a lot of matters. One matter raised with me concerned patients who were, in what is termed in the jargon, 'outliers'. I was particularly keen to get information in relation to these matters to obtain an overview of the situation. Some work was being done in the Women's and Children's Hospital, because it was particularly in that area of children's long-stay outliers that I was focusing.

Unfortunately, at that stage there was some misunderstanding with the facts that were presented in the form of an incomplete survey. Upon seeing an article in the paper—which neither I nor the Minister for Family and Community Services knew about—I rang the Women's and Children's Hospital. The hospital took immediate action and found that a staff member had misunderstood and misrepresented some facts. The hospital has written to the Minister for Family and Community Services to identify that. It is not a matter at all of a misunderstanding between the Minister for Health and the Minister for Family and Community Services; it is simply a matter of a misunderstanding of data that was in a formative stage being prepared by a staff member of the Women's and Children's Hospital.

ASBESTOS

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations assure tenants who live in Housing Trust homes that they are not at risk from asbestos? A recent television news report referred to the removal of asbestos floor covering from a trust property and warned that the asbestos could be a health risk.

The Hon. J.K.G. OSWALD: The Housing Trust is well aware of the potential risk associated with asbestos. Our expert scientific advice is that asbestos does not pose a safety risk unless the fibre is released into the atmosphere. This can happen through drilling and the sanding process, and it can also happen when people attempt to remove vinyl which has an asbestos backing. To assist tenants the Housing Trust has previously given out brochures which give certain warnings and informs them of those products that contain asbestos. The regulations under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act deal with the handling and direct removal of asbestos material.

The trust has developed procedures to manage asbestos removal based on these regulations, and it employs companies and individuals who are specifically licensed under the Act. The recent publicity related to a case where the tenant removed vinyl and exposed an asbestos backing. I point out that on many occasions the vinyl has been installed by a tenant or previous tenants and not necessarily by the Housing Trust. However, once the asbestos has been identified the trust will employ someone who is highly qualified to remove it. All I can say in this particular case is that, if tenants intend removing vinyl floor coverings from their properties and they have any concern at all about the presence of asbestos, they should contact the trust's regional office, and that office will send out an expert in the field to investigate the matter. If it does contain asbestos, the trust will remove it using qualified people who are licensed under the Act.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): In light of the fact that the Premier announced that the priority of last year's budget was economic growth, how does he explain recent ABS economic data which show for South Australia appalling rates of growth and declines in indices, such as dwelling commencements and motor vehicle registrations?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I suggest that the honourable member read the recent report from Access Economics in terms of the economy of each of the States. That report highlights the sort of legacy, in terms of the State economy, left to this new Liberal Government by 11 years of Labor Government. The report talks about the need for massive restructuring of the South Australian economy; the fact that we had no international tourism industry; the fact that we were heavily reliant on manufacturing industry that was focused on the domestic market; and the fact that we were uncompetitive in a range of areas, particularly because the former Government had increased taxation by the highest percentage of any Government in Australia for the past three years leading up to the last election. Other areas were also picked up in this report.

The one thing this Government has done and done very effectively is to start to bring about a massive restructuring of the State's economy. First, we have tackled the State debt, as it indicated we needed to do. We have tackled the recurrent

deficit, as again that article stressed we needed to do. We have started to bring about restructuring in terms of what industries we are advancing in this State. We are focusing on export industries, because they can obtain the benefit of the growth in the Asian area in particular. For the first time, we have started to put in place an international tourism industry. But what happens? The Labor Party, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, gets out and knocks it every time we make an announcement.

The Hon. S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Worrina. Look at the extent to which the Labor Party, including its mouthpiece, Don Dunstan, has knocked Worrina since the day I announced that we had an international tourism project there.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: We didn't knock IBM, did we? You knocked it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Labor Party has come out knocking the information technology industry and our outsourcing of Government work. There is a second area where Access Economics stressed that this Government needed to restructure the economy, which we are doing. We have had to establish in South Australia industries which are not so reliant on tariff support. If there is one industry where that is the case, it is the information technology industry which this Government has done so much to build up in South Australia.

I also point out that, as part of the restructuring, if the Government cuts more than 5 per cent off its own expenditure, automatically that will produce a lower growth rate in the Government's input into the economy. If imposed on that is the worst drought for many years, that also has a negative impact. However, the same report from Access Economics talks about this State now facing the prospect of a considerable acceleration in growth rate. For 1995-96 it is projecting a growth rate of 3.25 per cent. I should have thought that was a clear mandate that this Government has started to carry out that important restructuring, cleaning up the Government's finances and putting this State back on to a growth path once again after the neglect and decline that occurred under the previous Government.

I highlight one further figure that the House must register. The former Government lost 33 000 jobs in its declining years. That is the sort of knock that South Australia received from the Labor Party. We are starting to build that up with 12 000 jobs in the first year, and we expect about 15 000 or more jobs this year.

AUSTRALIAN TOURISM EXCHANGE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Tourism explain the significance of the Australian Tourism Exchange held last week in Sydney and what South Australia will gain from its presence at that event?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yesterday I dropped some special figures in relation to tourism in South Australia, and as part of my explanation I made some brief comments in relation to the Australian Tourism Exchange. I think it is important to put in more detail as to what happened at the Australian Tourism Exchange. It is the largest travel wholesaling and retailing exchange in Australia and in the southern hemisphere. There were 370 booths with 530 wholesalers and 569 buyers. Those buyers came from all over the world and they were interested in purchasing business in every State of Australia. There were 31 companies from South Australia compared with three companies that were there some two

years ago under the Labor Government. By encouraging private sector operators we shall be able to get an estimated \$150 million worth of tourism business in this State over the next 12 months. The reason why we can pretty accurately put that down is that it is estimated that over the past three years \$1.5 billion of tourism business has come out of the Australian Tourism Exchange in Sydney.

One of the interesting groups that was buying most with regard to South Australia was of a German-speaking background. It is interesting to note that in the latest statistics from the Bureau of Tourism we have had a 38 per cent increase in tourism numbers from Europe in the past 18 months and a 32 per cent increase in tourism numbers from Asia. The interesting figure is the 38 per cent from Europe, which comprises specifically Swiss, German and other people from that area. One of the other important issues is that out of this Tourism Exchange we expect for the first time to get the opportunity to get in touch with 28 new international operators who will operate in South Australia.

RAILWAY STATIONS

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Does the Deputy Premier stand by his 1991 public statement that there were no good arguments for the closure of Millswood, Hawthorn and Clapham railway stations, and does his statement last week, 'This is the end of the series,' mean that there will be no further metropolitan railway station closures for the term of this Government? In an Adelaide *News* picture story of 1991, for which the member for Waite was photographed trackside, he said that closing the stations would achieve little increase in efficiency and would hurt the service by reducing the number of people who had access to it. He added:

Given that the current superior speed and comfort of train travel has had little effect on patronage levels, I can't see that closing a few stations is going to help. We have seen no good arguments for their closure.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has explained his question.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I am more than happy to answer the question—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: —because, if the Leader of the Opposition will listen, if he had—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: No, he won't.

The SPEAKER: I assure the member for Giles that he will.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: If he had obtained the material and talked to his colleague, who was then the Minister for Transport, he would know that I made representations to the then Deputy Premier not to close any stations on that line. I made that point at the time and he well remembers. I said, 'I will use every endeavour on the basis that they have to perform.' At the time I was reported in the local media as saying, 'If we do not get patronage up, the stations will close.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is answering the question.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Giles well remembers that that was the deal.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence has asked his question.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The member for Giles said, 'We are going to make a special effort,' and he gave out free tickets. He must have been compelled by the argument. The only trouble was that there was a big train strike, so nobody got on the trains. It was one of those great debacles with which only the Labor Party can be associated. My record is completely clear and clean. I sent out a newsletter to all my constituents, saying, 'If you don't use the trains, be aware that you will lose the stations.' Indeed, I said, 'You have to get on the train. You don't take a car; you take a train. If you have a discretion about travel, take a train, because, if you don't, you will lose the stations.' I said that at a number of meetings. I warned them, and nobody took any notice. It was one of the battles that I lost. Members should be aware that I campaigned for increased patronage, because without increased patronage—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence is out of order.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I said, 'Without increased patronage you will lose your stations,' and that is exactly what happened. As has been done over the past 10 years, there has been scrutiny of the patronage of all stations in middle Adelaide because people are not using the trains.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr WADE (Elder): With the prospect of the information super highway becoming a major factor in our lives, will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education highlight how the Adelaide Institute of TAFE is exploring ways in which computer technology can be used to improve productivity in training institutes within the Asia Pacific region?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this area. The Adelaide Institute of TAFE is an outstanding example within the TAFE sector of what is being delivered in South Australia. Currently, we have people from 19 nations under the Colombo Plan Staff College for Technical Education updating their skills in regard to the delivery of training using hi-tech facilities. That institute is one of only two in Australia which is designated as a centre of excellence for the delivery of technical and vocational education using high technology. It is to the credit of that institute, its staff and also TAFE. Those people from 19 countries have been looking at the expertise that is available here. It is the first time that group has come to Australia to look at delivery via Internet, CD-Rom technology, computer assisted learning in its various formats and also where we lead in terms of satellite delivery and video conferencing.

It is one of the unfortunate things that people in South Australia do not appreciate how good our TAFE sector is and, in particular, how good the Adelaide Institute of TAFE is. That facility, which is principally in Light Square, accommodates in excess of 23 000 students: it is much larger than any of our three excellent universities. It is soon to be expanded to take about 28 000 students. It is a leader and is recognised throughout the world as being excellent in terms of the delivery of training for technical and vocational education. We should celebrate the success of that institute and its recognition by UNESCO as one of the centres of excellence, and commend the staff there as a further example of how South Australia can lead the world in being the smart State.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): Whilst the Minister for Industrial Affairs is wrestling with the medical profession over WorkCover payments, will he also investigate the amounts some hospitals are charging WorkCover? A constituent was recently admitted to Whyalla hospital for after-care following an X-ray. He was admitted at 1.30 p.m. He had his temperature and blood pressure taken, and used a bottle. He was not seen by a doctor and was discharged at 7 p.m. on the same day. For the 5½ hours he was in hospital, WorkCover received an account for \$964?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is a very important question and I will take it up with the corresponding Minister.

POLICE COMMAND RESPONSE DIVISIONS

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Emergency Services provide the House with the latest results from the command response divisions which were set up on 1 January 1995 as a direct result of the success of Operation Pendulum?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in policing matters. Of course, the member for Florey, as a former police officer and Police Association representative, is well aware of the significant measures that can be taken by special policing operations to reduce crime. I am pleased to report that to date police have achieved significant success in the use of the new command response divisions that have been established. Members may recall that following the success—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the member for Spence cares to sit back and listen for a change, he will hear how police are actually achieving things they were unable to achieve under the bureaucratic impositions placed on them by his Government. After the success of Operation Pendulum, two command response divisions were established from 5 January this year for an initial six month trial period. Each command response division comprised 47 police officers with a northern division being located at Holden Hill and a southern division being located at Glenelg. These divisions have to date undertaken policing operations to address behavioural problems and continued the successful tactics which were developed during Operation Pendulum, which proved significantly successful in clearing crime across metropolitan Adelaide. The divisions are also drawn upon for special tasks, and the most notable of those recently was providing operational support at the National Action rally at Glenelg.

I am pleased to report that as at 30 April, after fewer than four months of operation, the divisions had achieved 427 arrests and 914 reports. The majority of these arrests and reports were for receiving and unlawful possession, larceny, break and enter, and drug offences. I remind members that this previous operation followed the success of Operation Pendulum which, in an intensive three month period, achieved the arrest or report of 1 080 offenders for 2 707 serious offences, the recovery of property valued at \$851 796 and the clearing up of approximately \$2.5 million worth of crime. The indications are that, at this stage, four months into the operation of the southern and northern command response divisions, their success is similar to Operation Pendulum, and we look forward to this clear-up rate continuing.

COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Minister look at providing compensation to people who are charged with an offence, who go to court and who then at the commencement of proceeding have the charges dropped? A constituent has complained to me that he had been charged with an offence based purely on a statement made by the alleged victim. On five separate occasions the charged person appeared in court and each time the case was adjourned. On the sixth occasion the police dropped the charge. The charged person was considerably out of pocket because of the unnecessary cost of legal representation and the time away from his business to attend the court on the six occasions?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Attorney. It is a very vexed question. I know that many people who are innocent and who are put through that trauma, whether civil or criminal proceedings, feel aggrieved that they have had to present themselves to the court. They have been aggrieved about the time involved, the costs of legal representation and the fact that they have gone through significant personal stress. At least in the civil jurisdiction there is a remedy whereby, if the person is successful, they have an opportunity to reclaim costs. In relation to the criminal jurisdiction, that has not been the case. It is not the Government's intention, as far as I am aware, to change that practice simply because it is the same practice that prevails around the world. It is unfortunately part of the criminal justice system that we have.

I will ask the Attorney to respond to the honourable member's question and obtain as much detail as possible on what progress is being made or what discussions have taken place on that issue. I know that it is very topical. I know that the extent to which a person is required, because of an offence being charged, to appear in court when, subsequently, the case is not proceeded with is being discussed right around the world. Many of those people, of course, are quite guilty, but there is lack of evidence, so in those circumstances no-one would feel that they are too upset by the justice system.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): I bring up the twenty-fifth report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Over the years that I have been here I have been slandered and libelled by a good many people from time to time, but I find the present practice in public a little more than I am prepared to continue to tolerate. It is indeed from people outside this place who have no respect for the truth and no respect for the rights of others. I have always pursued truth in public affairs and justice for the individual,

wherever they have been wrongly accused or misrepresented. In exercising these principles, I do not seek kudos for myself, nor have I ever done so, least of all at the expense of others. I have always sought to protect the practices and privileges of this place, to my great personal cost, both in money and in terms of career advancement on many occasions, and I guess that this occasion will be no exception.

I draw attention to some problems that confront this country in general and this State in particular about development. Development anywhere authorised by State law, quite properly, will be overridden by a centralist Federal Government such as the ALP Keating Government whenever it suits its political agenda to do so. The case of the Hindmarsh Island bridge is absolutely no exception. I have not proselytised that matter, nor have I sought statements relating to it, however these have come to me in consequence of my demonstrated commitment, I guess, over the years, and my willingness to ventilate matters where truth has been the victim of political opportunism.

During the course of debate yesterday on the Planning Bill I drew attention to the consequences for planning law at State level where the Federal Government chooses to demonstrate that it has power over what the State can do whenever it chooses to do so and obviously, in this instance, it has chosen to use the Aboriginal people and their alleged beliefs for its own political ends. In the course of the remarks I made I was reading a letter into the record from Mr John E. McHughes. He is of Aboriginal descent of Ngarrandgeri extraction. In the course of reading that letter—and I will not read that part of it such as the record shows already, but I will simply summarise it—I indicated that Mr McHughes is the son of Walter McHughes and a grandson of William McHughes. Both of them come from Raukkan, which was known as Point McLeay.

He was born at Wellington and was a member of a family of 15. He spoke about these matters, the so-called discoveries made by Professor Saunders, to a friend of his, a fellow Ngarrandgeri, Mr Henry Rankine. He pointed out that Mr Rankine believed that the Granite Island dreaming and any alleged women's secrets spiritual thing had been destroyed on that site, if it ever existed there, at the time rock was blasted for the breakwater. He said he had a lot of respect for Mr Rankine, and so do I. He pointed out that he had never met Mr Doug Millera officially but that he did see him one Saturday evening, as it turns out, not long before the Hon. Robert Tickner, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the Federal Government, stopped the bridge. Members might be interested to learn that Mr Doug Millera was also one of the group of people who sought overseas aid from Colonel Gaddafi in Libya. He came into the hotel and gave a black power salute. He was also in company with a man who comes from the other side of this issue, Alan Chirpy Campbell. This man sought to get Mrs Joe Lush, nee Tripp, recognised. She lived on a site near Goolwa for 40 years, yet his efforts were despised, indeed ignored by these people. He said:

When we first ventured on this project we had trouble getting this recognised. It was published in the *Advertiser* and the *News*. However, not one Aboriginal authority came forward to help us fight for this small, but meaningful monument.

I ask all members to examine the record of that document—his letter—and see how stupid and irresponsible the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the Federal Government has been in the way in which he has dealt with this matter. There was connivance and there certainly was conspiracy to do what

should never have been done, and I am well satisfied of that and so is Mr McHughes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): I refer today to an incident involving our new transport system. Late one Friday morning I received a call from a constituent who had just been notified that the bus service running near his house had been cancelled. The bus ran from Salisbury through to Tea Tree Gully and his two children would use that bus to attend Golden Grove High School. My constituent had chosen Golden Grove High School because the bus went directly there from his house in Salisbury Heights and if his children had attended the other local school at Salisbury East they would have been required to catch two buses. So, he had deliberately chosen Golden Grove High School for this reason. He had been notified the previous day that that bus service would no longer be available for his children: it would no longer be available from that day. My constituent was given one day's notice to make other arrangements.

Not only that, but it turned out that the timetable was not available for the new service: the old service was to be cut in two, one service originating out of Salisbury and terminating near Greenwith, being run by the Elizabeth depot of TransAdelaide. His children would have to get off and catch another bus which would go past their school, and that bus would run out of the St Agnes depot. My constituent's major problem was that he needed to get the timetables, but they were not available. He was meant to send his school-age children to catch a bus at some time or other, to get off at Greenwith, to stand in an area where there was no bus shelter—no shelter from the weather—and to wait until a bus—and they did not know when it was coming—might pass.

I rang both the Elizabeth and St Agnes depots and eventually the city head office of TransAdelaide. This was late morning, yet one of the timetables was not even to be printed until 2 p.m. The Elizabeth depot timetable was available later that day but was not printed for people to get hold of. The best they could do for me, they said, was to promise to have the timetables available on the buses on the weekend, which meant that people with school-age children would somehow have to use a bus on the weekend to try to obtain a timetable. Eventually by five minutes to five, I managed to get both timetables faxed through to my office so that I could then fax them to my constituent.

Just one constituent was able to find out the timetable and I hope that family was able to pass on that information to other families whose children caught that school bus. It is appalling that TransAdelaide would let the situation reach the point where passengers were not notified of the rather dramatic change to the bus route, where timetables were not available when that change occurred and where the infrastructure was not in place for those children and adults who needed to change buses half way through their route. No shelter was available for these people. Indeed, I am told that about 15 or 16 school children would be on that bus, so those 15 or 16 children would not have known where they were going or what they were doing on that Monday. I am told that not only were passengers not informed but that there was no consultation with the council or residents.

If this is the sort of service that we can expect from the new TransAdelaide system, we have to look forward to a change in Government to get a better system in place. This

is not the only incidence of the transport system being changed with little consultation. People are starting to become concerned, especially those in our outer suburbs, about what is happening to the bus system. I have sighted a pamphlet that the Minister put out (and I must get the title right) saying that 'the system is bigger, better, larger and faster'. I think it has proved to be the opposite.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr BASS (Florey): This afternoon I will speak briefly about the Modbury Hospital, and I am sorry that the shadow Minister for Health, the member for Elizabeth, is not in the Chamber. I will give an overview of what happened when the Government decided to implement private managers in the hospital. Rallies and public meetings were called by the Labor Party, led by the Federal member for Makin, Mr Peter Duncan, and some of his staff, and they made several comments on why the Government should not do what it intended to do. All we were doing was putting in private management but, no, they did not accept that. They had the Nurses Federation at Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre telling the elderly that the Government was going to sell the hospital, so they should sign their petition. They had rallies in Rundle Mall. They had a rally at the hospital the day we signed the contract with Healthscope. I drove over there and saw that there were 16 people at the rally and, when you consider that Modbury Hospital covers—

Mr Brindal: One six?

Mr BASS: One six. When you consider that Modbury Hospital caters for probably 150 000 people, 16 is .01 per cent. But let us be fair: I drove by later on, and a police car there had stopped for the two policemen, to have a sausage. I counted them into the number of people present, so that there were 18, but that is still only .01 per cent—not what we would call a real representation of the people in the north-east.

Mr Brindal: You should have counted the sausages.

Mr BASS: I should have done. During the rally, the Labor and union people decided to throw in another red herring, saying how the Port Macquarie Hospital was to be a private hospital dealing with public patients and how that was a catastrophe. 'You can't do this,' said the unionists and the Nurses Federation. But, lo and behold, the Port Macquarie Hospital did not start until November last year, so what the union, the Nurses Federation and the Labor Party were saying was a load of codswallop. The Federal member, Mr Peter Duncan, even tried to get the Federal Health Minister involved and to say that they would stop the finance coming to South Australia. I think the Federal Government has done enough to harm the health services with the way it is carrying on.

I happened to speak recently with the member for the Port Macquarie district, Wendy Machin, MP, and asked her how the Port Macquarie Hospital was going. She said, 'It's been a complete success; everybody is happy with the service.' She said that, in fact, at the last election the Labor candidate used the Port Macquarie Hospital as a fighting stance to try to dislodge the sitting member. Would you believe that Wendy Machin, MP, not only won but outgunned the Labor candidate by two to one?

I was very unfortunate some weeks ago to have my father go into the Modbury Hospital. He was in there for 11 days, and I went there regularly and spoke to the nurses. Everybody is happy; they provide a great service; the patients are well

looked after and everything is running like a charm. Now, where is the member for Elizabeth? Has she stood up and said, 'I was wrong. I threw in all the red herrings I could, but I was wrong: the Modbury Hospital has been an outstanding success. Healthscope is now managing it, everything is going well, it is reducing the waiting lists and it is delivering an excellent service'? I suggest that the shadow Minister, the member for Elizabeth, should stand up in this House and apologise for throwing in all those red herrings when such a good service is being provided for the people of the north-east.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I will follow my friend and colleague the member for Florey by saying that my step-daughter had a son, Lucas William, on Friday a week ago. She had that child at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and I can assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that there was no waiting list at all. She went into labour and delivered that child in a wonderful new facility with care and attention of a standard of which the Government can be most proud.

The Queen Victoria building is certainly a credit to this Government and to the previous Government, which would have been involved in its planning. The level of help which Natasha received there is a credit to all associated with that hospital. When we are talking about such things as waiting lists it is important to remember that we are talking about specific classes of people. I was being facetious about saying there are no waiting lists for pregnancies, because a child tends to be born, whether or not we like it, exactly when the time has arrived. Our hospitals are coping with births and, as far as I know—and I have not heard the Opposition say otherwise—they are coping with emergency medical procedures.

When we are discussing waiting lists, we are talking about waiting lists for elective surgery, which is of a different order from people who are in need of hospitalisation for emergency procedures or for procedures which simply will not wait. I say that in the context that tomorrow the Deputy Premier will introduce the second budget of this Government. I can predict that in my own electorate, in the media and from the Opposition there will be no end of carping and criticism to the effect that we should not be doing this and we should be doing something else.

I would like to share with members an experience I had recently, because yesterday I spoke about the education protest outside this building. This year I had occasion to visit the Highgate Primary School which, like schools in the electorates of some of the members opposite, had lost a teacher because of staffing numbers and the way the enrolments work. I went there and said that I would help to get a teacher reinstated at that school but I would not help if it meant taking a teacher from a school in the district of the member for Torrens, the member for Eyre or any other member of this House.

Whatever the rules are they must be applied fairly, because it is my belief that the parents in the member for Torrens' electorate love their children no less than do the parents of Highgate Primary School, Unley Primary School or Cook Primary School. So, the system has to be fair. We then talked about what we could do, and I said that, if education is important, as you say it is and I believe it is, one of the options is to put up taxes, but guess what? There was not a great deal of receptivity among my electors for any

increases in taxes and charges. I would say that is one of the great dilemmas faced by this Government, by the Opposition when it was in Government (and if it ever comes into Government again), and by every single member in this House.

We all have the experience of a constant procession of people all thinking they need special attention. Indeed, some of them are unfairly treated, but many other people think their need is a priority. When you get down to the hard question facing Government of how to pay for this need, how to meet it and deciding what can be cut to provide the extra money you are seeking, you never seem to get an answer, let alone a satisfactory answer. We all constantly want more and we all seek to do more, but we do not want to pay more for it. I am talking not only about electors and Government but about us as human beings. We all want more pay, but we do not necessarily want a greater workload to earn the greater pay. We all want cheaper electrical goods, and we do not mind paying for overseas goods, whether or not they do Australians out of a job. We do not mind paying for overseas goods if they cost less, because we will always take the best bargain we can. I put to members opposite, if they want to play a constructive part—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I believe in buying Australian, and I constantly write to my electors saying that, but I have to say that they, and sometimes even I—because I am as guilty of it as they—will look along the shelf and pick out the best value for the cheapest price, because it is sometimes easier to be honest in theory than in practice.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Today I want to continue with my remarks commenced during the grievance debate yesterday regarding traffic along Trimmer Parade and Sportsman's Drive at Seaton, and also at the junctions of Island Drive and Bartley Terrace with West Lakes Boulevard. The problem at these three junctions, more frequently at Trimmer Parade, occurs when vehicles coming to a T-junction are about to turn left or right, Although the driver's code manual put out by the Motor Registration Office—and it is also taught by driving instructors—states that the driver on the inside lane remains in that lane until the turn is complete, most drivers want to cross over one or two lanes at a time. In so doing, they cause accidents over and over again. The Department of Transport could assist drivers by painting lane markings on the roadways indicating to drivers that they should keep within that lane. I hope that this is done quite soon.

My other concern involves the member for Ramsay, who is at present (for a short time, anyway) the Leader of the Opposition. He conducted a survey in my electorate of Lee a few months back in order to get the electors' feelings about how to combat crime. He has said in this place and through the media that crime in this State is on the increase and there should be a bipartisan approach to this problem. Up until now, I have not seen the results nor any correspondence from the Leader regarding the recommendations of that survey. Of course, I undertake surveys in my electorate, both when I go door knocking and when I issue to new electors with my welcoming letter details of surveys on various issues, whether it involve traffic or education problems, the matter of how to combat crime, or local government questionnaires, and I will be collating these returns in the next couple of weeks.

We hear from Labor members opposite rhetoric but no substance in what they say and no follow up to surveys they conduct. I do welcome the opportunity, whenever the Leader

of the Opposition wishes to take up my offer, to discuss with him his views on combating crime. I do not know why he chose the electorate of Lee, because I thought that crime in my electorate was very minimal. I have some hot spots under control with the full cooperation of the Henley and Grange police. I would say the Leader would have more problems in his area of Ramsay for which he has done nothing in the past 14 years.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Today I want to raise another issue that one of my constituents brought to my attention involving the EWS.

Mr Brindal: You must have a very busy office.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I do have a very busy office, and I will explain one of the reasons for that.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Well, if your Government continues to proceed with abandoning, for money, its responsibility for the State's water supply and sewerage services, I envisage many more of these problems, and I have no doubt that members opposite will also be constantly—

Mr Rossi: We don't run away from our problems, unlike you.

Mrs GERAGHTY: You do run away from your problems, and perhaps we can get onto that matter later. You will be bombarded with these problems as well.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: This experience brought to my attention really highlights many of the problems that exist under this Government's new system. A woman in my electorate who is in her 60's—and unfortunately this often happens to elderly people—recently sold her home and moved into what was to be her hassle-free retirement unit, only to become a victim of an extraordinary mess, and that mess is the Government's new water rating system.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: All part of the process. Her first major shock was to receive a water bill for over \$1 000, more than four times the amount she was used to receiving. The home she sold was on a quarter acre. Because she was the unfortunate buyer in this block of six units, she copped the whole bill for \$1 000. The other units were tenanted by people renting those properties, but she copped the bill, because her name was entered on the EWS computer as the receiver of the rates notice. She was sent the account for all the units, even though she was not the tenant of unit No 1. She was tenant of unit No. 5, and she was listed as the owner of an asset of more than \$530 000. I would have liked to be listed as that, had I owned it.

Mr Brindal: If she sold the other four she would have made a lot of money.

Mrs GERAGHTY: They were not hers; she did not own them.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: My constituent did not have the title so she could not sell them, and she was actually quite traumatised by this. To add to the trauma and stress, when she approached her council for a concession card, she was refused because she owned too many assets, namely, this \$500 000 block of units. I contacted the EWS and was told, 'It will be fixed up in the next financial year.' So, she lost her accessibility to concessions. When I asked the EWS about it, they said, 'This is the system now. We will fix it in the next

financial year.' All that has happened is that the Government has caused an absolute and utter mess.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I have not given up on this. There is not long to go, but I have no intention of giving up. As a result of this, my constituent decided to install a water meter at her own expense, for about \$800. The reason for doing this is that she has no faith in the Government's pricing system. I have no doubt that there are many other numerous elderly people out in the electorate who do not even know they can challenge the bill. They get so traumatised by it but do not go either to the EWS or to their member of Parliament because they do not know they can challenge it. This lady lost her rights to concessions, concessions she was entitled to but was refused because of incorrect records. As I said, what was the response from the department? They were very sorry about it—it will all come out in the wash!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr MEIER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

SHOP TRADING HOURS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shop Trading Act 1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes amendments to shop trading laws in South Australia as a consequence of the decision of the High Court of Australia on 10 May 1995 declaring invalid certain certificates of exemption issued pursuant to section 5 of the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977. The primary purpose of this Bill is, so far as is necessary and desirable, to maintain existing shop trading hour arrangements which have operated since the mid 1980s pursuant to section 5 certificates of exemption (other than the existing additional day of late night trading in the metropolitan shopping district).

The primary focus of the case brought before the High Court, and likewise the primary focus of this Bill, is the proposal that shops in the central shopping district (defined as the Adelaide city centre) be permitted to trade between the hours of 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Sundays. Sunday trading in the Adelaide city centre for non-exempt shops has operated since 6 November 1994 pursuant to section 5 certificates of exemption. In implementing this policy decision last year, the State Government implemented one of the central recommendations of the Independent Committee of Inquiry into shop trading hours in South Australia which had been established in February 1994 and which had reported to the Government in June 1994.

In total, 51 certificates of exemption were issued to non-exempt shops in the central shopping district. As a consequence of the High Court's recent decision those certificates have been declared invalid. In the seven months that Sunday trading for non-exempt shops in the Adelaide city centre has been in operation, the extended hours have been well received by both the retail industry and the South Australian

community. An average of 72 000 people per week have taken advantage of Sunday shopping in the Adelaide city centre. These extended hours have also materially contributed to the combined strategies of the State Government and the Adelaide City Council to revitalise the Adelaide city centre and to project South Australia and its capital both nationally and internationally as a desirable destination for investment and tourism.

The Government introduces this Bill in the public interest and in the interests of the continuing development of our State. Without this proposed amendment South Australia's capital, Adelaide, would be the only mainland capital city in Australia which does not permit opening of its city heart for Sunday retail trading. Yesterday, the Retail Traders Association released a survey undertaken on Saturday 27 May by Harrison Market Research of 1 000 Adelaide residents selected at random. The results of the survey are very interesting. Question 3.2 on page 6 is interesting, and I will read it into *Hansard*.

The survey asked the following question: do you agree or disagree that people should have the choice to shop in the city on a Sunday if they wish to? Of those who responded, 86.4 per cent agreed and 13.6 per cent disagreed. The more interesting result was that, of 426 Liberal voter respondents, 90.6 per cent were in favour of Sunday trading; of the 338 Labor voters registered in the pool, 85.2 per cent supported Sunday trading; of the 64 Democrat voters who were surveyed, 79.7 per cent supported Sunday trading; of the 24 respondents who were recorded as 'Other', 75 per cent supported it; and of the 148 voters who were not prepared to say which way they voted, 81.8 per cent supported Sunday trading. An overwhelming average of 86.4 per cent of voters thought that people should have the choice to shop in the City of Adelaide on Sundays.

At page 7 of the same report, 91.1 per cent of people agreed that shopkeepers should have the choice to open their shops in the city on Sunday if they so wish. Those of us who have taken the time to look at the City of Adelaide over the past six months will know that a large number of businesses have chosen, of their free will, not to open. Predominantly, those people are in a jewellery or shoe business. Those people who have chosen not to open in other businesses have been in arcades, and those arcades specifically run off Rundle Mall. That is exactly what the Liberal Party said at the start of this process, that is, if you want to open you can; if you choose to remain closed or not to trade, that is your option.

It is also interesting that one of Adelaide's leading restaurants, Alputte, probably considered to be one of the best restaurants in our city, for commercial reasons decides to trade from Monday to Friday, and on Saturdays and Sundays it chooses not to trade. That is quite opposite to the rest of the restaurant industry in our State. One would expect that most of its business would be done on Saturday and Sunday, but this magnificent restaurant, by choice, has decided, for family reasons and for all sorts of reasons, that it does not want to open on Saturdays and Sundays. I would have thought we should be encouraging that policy. We should set a framework within which people can trade and then allow them to choose on any one of those seven days to either open or close.

Another interesting point from the survey was that this response of 86 per cent support crosses all political Party lines, as I suggested. I will repeat them, because they are important: Liberal, 90.6 per cent; Labor, 85.2 per cent; Democrats, 79.7 per cent; other, 75 per cent; and not stated,

81.8 per cent. It is a magnificent overall result for those who support Sunday trading with respect to the consumer. All age groups, when looked at, also significantly supported shop trading in the City of Adelaide on Sunday.

Another interesting point that came out of the survey and which staggered me was that 40 per cent of the people surveyed had shopped in the city in the past six months on a Sunday. Translating that through the community, it represents hundreds of thousands of South Australians. The only conclusion is that consumers, people who spend their money in these shops which had the opportunity to open, very strongly support the Government's policy of having the CBD open for extra trade on a Sunday.

The Government's initiative on Sunday trading in the city, during the time that I have been Minister and the time when I was shadow Minister, has received unparalleled support from industry groups compared with previous shop trading hours debates. This proposal of shopping in the City of Adelaide on a Sunday has been supported by the Retail Traders Association, the Newsagents Association, the Hardware Association, the Pharmacy Guild, the Furniture Retailers Council, the Motor Trades Association, the Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Employers Association, the Australian Hotel and Hospitality Industry Association, the Rundle Mall Committee and the East End Traders Association.

The only group involved in shop trading which has not supported the move to open up the city is the Small Retailers Association. Having been president of one of those groups, I know that 90 per cent of the membership of all those groups is comprised of small businesses. I know that from having been president of one of those organisations, and 100 per cent of its membership comprised small businesses. I make it clear that my personal view is that in excess of 90 per cent of the membership of those associations is made up of small businesses. In saying that, I note that the Retail Traders Association, which is often accused of representing only large business, has 90 per cent of its total membership comprised of small businesses.

The definition of small business being a business that employs fewer than 50 people is not mine. That takes into consideration all supermarkets and large businesses, other than Coles Myer, Woolworths, and so on. As I said, it is not my definition; it is a definition accepted by the Federal Government, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and so on. In the time that I have been involved in this debate this must be the only occasion when all those groups have come together to support the extension of shop trading hours exclusively in the CBD of Adelaide.

Our proposal is about choice; and it is about allowing small retailers in the city to make that choice. As I said earlier, it is interesting to note that many small traders have chosen not to open. It really puts a myth on the argument that has been put forward to the effect that they are forced to trade. One has only to go into the city on a Sunday to see that all the jewellery shops and shoe shops in the Mall and predominantly all the small businesses in the arcades have chosen not to open. Even though on average there have been 70 000 people in the Mall, a large number of small businesses have chosen not to trade on a Sunday. Obviously, having done that for six months, their decision has not affected the future of their business. If it had, and if some of the myths about being forced to open were true, all of them would have

been open because they would have seen a competitive disadvantage.

This is one area that I can talk about because I know a bit about it. If there is a competitive disadvantage to most business people, they do something about it. They do not stand around and say that they will not open and then complain about being beaten down the street; they will open and do something about it. Those who have been in the city on a Sunday would have to come to the conclusion that, after six months, those who are not trading do not see a competitive disadvantage because others have chosen to open. Anyone who puts that sort of story forward does not understand how retail business operates.

I suggest that anyone who thinks otherwise has never been in a truly competitive position and that, more than likely, they have had a self-designated area in which they are the only retailer for at least a square mile and therefore have their own nice little nook and cranny. Those in the city and in the malls do not have that, and I suspect that those who have chosen not to operate obviously decided that it would not make any difference to the overall profitability of their business. If they did, they would be open. I think that is the only certainty in this debate.

Whilst many people have been prepared to say that they are opposed to this proposal, a few have said that they are in favour of it. I could mention numerous groups, but I refer to a letter I have received from a gentleman from Dymocks Book Shop in Rundle Mall. He has written to me, saying he would like me to quote his letter, because it is an interesting issue. This bookshop in Rundle Mall has traditionally been closed on a Sunday, but this gentleman says:

This is one small business that says PLEASE KEEP SUNDAY TRADING GOING. We have not suffered any fall in through the week trade. Friday and Saturday are as strong as ever, if not better. Sunday is a great family shopping day. The customers love it. The atmosphere in our shop is terrific on Sundays AND—

this is the important issue that has been lost in much of the debate—

Two students are paying their way through university by working Sundays and love it;

A scout leader is paying for a trip to a World Scout Conference by working Sundays.

Please keep it going somehow!!!

The letter is signed by Bruce Macky, who says that he is quite happy to have his name mentioned. That is one of many.

To put the other side of the coin—and I am happy to do that—many small operators in the city argue that they are forced to open because of their leases. We recently passed legislation in this Parliament which gives them more protection than they have ever had with respect to their leases. I put a challenge to them last night at a small retailers meeting, because it has not happened in the time that I have been Minister, even though at about a dozen public meeting I have said I would be happy to receive information. I put out a challenge: if there is any landlord who is putting pressure on them to open on Sunday, which, in essence, is illegal, give me the information and I am quite happy to take it up with the Attorney and have it fixed up. I hope that the rumours turn out to be fact, because over the 18 months I have not had one single person come to me. I know that other members of Parliament have and I know that they have been in small and large shopping centres. If that is the case, bring it to me or bring it to any Minister who is responsible, and we will have it fixed up, because it is illegal and it cannot happen.

Having been in the retail industry for a long time I know that intrinsic pressures are put on from the landlord. If that happens let us all do something about it, because there is no doubt that the community at large is sick and tired of monopoly groups that own large shopping centres putting pressure on smaller units and taking excessive rents out of their pockets or taking excessive outgoings. I do not know anybody on either side of this Parliament who supports that. If that is the issue—the one issue that seems to be predominant in holding up this extension of trading hours in the city—let us get it all out and we will do something about it. If that call is not answered, we cannot do much about it.

Another group which I omitted in opposition as it was not an employer association was the union. I understand the STA's position: over the years it has put an argument in all States of Australia that there be no Sunday trading. I understand its role in arguing that. But I also note that, when it occurs, the very same union is prepared to enter into enterprise agreements across the seven days where penalty rates are offset. It is a very progressive union. Once it is in place, it is very happy to move quickly to make sure that there is an arrangement (I said something else before but I will call it 'an arrangement') in which the trading pay offs—and there are pay offs—occur.

In relation to that survey, it is interesting to note that 71 per cent of the people surveyed believe that employees should have the choice whether they work on Sunday. They have exactly that choice because it is a seven day working week. Having looked at some of the enterprise agreements recently struck in the retail industry in our State, I note that there is an opportunity to restructure and revamp the whole working week so that you do not have to work on Sunday. You can work your 38 hours in any one of those six days out of the seven. Having been in the retail business for 30 years, I know that that has been done for years. The only difference is that it has been done with penalty rates. It is now not being done with penalty rates by those who choose to restructure and reduce the per hour costs right across their business at the end of the day. That is being done. There are registered agreements in the commission now achieving exactly that, and anybody who does not believe it ought to get a copy and get themselves up with what is happening in the real world in terms of how the industry can now reorganise itself so that, if wages costs on the weekend are a problem, in essence they can be worked out over the whole week. It can be restructured.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We said all that before the election and I will get to that issue. I have plenty of time to put all the facts on the table. I can understand those who choose not to read what is put out and get conveniently carried away with their political opportunism. From an Opposition point of view, I can understand the political opportunism out there right now. As dear old Donny said the other day, it seems that the issues of the 6 o'clock swill, Saturday afternoon shopping and now Sunday shopping all seem to be coming from the same group of people. It is interesting to note that the argument about shops and hotels falling over on the 6 o'clock swill was not proved.

I point out to the people who argued that Saturday afternoon trading would be the end of the world that nothing has happened. The same group of people is arguing that it will be the end of the world because of retail shopping hours. They put forward the same argument in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and Perth, and now they are using that argument in

Adelaide. Every small retailer and large retailer in those cities has readjusted the way they run their business and they are still surviving. The number of small businesses that are failing now is the same as the number that failed last year and the year before: the number of big businesses that are failing now is the same as the number that failed last year and the year before. They fail for the same reason time in and time out. It has nothing to do with the number of hours they are trading. It is about lack of management ability and lack of finance.

All members opposite who were involved in the introduction of the Small Business Corporation in the very first year that I came into this Parliament ought to read what was said. Interestingly, it was supported strongly by the Opposition at that stage, because we believed that the Minister at that time was doing a good job. It was a good idea. The reality is that it is about management and finance. It is not about the number of hours that you are able to trade or not to trade: it is about how you manage your business successfully in the environment and district you have chosen to be in. Somebody said to me a long time ago (and it is probably the only truism in business in the retail area) that there are only three important issues: location, location and location. I have seen many good businesses (and I have had one myself) have superb success 35 years ago, but two major shopping centres came into the district and the community, not me, made the decision to shift trading patterns to other areas.

Anyone who understands the retail industry would know that the biggest single threat to the City of Adelaide and the CBD is not the extension of shopping hours on Sunday: it is Westfield Marion, Tea Tree Plaza, West Lakes and all of the major shopping centres around the city. You only have to look at the movement of traffic away from the City of Adelaide by consumer choice. They are the people who actually pay our businesses. Those who actually come in through the door, the consumers, have moved away from the City of Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza, Salisbury, Marion and so forth.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Government has made a very simple decision about Friday night: it was not successful.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It simply has not been successful.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We have spoken to all of them. The only group that wants to open on Friday night is Coles Myer. You go and ask all the other shopping centres.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I have no idea whether it did or did not.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You know more about it than I do. Is this another one of these Catch Tim things where you will have egg on your face? One of the things that is important in this whole area of shop trading is consumers. Everyone seems to forget that the very factor that paid my way in a profit business over the past 30 years was not my ability or that of my staff to run the business: if consumers do not come through the door, you do not have a business.

Clearly, 75 000 consumers per week on average over the past six months have made this choice themselves. There has been no-one out there with a big bus pushing them along as we had with the busing in with the WorkCover debate. There

has been no-one out there saying to the people, 'Come into the City of Adelaide and get all these benefits.' The people have chosen themselves: 75 000 people, twice as many people every week as go to the Crows games. That is a lot of people. On one weekend it was 140 000 people and on a low weekend it was 40 000 people. It is the consumers making the decision that they ought to go in and experience that opportunity.

I would like to make another point that is relevant to the whole debate. Over the past 10 years the Labor Party implemented trading zones in Victor Harbor, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Naracoorte. It seems odd to me that in those trading zones 24 hour trading, seven days a week, is supported by everyone who is opposed to it here. We have all those trading zones, yet in the city we cannot have that. The only measure of support is that there are enterprise agreements between unions in those areas to support trading seven days a week. Principally, it is the Woolworths and Coles Myer group. We have no small retailer association saying, 'We have to close up Victor Harbor, Port Augusta and Whyalla.' I can imagine what the member for Giles would say if his beloved Whyalla was closed up.

It is amusing that in those five areas of the State we can have trading 24 hours a day, seven days a week, yet in the city we can have a restricted zone of only six hours on Sunday as an extension. Anyone would think we were talking about 24 hours, seven days a week. Let us look now at how many shops can open for 24 hours a day, seven days a week. About 80 per cent of all shops in the city and the suburbs—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: They are already deregulated and can trade, and they are under 200 square metres. We can add all the petrol stations such as BP Plus; they comprise another group that can trade 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There is then the 777 group under 400 square metres which can trade seven days a week, 24 hours a day. These people are already covered in the Act as set up and supported by the previous Government and the union. They are supported by everyone. More than 80 per cent of all businesses in this State can now trade 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will come to that in a minute: I have a few extra notes on that. The reason we opposed Saturday afternoon trading in the city was simple. We argued at the time that we needed enterprise agreements to break the penalty rate issue as it related to shop trading hours on Saturday. Why did we agree to it in the end? Because the union got together with retailers and made an arrangement to remove trading and cost issues impacting on businesses to enable them to trade. That is why the Liberal Party agreed to it. I remember saying that, because I was part of the debate. I said, 'If an arrangement could be entered into between employers and employees in the retail award, it could be done.' That is how Saturday afternoon was finally agreed to by the Liberal Party.

There was a totally different reason why we opposed it. Eventually it happened and we supported it. We said at the election, and it was clearly put out by me in an election document on shop trading hours, that we would introduce enterprise bargaining right across the board so that it encompassed every day of the week and not purely and simply Monday to Saturday; it would encompass the lot. We also said that we would have an inquiry with all people being involved. The inquiry said we should deregulate. It said that

the whole thing was a nonsense and that we should get rid of it in four or five years. All groups were involved in that. It is interesting that that document was leaked and we have a fair idea from where it was leaked. It was interesting how it wound its way out when only members of the committee had it. We have a fair idea where that came from: we think it came from a group who did not want that to happen.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That is the issue and it has gone. What we are on about is to say that there will be no extension of shopping hours as it relates to Sunday in the suburbs, other than all businesses that can currently trade. This Bill will cover all the shops that have been caught up with this certificate 5 exemption fiasco. All that will be cleaned up, plus we will put into position limited trading between 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. in the CBD of our city.

Mr Foley: And get rid of Friday night?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We do not have to get rid of Friday night. You ought to know that, if we do not put anything in the legislation, the section 5 certificates put that in place because, if they are no longer valid, they are no longer in place. If the Bill is passed by this Parliament—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It never ceases to amaze me how high you jump when the secretary of the SDA says, 'Jump.' We can look at the amount of money that has flowed from the SDA to the ALP and it is a fascinating exercise. We can all play that game.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You are sponsored every time. Your previous history involved being a junior secretary of the union. I understand that they are very supportive: there is nothing wrong with their being supportive. When I came to this Parliament the Pharmacy Guild supported me, too. Everyone is supported in some way or another the first time around. Some members like the member for Spence are supported every time but, as the member for Spence well knows in regard to this area, he will not jump that high in regard to the union, because I know he is a clear and subtle thinker who will give the consumer some benefit. He also knows that, unless consumers go there, his employee friends do not have any jobs. He knows full well that at the end of the day the jobs of his employee friends is the most important issue as it relates to the union, and that is what this story is all about. It is interesting to me that I can come into this city and gamble at the Casino 24 hours a day, seven days a week— at the Casino put through this Parliament by the Labor Party—yet I cannot shop between 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Sunday and buy any clothing that I need.

Interestingly, I can also go into the hotels in this city and play poker machines. I can gamble, or I can come into the city and go to church on Sunday almost at any hour of the day, but I cannot come in to shop. I can go to Victor Harbor or Whyalla to shop 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I can come into the city and gamble in a casino supported by the Labor Party, but I cannot come and shop on Sunday afternoon if this legislation fails.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I will get to that in a minute and read it out, because it makes very interesting reading. I know that this document was handed out in the member for Hart's electorate, because I went down and put it under the door of lots of small businesses there. I know full well that he would have got a copy of what it said. It said that

immediately we got into Government we would remove the five day deal that was done between the unions, Woolworths, Coles and the Government. Rather than that happening immediately, it took us about eight days, and I think the certificates of exemption were revoked on 6 January. We saw the very hypocrisy of members opposite, talking about the use of section 5 certificates: they did a deal with the union to use those certificates, contrary to the Act, to extend shopping hours for supermarkets from Monday to Friday so that it would suit their mates.

An honourable member: An agreement.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It was not an agreement; it was a deal. It was a deal done between the STA, Bob Gregory, the Premier at the time (Mr Arnold), Woolworths and Coles, and it was shoved through. It was a deal. The unions wrote to Minister Gregory and said, 'Now that we've got this all in place, how about getting it through the Cabinet?' I did not bring in the actual letter but I will do so, because it might be an important letter. In essence, that is what the letter said: 'Now that we have this arrangement in place, we want you to go ahead put it in.' It is good to see the Leader of the Opposition in here now, because he was obviously involved in the Cabinet that organised this arrangement.

The other point that was made in the letter on shop trading hours that went out to a whole range of small businesses prior to the election was that an inquiry would be set up to examine whether shop trading hours should be extended and, if so, to what extent. It could not have been made any clearer than that. That letter went out prior to the election under my signature, under the heading of 'Shop trading hours'. It promised immediately to set up an inquiry into whether shop trading hours should be extended; if so, to what extent and how this should be implemented; whether there should be some changes to leases under the Landlord and Tenant Act; whether the planning laws needed amending; and the question regarding the role of retailers.

The only thing we breached in this document was that we said there would be four on the committee and there were seven. Every other single issue has been carried out. Headed 'Shop trading hours', it was a policy document that went out to all small businesses prior to the election. Bearing my signature as shadow Minister for Industrial Relations, it clearly set out the position of the Liberal Party in relation to shop trading hours. It was a very clear document that nobody could dispute, because it is there in black and white. We said we would determine whether shop trading hours should be extended; if so, to what extent and how this should be implemented. I might point out that before this letter was sent out there was consultation with the RTA and Small Retailers Association. There was absolutely no doubt at all in respect of any association involved in the retailing area as to what the inquiry would be about—absolutely no doubt whatsoever.

The proposal in this Bill which would permit Sunday trading in the Adelaide city centre only is made by way of amendment to section 13 of the Act. That section does not compel any retailer to trade during the hours which would be legally available to shopkeepers. These provisions, together with the recent retail tenancy legislation introduced by the Government and passed by this Parliament, would ensure that retailers, and in particular small Adelaide city centre retailers who do not wish to trade on any or all of the available Sundays or during available hours on Sundays, cannot be required to do so.

As I said earlier, we hear a tremendous number of stories about how landlords stand over the tenants. As I said last night, and as I have said about a dozen times previously, send those issues to me or to any member of Parliament on this side—and I am darned sure to members on the other side—and we will get this sorted out, because this Parliament has clearly set out that landlords should not be abusing their privileges as they relate to tenants. This whole Parliament has agreed to that, and I reassert it now.

In introducing this Bill the Government reaffirms its decision of August 1994 to limit general trading to the Adelaide city centre. The Government is not satisfied that a case has been made out for permanent Sunday trading in the metropolitan shopping district and the Bill quite deliberately does not provide for that. This approach is also consistent with the Government's actions in consistently refusing in the past seven months to issue section 5 certificates of exemption for permanent Sunday trading in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

Over probably the past six months I have had about half a dozen applications from Westfield, the Biscaini group in Salisbury, a group in Port Adelaide which I cannot recall and the West Lakes group asking for an extension of shopping hours in the suburbs. As I said last night, the only way you can judge the sincerity of the Government is by its actions. Every single one of those applications that have been made has been rejected. I think it made the local paper in the Salisbury area, where Biscaini Investments, which has a new shopping centre there, is not able to trade on Sunday, exactly as happened at Tea Tree Plaza.

The Government has no intention of enabling Sunday shopping in the suburbs. It is and has always been our view that the heart of our city should be opened up to Sunday trade, and 70 000 people each week seem to be reaffirming that. As I said earlier, if you doubled the number attending a Crows match, that is how many people are choosing week after week to use the city centre of Adelaide. The High Court's decision has had wider ramifications for retail trading in the State than simply declaring invalid Sunday trading certificates within the Adelaide city centre. For the first time since section 5 of the Act came into operation in the early 1980s, a court has interpreted the power to issue certificates of exemption in a highly restricted fashion. In the period 1987 to 1993 Labor Governments in this State have issued 883 such certificates of exemption, with 568 of these certificates permitting permanent trading hour exemptions. As a consequence of the court's decision, many of these certificates of exemption issued since the mid-1980s by both Liberal and Labor Governments permitting Sunday trading and public holiday trading by some hardware retailers, furniture retailers, floor covering retailers, automotive spare parts retailers, garden retailers and hairdresser shops are, on the advice available to the State Government, also invalid.

This Bill recognises that Sunday and public holiday retailing by these categories and specialist retailers has been generally well received by the public and each industry sector. The Bill proposes to remove the uncertainty of these retailers having to trade on Sundays pursuant to certificates of exemption and to remove anomalies arising from the fact that some specialist retailers are permitted to trade on Sunday between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. and on most public holidays. The Bill proposes that hairdresser and garden shops be permitted to trade as exempt shops, given that certain categories of hairdresser and garden shops are already exempt pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Act. The

Bill also proposes that the definition of nursery and garden shops be redefined to reflect conditions applicable in the existing certificates of exemption.

In considering the legal effect of the recent High Court decision, the State Government has also received advice on the legal status of trading shops in petrol stations. Since 1986, the State Government has issued licences pursuant to section 17 permitting deregulated trading by petrol stations. Advice now received by the Government is that the sale by petrol stations of general retail products outside of hours regulated by the Act is not permitted as a consequence of existing provisions in section 4 of the Act. Accordingly, the Bill proposes amendments to the Act which would permit petrol stations to continue to sell general retail products but not on any broader basis than other exempt shops selling those same products.

In introducing this Bill, the Government proposes to address one further anomaly in respect of the operation of the Act. A number of provisions of the Act impose restrictions on the number of people who can be employed by exempt retailers. The Government considers this anti-employment restriction to be outdated and unjustified on policy grounds. Removal of these restraints on employment is unlikely to have any broader trading significance within the industry as exempt retailers would still be subject to existing restrictions on the floor area of shops and the nature of products to be sold.

One further matter addressed in this Bill is the need to enable section 5 certificates of exemption to be issued on conditions which limit the hours or days of exemption. One consequence of the High Court decision is that certificates of exemption could be lawfully issued to individual shopkeepers on a basis which totally deregulated trading hours for that retailer but not on a basis which allowed for partial exemption of a limited nature. There are a variety of circumstances which have justified the issue of section 5 certificates of exemption for localised and in-store activity but where the exemption sought and granted has been for limited hours only. The Bill proposes the necessary amendment to section 5 to accommodate this requirement. It also creates an offence for a breach of conditions in section 5 certificates.

Furthermore, the Bill proposes an amendment to the interim proclamation power of section 13(9) of the Act so as to enable conditions to be imposed on such proclamations, for example, conditions related to voluntary employment of employees. In introducing this Bill the Government has not proposed amendments to late night trading in the metropolitan shopping district, notwithstanding that section 5 certificates of exemption have permitted additional Friday night trading in the Adelaide metropolitan area since 4 November 1994. The Government has been advised that the reasoning of the High Court decision has had the effect of invalidating those certificates. In these circumstances, the Government has decided not to permit those arrangements to continue, given that the majority of non-exempt retailers have elected not to trade on the additional late night.

This Bill is a package of commonsense reforms to the Shop Trading Hours Act which is consistent with consumer opinion and retail industry operations. Those reforms are designed to bring about increased trading certainty within the retail industry, its employees and consumers. They are also designed to overcome the uncertainty and adverse consequences which have arisen as a result of the recent High Court proceedings and to improve the general operation of the Act. I commend the Bill to the House and now insert the

detailed explanation of the clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act so that it refers to the regulation of opening and closing times of shops, where currently it refers only to regulation of closing times. This amendment is consequential to the amendments to section 13 of the principal Act.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause makes a number of amendments to section 4 of the principal Act.

Paragraph (a) of the definition of "exempt shop" is amended to remove the reference to hairdresser's shops (because the proposed amendment to paragraph (c) of the definition would result in all hairdresser's shops being exempt) and by removing the restriction as to staff levels contained in subparagraph (iii).

Subparagraph (ix) of paragraph (b) of the definition of "exempt shop", which currently lists various products commonly sold by garden supply shops, is to be replaced so that it simply refers to "garden supplies". That term, however, is to be defined elsewhere in subsection (1) to include the items currently listed and some other items that are commonly sold by garden shops.

As referred to above, paragraph (c) of the definition of "exempt shop" is to be replaced so that all hairdresser's shops will be exempt shops.

Subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (d) of the definition of "exempt shop" is replaced so that a shop will satisfy that subparagraph if it has a floor area of 400 square metres or less, regardless of the numbers of staff in the shop.

A new paragraph (g) is inserted so that the definition of "exempt shop" will also include those garden shops referred to in new subsection (3) (see below).

As referred to above, a new definition of "garden supplies" is inserted in subsection (1) of the principal Act. The new definition includes garden tools, machinery or equipment, garden ornaments and other garden accessories as well as the items currently listed in subparagraph (ix) of paragraph (b) of the definition of "exempt shop".

A new definition of "public holiday" is inserted so that term, itself, will not include Sundays.

A definition of "trading day" is inserted (because that term is used in new section 13(5c) as well as in section 4(2)) although the new definition does not differ substantively from the explanation of that term contained in the current subsection (3).

The current subsection (3) is repealed and a new subsection substituted which provides that where a non-exempt shop sells garden supplies in a separate area of the shop (the "garden shop"), that area of the shop will be taken to be an exempt shop if 80 per cent or more of the total price of goods sold from the garden shop during the preceding seven trading days was for garden supplies, provided that the public does not have access to any other part of the shop at any time at which that part of the shop must be closed under this Act.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 5—Certificate as to exempt shop

This clause inserts new subsection (2a) into section 5 of the principal Act. The new subsection specifies that a certificate under section 5 may be subject to a condition specifying hours during which the shop must be closed.

For consistency with section 14 (which makes it an offence to open a non-exempt shop at any time that the Act requires that shop to be closed) a new subsection (4) is also inserted which makes it an offence (with a maximum penalty of \$10 000) to breach a condition imposed in a certificate under this section.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 13—Hours during which shops may be open

This clause makes a number of amendments to section 13 of the principal Act. Current subsections (1)-(3a) are replaced with new subsections as follows:

- New subsection (1) deals with trading hours in the Central Shopping District and provides that a shop situated in that district may open until 6 p.m. on every weekday other than a Friday, until 9 p.m. on a Friday, until 5 p.m. on a Saturday and from 11 a.m. until 5 p.m. on a Sunday.
- New subsection (2) deals with the trading hours of shops situated in all other shopping districts and provides that they may open until 6.00 p.m. on every weekday other than a Thursday, until 9 p.m. on a Thursday and until 5.00 p.m. on a Saturday.

- New subsections (3) and (4) deal with shops selling caravans, trailers or boats and shops selling motor vehicles (other than caravans and trailers) respectively. The new subsections do not make any substantive change from current subsections (3) and (3a) but have been reworded to match up with the other new subsections and to make it clear that they are subject to new subsection (5d) and to any proclamation made under the section.
- New subsection (5) simply makes it clear that a proclamation under subsection (4)(c) (which is equivalent to the current subsection (3a)(c)) must apply to all shops selling motor vehicles (other than caravans and trailers) and may be revoked.
- New subsection (5a) makes it clear that subsection (1)(d) does not entitle the shopkeeper of a shop referred to in subsection (3) or (4) to open the shop on a Sunday.
- New subsection (5b) provides that a shop the business of which is the retail sale of hardware and building materials, furniture, floor coverings or motor vehicle parts and accessories, may also open from 9.00 a.m. until 5.00 p.m. on a Sunday or public holiday except Good Friday and Christmas Day. This is qualified, however, by new subsection (5c) which provides that subsection (5b) only applies to a shop if the total price of the goods sold that fall within any one or more of the specified classes is 80 per cent or more of the price of all goods sold at the shop during the previous seven trading days.
- Subsection (5c) also requires that in the case of hardware and building materials not more than the prescribed percentage of prescribed categories of hardware and building materials make up the total quantity of hardware and building materials sold at the shop during the preceding 7 trading days. The purpose of this requirement is in line with the condition on existing permits for hardware shops which regulate the proportion of their sales of the hardware and building materials set out in schedule 2 of the regulations under the Act.
- New subsection (5d) provides that, subject to subsection (5b) and to any proclamation made under this section, shops situated within shopping districts must be closed on public holidays. The prohibition against trading on public holidays is currently covered by section 14(3), but has been moved into section 13 so that section will cover both trading on Sundays and public holidays and will give a more complete picture of allowed trading times under the Act.

Subsection (6) is consequentially amended to refer to opening and closing times (where currently it refers just to closing times).

Subsection (10) is amended to enable a proclamation under subsection (9) to be subject to restrictions or conditions.

Clause 6: Repeal of s. 13A

This clause repeals section 13A of the principal Act, which deals with permits for hardware stores to trade on Sundays and certain public holidays (now covered by section 13(5b)).

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 14—Offences

This clause consequentially amends section 14 of the principal Act. Subsections (1), (3), (5) and (6) are repealed and two new subsections are substituted as follows:

- New subsection (1) provides that it is an offence (punishable by a maximum fine of \$10 000) for a shopkeeper to open his or her shop for admission of members of the public at any time except those at which he or she is entitled to open the shop under the Act. This is essentially the same as the current subsection (1) but is expressed in terms which are appropriate for the regulation of both opening and closing times.
- New subsection (2) provides that it is an offence (punishable by a maximum fine of \$10 000) to sell or cause or permit to be sold, any goods in or about a shop at a time when the shop is required to be closed. This is essentially the same as the current subsection (5) but does not refer to Sundays and public holidays (because that is dealt with in the amendments to section 13) and is expressed in terms which are appropriate for the regulation of both opening and closing times.

Subsections (8), (9) and (10) are also consequentially amended to remove the references to hairdressing shops (which would be exempt shops under the proposed amendments to section 4).

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 17—Licence to sell motor spirit and lubricants

This clause amends section 17 of the principal Act. Subsection (1) is amended to make the wording of the subsection consistent with the new definition of "public holiday".

Subsection (4) is replaced with two new subsections as follows:

- New subsection (4) provides that a shopkeeper who holds a licence may open the shop to which the licence relates for the purpose of selling motor spirit and lubricants in accordance with the licence. This is essentially the same as current subsection (4) but is expressed in simpler language.
- New subsection (4a) provides that a shopkeeper licensed under this section may also sell, in accordance with the licence, any other goods that are normally sold at the shop provided that—
 - (a) the retail sale of motor spirit and lubricants constitutes a prescribed percentage of the total business carried on at the shop;
 - (b) the shop is one that would fall within the definition of "exempt shop" in section 4 if the business carried on at the shop did not include the retail sale of motor spirit and lubricants.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): First, I want to make a couple of remarks about the Minister's courage.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair assumes that the honourable member is the lead speaker for the Opposition and therefore has unlimited time.

Mr QUIRKE: That is correct: that is my understanding. We have been waiting a long time for this legislation. We were told we would have the Bill before the House before the backbench ganged up on the Minister and made it fairly clear to him that they would not support Sunday trading. That is what a large number of them said. In fact, a couple of them even went out and got some fairly big petitions. I remember one of them had a story in the *Sunday Mail* indicating that he had 20 000 people against this—

Mr Evans: 50 000!

Mr QUIRKE: It was 50 000, was it? I correct myself. The member for Davenport tells me that 50 000 people said they did not want this. However, as is usually the case with members of this Brown Government, we find that they go to ground when these things happen. In fact, with shop trading hours, the Government has continually changed the position until eventually the High Court of Australia shamed it into bringing this Bill before the House. Make no bones about this, Mr Deputy Speaker, the reason this Bill is here today is that this Minister and the crowd he hangs around with could not find one High Court judge who supported what they did. They made it clear that he had to bring legislation into this House—

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. Less than 24 hours ago, the member for Playford took a point of order on my using the pronouns 'he' or 'her', 'him' or 'she', insisting that an honourable member be referred to either by title or by the name of the electorate. Sir, I ask you now to remind him of that or otherwise make some other appropriate remark about the use of personal pronouns.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for Ridley for his instruction. The member for Ridley believes he was wrongly interpreted yesterday evening on the question of the use of the personal pronoun. The precise position is, as all members know, that it is quite proper for members to address other members in the House by the name of their electorate or by the name of the honourable member, following which the Chair will tolerate the use of the personal pronoun 'he' or 'she', but not 'it'. The member for Playford.

Mr QUIRKE: I gather that the member for Ridley is now satisfied that he has some sort of—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the Chair's ruling.

Mr QUIRKE: The High Court of Australia has made it absolutely clear that the current exemption regime here in South Australia is wrong and needs to go through this Chamber and the other place, involving the democratic procedures of Government. I would have thought that, with all the noise made by the Government with respect to shopping hours, both before and after the election, it would be happy to bring a Bill into this House and test its majority on the floor. In fact, when the Government first came to office, there were 37 of them, and now it has only 36 members, but unless my mathematics are wrong Government members are here by nearly four to one.

Why did a Bill not emerge in this House to sort out the shopping hours situation? The reason is that the Minister and the Government had a bit of difficulty with their own backbench and particularly those members who were out there making a large noise about this extension to shopping hours. We will put those views to the test, probably at a later hour tonight, but certainly tomorrow. We will give some of the backbench members the opportunity to vote the way they told the public, through the various media outlets, they would vote.

I understand that the Minister has now got on top of his backbench revolt and that we will see very few members of the Government stand up to the Cabinet and to the Minister on this issue. That will be lamentable if that is the case. We will give them the opportunity. The Opposition's approach to the extension of shop trading hours the last time we were in Government was on the basis that there had to be proper arrangements between small business and the employees who worked in those enterprises. We were happy to see legislation on appropriate shop trading hours go through this House that satisfied all relevant parties. I clearly remember the Saturday afternoon trading debate, and my memory is a bit different to the Minister's account. I clearly remember the then Opposition, the now Government, making it quite clear what its caper was at that time. It did not support the extension to Saturday afternoon trading at that time. I cannot remember its sudden conversion halfway through the debate. The member for Giles was the Minister at the time.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I really find this argument that it suddenly saw the light on the road to the Legislative Council not only trite and a nonsense but totally against what I clearly remember being the case when we debated that measure. On this side of politics, in the shadow of the State election, the same process was followed for the extension of shop trading hours to 9 p.m. in the suburbs on Wednesdays and Fridays and in the city from Monday through to Thursday. Quite clearly an agreement was reached between large business, small business and the employees who had to work in those enterprises.

The representatives of these organisations came to the Government and said, 'We want relaxation of the hours on the following basis', and certificates of exemption were issued at that point. It would have been a legislative matter had it not been so close to the election, and the legislation would have taken some time to draw up. The process was exactly the same. When there is general agreement between all parties, we on this side of politics agree to the necessary changes. I cannot say that the other side adopts that approach, and I will come to its record in just a moment. At the end of

the day, the changes made in 1993 still reflect the position of the Labor Party in South Australia.

Quite clearly, in that whole arrangement, there was to be no extension to shop trading hours on a Sunday. That was the fundamental point in that whole arrangement—there would be no change to the arrangements on a Sunday. The Minister has a rather interesting record on this. I received a letter from a deli owner in Para Hills. The guy owned a couple of delis and he wrote to me in absolute dismay in February 1994. In that letter he said that he would never vote for me again. The reason he would never vote for me again was that he no longer trusted the word of the Minister—the Hon. Graham Ingerson. The deli owner said that, during a rally that he attended, Mr Ingerson promised not to extend trading hours to Sundays.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: There is a word for that.

Mr QUIRKE: I cannot use it, unfortunately. If I did, I am sure that someone would take a point of order. Every one knows the point I am making. The deli owner told me that he would never vote for me again if Mr Ingerson could not keep the promise he made at the rally before the election. I wrote back to this fellow and said that I sympathised entirely with his position, and I pointed out that, unfortunately, Mr Ingerson had a very difficult lot to deal with. We may see that later on tonight. We will see what people such as the member for Hartley do in the House today. We will give him his opportunity later. We will see how much courage these people have and whether they will stand up for small businesses. One area I remember well is Unley. We will see what happens with the member for Unley, the member for Colton and a couple of other members—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I understand that the member for Davenport is on side with some of the Opposition position on this. Of course, we have a number of other members who have made much of the fact that they will stand up to the Government on this issue. In my response to the poor deli owner, I pointed out to him that the Minister had a hard time dealing with some of the people on his side of politics.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: We will come to him later. This poor deli owner told me that the Minister had given him a cast iron promise that there would not be any of this sort of nonsense; that he did not have to worry about Sunday trading, and all the rest of it. On 6 January the Minister cancelled all the exemptions issued by the previous government. That much is correct, but a couple of months later we found that we were to have Sunday trading. I was puzzled by that; I thought we were told that that would not happen, but the word was out from Woolworths, Coles and a few other organisations. They were told something different before the election.

They were told that, by the time a series of very anti-Labor measures were introduced into the industrial relations regime in South Australia, they may see a complete deregulation of shopping hours, and that that would be followed by the fact that workers, who would have to work at these times, would not receive penalty rates and would no longer be protected by the then current regime of laws. Coles, Woolworths and all the other organisations were told not to worry because by June things would be fine for them.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: It would appear, as the member for Giles says, that two groups were running around with two different sets of preconceptions. Certainly most of them have come through to my office and indicated to me that the Minister

and the Government were saying to a large number of people, 'We will look after you. Don't worry about it.' There was another group that went to see the Minister before the election and it appears that that group put its money where its mouth is. That group wanted to make absolutely sure that this Government, when it was elected, would cancel certain exemptions. Of course, when we looked at the list of donors the other week we found that it certainly did put its money where its mouth is. In this whole web, the Minister decided that rather than chance his arm at legislation in here, where we know what the result will be unless there is an absolute mass defection, or members such as the member for Norwood stand up for the sorts of things that he said in the media—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: He said that once before in a preselection. In fact, the member for Norwood has tried to get the seat of Norwood for both Parties. I make no further comment on that, other than to say that we all know the member for Norwood and remember him well. I do not think that many of us remember him all that fondly. Possibly members on my side with a more Left persuasion than I have would remember him more fondly.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: No, we wouldn't.

Mr QUIRKE: I certainly do not. The member for Giles, who is a well known representative of that school of thought, assures me that I am wrong, and I will take his word for that. The member for Norwood has made it pretty clear around here that he was not going to have a bar of Sunday trading, and then we heard from the member for Unley and from a whole range of members opposite. I will make another prediction: we will hear a pile of them tonight explaining why they will not come over and vote with us. One or two might, but tonight we shall hear all the apologies that we are used to with this Government.

Finally, when the Government decided to make probably the most significant change to shopping hours in this State for many years—and it did it on a Sunday, which it clearly indicated to a large part of the community it was never going to do—the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association took the only principled stand that it could in those circumstances.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: Given the basis of the money paid in by other organisations that sees instant action from this Government, I suggest that the Minister ought to keep silent on this issue. At the end of the day, the SDA protected its members by taking the matter to the High Court of Australia, and the Government could not find one judge to side with it. There was no split decision: it was not four-three; it was not a case where the Government got a couple of people on its side. It was absolutely clearcut: the Government got nil.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: My case rests. The Minister says that that is why he is here. He has been chained to a community debate on this issue. He has now admitted in the House that he has been dragged into this legislation today. A couple of points need to be made in relation to this legislation. Indeed, if the legislation is passed in this form, people who now have Sunday off with their family will be not only required but directed by their employer to work on a Sunday. There is no protection in this legislation for those who may have to work because this Government cannot keep its promises. Indeed, we support the position taken by the SDA, and that is that employees may have one day a week off with their family.

The puzzle about this legislation—and I say that it is a puzzle—is that the Government, having built up its stock before the election by doing a deal with some of the big boys around town and then promising all the little guys at a rally that it would do the opposite, is now squandering all that credit at a rate of knots. The puzzle is: what will happen to Friday night trading in the suburbs? The Premier has said that the Government will get rid of Friday night trading in the suburbs. I understand that one of the reasons is to placate some of his backbench members. We will find out later tonight from some of those members exactly what the arrangements are. I can tell members what it has done: it has thrown the suburbs into absolute turmoil. Those stores do not know what is going on.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The Minister makes light of this. He says that everybody is cheering. That is not what I heard on the radio last weekend. I think that a number of people are operating enterprises on the basis of certain sureties which are no longer there, and they are not only confused but annoyed about it. The Minister read a couple of letters referring to people who are paying for their education as a result of working on Sunday in the Mall. One of the letters was about a student paying for his education and somebody who was going on a trip somewhere with a scout group. I never got the names.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: You did not read them out, but you can give them to me later. I am sure that you have plenty of other letters like that. The Wotton technique, which is the reading of letters and all the rest of it, I find interesting. But what about some of those kids who get a few quid by working on a Friday night? The Premier did not care about that too much, and we found this afternoon that the Minister may just issue exemptions or do something for Friday night trade in the suburbs, so we do not know where we are going.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: He now tells me that he is not going to do that. From his speech it sounded very much to me as though we would still have two nights trading in the suburbs.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: If that is not the case—and I take the Minister's word for it in *Hansard*, and he will have his opportunity to say it later—then the same argument about Sunday for the kid who wants to pay for his education or the boy scout who wants to go to the next jamboree works just as well in respect of Friday night trading. What the Government has selectively chosen to talk about—because it is an argument of convenience—is the kids who are making a few quid by working in the Mall on a Sunday, while ignoring the kids who are making a few quid on a Friday night.

The overwhelming number of shop assistants for one group—and I will deal with the consumers and others later—fear Sunday trading because that is their day with their family. They also fear the sorts of provisions that a Government will put in place which will give them absolutely no choice at all. This Government has haemorrhaged on this issue more than anything else. One reason is that it has never played with a straight bat since three or four weeks before the election when it was making promises to all and sundry.

We are told that consumers ought to have a say in this matter. If the argument is consumers and consumption, why does this Bill not open up Sunday trading in the suburbs? We know why: we can answer that question straight away. It is

because the bulk of Liberal backbench members will vote with the Opposition to defeat that legislation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford has the floor. I do not think the member for Giles or the Minister are contributing anything to the debate.

Mr QUIRKE: I am pleased that the member for Mitchell is present, because he has made a few comments about shopping. I understand that his landlord is the Westfield shopping complex at some point down south. Westfield has a view on this, too, and I understand that it is not very complimentary to the Government. It may appreciate some of the comments that the member for Mitchell has made, and we shall see just how good a representative the member for Mitchell is for Westfield. In fact, we shall have a good look at a few members tonight and tomorrow, and we shall see how the vote goes. I predict, as I did before, that the bulk of members here will placidly sit behind this Minister and the Government because they do not have the courage to stand up to them. They know that they will never get on to the front bench if they stand up and are counted on this or any other issue. We will see future editions of the *Sunday Mail* with all these people saying, 'We got this big petition, we got all these names, we got all this and all that.' But which way will they vote? We shall see as the day progresses. Yesterday, the Opposition announced that it would, if necessary, proceed with its own legislation on this issue. Let me make absolutely clear what our position is.

Mr Brindal: Where is the legislation?

Mr QUIRKE: You will have to wait until tomorrow; you know the rules. It comes down on a Thursday morning. The Opposition does not have all the time that the Government has during the week to introduce Bills. It took long enough to get a copy of this Bill and, if it were not for our good graces in suspending Standing Orders, we would still not be debating this issue today. The Opposition's legislation is simple: we will introduce a Bill, if we have to, to cover the organisations that the Premier was threatening at the end of last week—the petrol stations that trade 24-hours a day, the hardware stores and the various other organisations. I find it amusing that it was this Premier as Minister for Labour from 1979 to 1982—the position that Minister Ingerson now holds—who extended shopping hours for the hardware stores. We are told now that, if we stand up for the rights of shop workers on a Sunday, he will cancel all these other arrangements. The Premier is presumably a man of his word. We have legislation ready to move in this Chamber—and for that matter in the other Chamber if necessary—to ensure that the Opposition in this State will not support that level of blackmail.

Everybody knows the numbers in this Chamber—11 to 36. But the numbers up the corridor are a bit different. I suggest that the numbers there on this issue will prove to be exceedingly difficult for the Government. It is not necessary for me to go through all the areas of this legislation. There are a couple of positive provisions and I will make some remarks about them. We will deal with them further in Committee, because I know that many members want to debate this issue.

As an Opposition we have no problem with various measures in this Bill which seek to provide a legislative framework for things which now rely on exemption certificates. We make clear that there are parts of the Bill which we believe ought to be part of legislation but which should have been done some time ago. One of the reasons we could not do that was that, when this Government was in Opposition,

it was very difficult and obstreperous on all these issues. It sought to make mileage every time there was debate on shopping hours. It promised one lot one thing and another lot the opposite. At the end of the day the Opposition will be supporting various provisions of this legislation that seek to sort out arrangements which should have been sorted out in legislation some time ago but which the Liberal Party made it impossible to sort out in the last Parliament.

In regard to Sunday trading, let me make absolutely clear that, until we have firm evidence from the representatives of all the relevant parties—small business, large business, employees and others—our position on shop trading hours is simple: we support the existing arrangements which take in a couple of nights in the suburbs and Saturday morning and afternoon trading. We will not support an extension in the city. We will not support an extension of Sunday trading in the suburbs. That is the Opposition's position. It is a firm position, one with which we went into the last election. We were criticised by this Minister and the Liberal Party then as to the shopping hours regime that we had brought in. We were criticised for allowing, during weeknights, an extension to trading arrangements, which were agreed to by the overwhelming majority of parties involved in those discussions. We went into that election with that position and that position is still ours today.

The Government's position is to do whatever it can get away with, provided the High Court does not tell it otherwise. That is what has happened here and the Minister admitted it some time ago in this debate. He said he would not even be here today. He would not have had a community debate if the High Court had not shamed him into it. The Opposition opposes the provisions in this legislation that allow for an extension to Sunday trading. We will oppose them in the Committee stage, we will oppose them at the second and the third reading stages and we will oppose them further up the corridor.

Mr CAUDELL (Mitchell): It is with much pleasure that I speak to this Bill, and I would have great delight if the member for Playford hung around for my speech. I challenge the member for Playford to go outside and make the statements he has made previously in relation to the fact that I have a landlord called Westfield Marion and that, basically, I play the tune of Westfield Marion. Let it be put on the record that I have no such landlord called Westfield Marion. I have a business of my own which has a landlord but that is not Westfield Marion. I occupy an electorate office which is located at Westfield Marion, and the landlord for that electorate office is the Department of Industrial Affairs—exactly the same as for the former member for Hayward (Mr Mark Brindal) and the previous Labor member for Hayward (June Appleby). At no stage has any member of Parliament in this House ever been a tenant of Westfield Marion.

I was interested in the comments of the member for Playford in relation to Sunday trading in the suburbs. If the Labor Party were able to guarantee support for Sunday trading in the suburbs both in this House and in the other House, I would support Sunday trading in the suburbs. We all know that the Labor Party is two-faced in what it says both here and in other places. At no stage has the Labor Party come up with a realistic trading hours policy. We saw its policy before the last State election and it allowed for supermarkets to trade on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays until 9 p.m. But we had the farcical situation at Westfield Marion, the largest shopping centre in

South Australia and the fifth largest in Australia, where only three shops could open and the rest had to close. Three supermarkets could open but Myers, John Martins and any other store over a certain size could not open. We had the farcical situation of a large investment not being able to trade.

Such was the shemozzle of the Labor Party policy on trading hours. It has no idea what it is like to trade or operate a business and to be involved in the retail sector. I sometimes wonder what is wrong with the retail sector. What makes the retail sector different from any other industry? What makes the retail sector different from the hotel industry? What makes the retail sector any different from the tourism industry? I am involved in the tourism industry and I have traded seven days a week for the past seven years. I am quite happy that that business has provided employment for young people on a Sunday as well as on a Saturday.

I was the spokesperson for the Service Stations Association in the push for 24 hour trading by service stations in the Adelaide inner metropolitan area. The Labor Government gave us an exemption under the Act. However, it adopted a farcical approach in regard to other retail shops. As a result of the service station industry being able to trade on Saturday afternoon and Sunday, those service stations trading the extra hours provided an additional six full-time equivalent employment opportunities for each service station in the Adelaide inner metropolitan area based on the extra hours available.

I refer to those issues over which we fought tooth and nail in this House and in another place in the past. How farcical it is that we actually argued about those issues. We had the situation in regard to baking bread on the weekend where on Sunday people could not buy bread baked in Adelaide and sell it in their shops. People had to buy bread from Mount Barker and sell it in the inner metropolitan area of Adelaide. What a farcical situation that was. But how many people are still complaining about that change which allowed bakeries in the Adelaide inner metropolitan area to bake bread?

Members interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Thank you, Frank. It would be nice if Frank stood up tonight and said, 'Frank is going to support Sunday trading not only in the inner metropolitan area of Adelaide and the city but also in the suburbs.' I refer to the farcical situation where delis could not sell groceries after hours: they had to put chain mesh over the groceries so they could not be sold. Not so long ago we had restrictions on the sale of red meat from butchers on Saturday afternoons. What a farcical situation when we had supermarkets that could not sell red meat during certain hours. Once again we have to debate retail trading hours.

I now refer to the *Advertiser* report that a number of influential members of the Government had either reserved their position or were going to cross the floor. I was referred to as one of those influential back benchers who intended to cross the floor. There was great delight in that, because they got one out of two right. As a result of that article I received a letter from a person in Adelaide who has given me permission to refer to his letter as follows:

I note that you may be opposed to Sunday shopping in Adelaide. This surprises me—

it surprised me too—

I thought you would, being a Liberal, be in favour of extra business. Personally, I wish to assure you that there are many single parent families out here in Adelaide and the surrounding area who are unable to do their shopping during the week, especially with their kids. Saturday afternoon and Sunday shopping allows them to do this

as a family if they so choose. I have been in Adelaide on a Sunday many times with my children and loved the relaxed weekend shopping atmosphere, the coffee houses and socialisation, etc.

I cannot understand why so many Adelaidians want their city to remain so far behind other Australian cities in economic health and business activity. It always seems to have been like this in Adelaide—you have to be dragged into the modern world kicking and screaming (I am not originally from Adelaide).

The argument that there are only so many dollars to go around so why open on Sundays is, as I am sure you realise, a foolish one. Even a graduate of high school economics knows that given the same amount of money supply, speeding up the circular flow of income means more jobs and greater activity. And opening shops on Sunday does just that, and it also provides the opportunity for employment for many people, such as students, who cannot work during the week. I hope you support your Party on this issue, and the families who want to shop on the weekend and Adelaide's economic advancement.

I support those sentiments. I refer to the survey published in the *Advertiser* yesterday prepared for the Retail Traders Association by Ross Harrison Market Research. The results of that survey are certainly interesting, because they showed explicitly that the majority of Adelaide consumers support Sunday trading in the city. The majority of people support people shopping in the city: 86.4 per cent of respondents agreed that people should have a choice to shop in the city if they wish to do so. We had 86.4 per cent agreeing: 90.6 per cent of Liberal respondents supported it, 85.2 per cent of Labor respondents supported it and said they wished to shop on Sunday, and 79.7 per cent of Democrat supporters—

Mr Evans interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: As the member for Davenport says, that is about every Democrat in the State. The research shows that the majority of people in Adelaide support Sunday trading in the city, and so they should. The individual should have the right to trade. We need only look at what happens at Westfield Marion on Friday afternoon. People decide with their own feet that they do not want to shop in the evening if they can shop during the day. Accordingly, Westfield Marion on Friday afternoon at 5 o'clock is absolutely dead. Friday afternoon or Friday evening trading in the suburbs—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: Friday night trading was not supported.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: They have been through that. They still have a policy which is old hat and which they know does not work for South Australia. The shopping centre did not force traders to stay open: no-one was forced to open their doors. Stores such as McDonald's continued to trade and did well but other stores such as Campbell's Newsagency, the Tie Rack, JR Surf and Ski and a number of small traders decided not to open on Friday afternoon; they were not forced to open and were not charged accordingly.

I laughed when I read the comments of the member for Ross Smith, and I am somewhat disappointed that the honourable member is not here today. He said he could imagine Japanese tourists buying a Jason recliner in Adelaide. Sometimes I think the member for Ross Smith sits in his Jason recliner for too long because the blood has gone to his feet and there is none left in his head: the lights are on and no-one is home.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the member for Mitchell will not continue with that.

Mr CAUDELL: No, Sir. As to tourism, Mr Speaker, I know that you are interested in tourism as you represent a country electorate and there are many magnificent attractions to see in your area. Before entering Parliament I was a tourism operator and there is much to be said for the setting

up of Sunday trading in the city associated with tourism. For all those doubting Thomases around the place, including the Opposition, we should look at the situation relating to tourism in Australia and particularly in South Australia. Singapore is one of the greatest shopping centres in the world, but the tide is changing. No longer can we get three or four Singapore dollars for every Australian dollar: the Australian dollar will buy only 96 Singapore cents. The cost of accommodation and food is much dearer in Singapore than it is in Adelaide. In fact, Australia has one of the cheapest accommodation and food rates of any country in the world.

We can compare Australia's accommodation rate to the rate in England, France or Singapore and be highly surprised. An average room at the Hyatt Hotel in Singapore will cost \$311 an evening. You can get the same accommodation in Australia for less than \$150. As for food, a three course meal in Paris costs about F900, and that is equivalent to about \$A225. The same meal at a top restaurant in Adelaide costs \$60 or \$70. So, it is obvious that there are advantages associated with accommodation and food in South Australia. Also, there are advantages associated with clothes. When people are looking for alternatives for their travel in coming years, we in Australia need to be prepared not only with alternatives associated with tourism but also by providing infrastructure for those tourists. That includes providing the infrastructure in relation to—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: The member for Playford asks what a pie and chips would cost in Paris. That is more to his liking; we can see by his stomach line that he eats lots of pies and chips.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: He drives a Volvo, does he? It is very interesting that, when the Adelaide City Council collected a petition from people who were shopping in the city, 12 per cent of the signatories were from interstate or overseas. Such is the number of tourists who visit South Australia these days. They do not necessarily have the Adelaide Airport as their first port of call; a number of tourists come to South Australia having landed at other locations in Australia. We have heard from the Minister for Tourism that QANTAS has increased the number of people travelling to South Australia by about 2 000 people a month.

We need to be alert to the requirements of tourists and to make sure that we have the facilities available for them. We need to establish the infrastructure for tourism. Not only must we ensure that we have an airport of sufficient quality and with sufficient facilities when those tourists arrive but we also have to ensure that we have quality conference and hotel accommodation. We must have quality packages which are marketed internationally, and we are starting to offer them, but we must also have the quality facilities to enable those tourists to shop. We must provide that shopping in the Adelaide city centre on Sundays, and that is what this legislation seeks to provide.

When we listen to the Opposition we have to wonder why it has opposed Sunday trading. Having provided certain exemptions for Sunday trading to different industries in the retail sector over the past 10 or 11 years, why does it turn around and all of a sudden oppose the provisions enabling the retail sector to trade in the city centre? Does it have anything to do with the fact that the bag man for the ALP, the member for Spence, was formerly associated with the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association (SDA), or does it have to do with the member for Napier and her

association with the MPA and the fact that her election campaign was financed with in excess of \$10 000 by the SDA? Is it because of her conflict of interests associated with that operation? Maybe the members for Napier and Spence would like to stand up in this House in this debate and fully disclose their association and their funding from the SDA and the reasons for their support for that organisation.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAUDELL: It is only \$50 000; only a tinkle in the bucket, as the member for Spence would say. It is obvious that the members for Spence and Napier and other members of the ALP who have been fully supported financially by the SDA are now being called to heel to support the issues and the stance it has taken. In the remaining debate we look forward to hearing the stance of the members for Spence and Napier on this situation. Let them explain to the electors and those people who are unemployed in Mitchell why they cannot get a job in the retail sector—because they oppose Sunday trading not only in the city but also in the suburbs. I would gladly like them to come down, because they are so keen to come to my electorate and talk about health; maybe they would like to come down to my electorate and talk about employment, or maybe they would like to visit Marion shopping centre and say why they oppose Sunday trading in the suburbs. Maybe they would like to tell the proprietor of Campbell's newsagency why he cannot trade on a Sunday. Maybe they would like to tell JR Surf and Ski and McDonald's why they cannot trade on a Sunday. Maybe they would like to tell the various other shop proprietors in Marion shopping centre why they cannot trade on a Sunday.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Spence.

Mr Caudell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell has had his opportunity. It is now the turn of the member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Thank you for your protection from the Liberal benches, Sir; I know I can always rely on you. I rise to oppose most of the provisions of the Bill. I am a financial member of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, the SDA; a membership I share with more than 20 000 South Australians so, if the Liberal Party is going to make play on an alleged conflict of interest—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. We are in this Parliament debating a Bill. I was not aware that the Liberal Party was doing anything; the Government is doing something.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The member for Spence.

Mr ATKINSON: If play is to be made of my membership of the SDA and of the House, I have to say that my membership of SDA is one I share with a very large proportion of South Australians, and it is a proportion of the population so large that any conflict of interest is submerged, especially when I disclose my interests. In 1988 and 1989 I was employed at the SDA.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Thank you, Minister. I spoilt a good industrial career in order to enter the Parliament. At the 1989 and 1993 State elections, the SDA donated about \$4 000 to my election campaigns. This is noted in the parliamentary register of pecuniary interests and in the returns I made to the Australian Electoral Commission after both general elections I mentioned. For the benefit of the Minister for Industrial Affairs, who is having difficulty adding \$4 000 to \$4 000, the

total amount was \$8 000. On the other occasion I spoke in the House on shop trading hours, namely, the extension of grocery trading to Saturday afternoons, I made the same disclosure. The SDA has been most careful to ensure that in its lobbying on trading hours matters it remains in tune with its membership, and that is why, more than a year ago, the SDA surveyed its entire membership to check its attitudes to Sunday trading.

I think the union was apprehensive that members of the union, so many of whom are casuals, might appreciate the opportunity to work on Sunday. It may be argued that it was extra hours and extra work, and the Minister has argued that strongly in this debate. Unions are elected by their memberships—in the case of the SDA, every four years—so it is important that the union get it right. The result of that survey is that the members of the SDA were overwhelmingly opposed to Sunday trading, so the union's campaign was in tune with the membership. As we speak on this Bill, the SDA is surveying its membership again, this time in the city, to ask their attitude to Sunday trading.

Before the 1993 election, the Minister who has led this debate promised South Australians that he and his Party were opposed to Sunday trading. That is what he promised South Australians. I know election promises are not worth so much any more, but that is what the Minister promised. He can go back to a leaflet he slipped under doors in a Port Adelaide electorate and say, 'If you read the terms very carefully, we promised an inquiry.' That is not the interpretation which the Minister wanted to place in the minds of small retailers. He wanted to place the interpretation that the Liberal Party was opposed to Sunday trading and would be for the whole four year term.

Mr Quirke: That's what they thought.

Mr ATKINSON: That is what they thought, and that is what the Minister let them think. The Minister, when he decided to revoke that promise early in the parliamentary term, chose to do so not by changing the law and bringing a proposed new law to the Parliament, but by certificates of exemption.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: As the Labor Party did for 10 years.

Mr ATKINSON: As the Labor Party did in many instances, as the Minister rightly interjects. At that time, he will recall that I crossed over to the other side of this Chamber to ask him if he had obtained legal advice on whether he could exempt the whole of the Adelaide shopping district under a certificate of exemption, whether that would stand up under administrative law, because from my recollection of my administrative law lectures in 1978, that was not possible and would not stand up in court. I cautioned the Minister about that.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The Minister was well advised. He was advised by a very clever Queen's Council, known as the Hon. Robert Lawson; it was all right. The same Hon. Robert Lawson was quite happy to boast before the High Court decision that he had so advised the Minister, and he won 2-1 in the South Australian Supreme Court. Well, the High Court struck down the Minister's certificates of exemption.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Well, I am sorry, but the High Court is a higher court than the Supreme Court. You might win at the Para Districts Magistrates Court, but you did not win over in Canberra. So, the High Court struck down the Minister's

certificates of exemption. The Minister cost the South Australian taxpayers at least \$60 000—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: No, more than that.

Mr ATKINSON: No, the Minister interjects that he cost the South Australian taxpayers—that is gamblers, drinkers and smokers in South Australia—more than \$60 000 by adopting this course, because \$60 000 was the amount of money that South Australian taxpayers had to pay the SDA alone for its costs of this appeal. The costs of the Crown would have been more, so we are talking about more than \$100 000, at a time of budgetary stringency, wasted on an administrative bungle by the Minister.

The Liberal Party introduces this Bill to allow Sunday trading in the city and to abolish Friday nights in the suburbs. It is interesting to consider the trading pattern in country areas which have had seven day a week trading for quite some time. How do they go on Sundays in a deregulated market? At Port Pirie, the average revenue generated on Sundays is 3 per cent of the weekly trade. The notional daily trading average on seven day trading, as you would know, Mr Acting Speaker, is 100 per cent divided by seven, amounting to about 14 per cent. In Port Pirie, 3 per cent on Sundays; in Naracoorte, 5 per cent; Victor Harbor, 5.5 per cent; Port Augusta, 6 per cent; and in Whyalla, the highest, 8 per cent. What is the best trading day in these deregulated markets? It is Friday—the night that the Minister wants to abolish.

This Minister has made quite a political achievement in alienating the small retailers, the 25 000 member SDA, Westfields, Coles Myer and most shops in the suburbs by taking Fridays off them, and he has alienated a large proportion of the Liberal backbench, most of whom will not have the guts to cross the floor, but some of whom will. That is quite a political achievement by this Minister who is in the dying days of his tenure of this portfolio.

The work on Sundays will not be voluntary. Whenever there has been an extension of trading hours, the truth is that shop assistants, by one means or another, are forced to work that spread of hours. That is the industrial reality.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: Do they get paid?

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, the Minister is right, they do get paid, but if you are a casual shop assistant and you knock back hours, whether they are on Sundays, Thursday nights or any other out of hours time, you will not get another offer. You will lose those hours and other hours. Effectively, you will lose your job: that is the truth. Sunday trading will cause a loss of hours at other times. We are seeing shops which once opened at 8.30 a.m. and 9 a.m. now opening at 9.30 and 10 a.m. Indeed, I was in Melbourne recently for a purpose which was well known to readers of the *Advertiser*, and when I got up early on a weekday morning to try to buy a toothbrush in the Bourke Street Mall, the shops did not open until 10 a.m.

Mr Quirke: What time did you have your photo taken?

Mr ATKINSON: I had my photo taken at the Top of the Town brothel later that day. I wanted my teeth to be pearly for the occasion. What is happening in our stores now is that during the week, in what were normal trading hours, the staff are thinner on the ground than they have ever been before. In Adelaide 100 employees have lost their jobs at David Jones and John Martins since the Minister's experiment with Sunday trading in the city. We are talking about the spread of trading hours. The revenue generated will be the same; it will be constant. The only question is: what hours is that revenue to be fitted into? The Minister is just introducing his own distortion of the market: that is all he is doing.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: As we did, yes. The Labor Party is historically associated with the early closing of shops. It is one of our historic achievements. It is the basis on which the early Labor Governments were elected. So, of course we distorted the market. We introduced certain hours during which you could trade and certain hours during which you could not trade. All the Liberal Party in this State is doing is changing the distortion.

If this Minister was a genuine liberal, someone committed to free trade, he would have come into the House and introduced a phased total deregulation of trading hours. That is what the member for Mitchell supports. That is what the Minister ought to be doing if he is a genuine, free market liberal. But he is not doing that: he is opening up the major retailers in the city on Sundays, and he is closing down the major retailers in the suburbs on Fridays. All he is doing is distorting the market, changing the range of hours within which shops can trade in a way different than they have historically traded and from how they have traded under a Labor Government.

Why is the Minister introducing this distortion? The answer is that Foodland was a big donor to the Liberal Party before the last State election; that is reason number one. It is in the interests of Foodland that the major retailers do not open in the suburbs on Friday nights. The second reason is more Government specific. The Government of South Australia, through GAMD (Government Asset Management Division), is the owner of the Myer REMM centre in the city. The Government is desperate to flog off the Myer centre to the highest bidder. How can it raise the capital value for the purpose of its sale? It introduces Sunday—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The Government has to sell it because the previous Labor Government, when it was in power, lost \$3 500 million through the State Bank. I am not avoiding that one, but the Liberal Government wants to sell the Myer centre.

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Bass): Order! The member for Unley has said enough.

Mr ATKINSON: The Liberal Government wants to sell the Myer centre, so it will change the law of this State which applies to every one; it will change the spread of trading hours so that we can have Sunday trading in the city, so that the Myer centre will get a bigger proportion of the retail market, its capital value will go up and the Government will get more money from its sale. In my view that is straight-forward Government corruption. It is the perversion of our law. As I said, if the Government was taking an honest approach to shopping hours it would introduce, through this Bill, the phased abolition of all trading hours.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The members for Mitchell and Playford are out of order.

Mr ATKINSON: I would not agree with that because I am not a liberal.

Mr Wade interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: No, I am not a small 'l' liberal. In fact, I loathe small 'l' liberals more than any other parliamentary tendency I can think of, for the information of the member for Elder. However, if the Government were true to its own economic philosophy it would introduce a total but phased deregulation of trading hours. However, it is not doing that—it is just introducing a different distortion for its own short-

term budgetary interests. Later on, when there is a new short-term political agenda, the Liberal Party will say, 'Catch Tim and Moriki have dried up, so who will give us donations for the 1997 election?' What we will get from this Liberal Government is an extension of Sunday trading to the suburbs. We will not get it now because Foodland kicks the tin, but we will get it later on when someone else kicks the tin.

All these arguments about Sunday trading being necessary in the City of Adelaide for tourism will be forgotten and Sunday trading will be extended to the suburbs whether the backbenchers opposite like it or not. I can inform the members for Reynell, Elder, Lee and Hanson that next time shop trading hours are debated the Government will have given up on those seats. The Government could not care less what it means to you in your electorates; it will extend Sunday trading to all the suburbs and to hell with you. That is what will happen.

Tourism is not a valid reason for having Sunday trading in the city. Not one extra tourist will come to South Australia because the Myer centre is trading on a Sunday. In fact, what will happen is that South Australians who happen to be shop assistants, or in families in which shop assistants are members, will cease going on Sunday outings to the major tourism regions of South Australia. Tourism will lose as a result of this change. There is not a tourism reason. People do not fly into Adelaide from Tokyo to go shopping in the city on a Sunday for a Jason Recliner or a posturpaedic care chair, nor do they come into the city to buy a packet of Cornflakes. Tourism is just a cover for this change, which is driven by the sale of the Myer REMM centre and by political donations from Foodland.

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): I rise to voice a very deep concern I have in respect of Sunday trading in the central business district of Adelaide. My comments will be quite basic. I and many of my constituents in Hanson—and the boundaries of Hanson extend to the edge of the metropolitan area—deem Sunday trading to be unnecessary and potentially damaging to small business in Adelaide. Personally, I am fundamentally opposed to the proposed concept, objecting on two grounds: first, Sunday is a family day. That might sound pretty old fashioned and square, but keeping the family together is a top priority in helping to combat the many social problems we have in our community.

As an ordained minister of religion—although I do not practise terribly much these days—and a counsellor for many years, I have dealt with many serious family problems and I am not convinced they will improve with Sunday city trading. Some say that they will. Whilst I agree with the argument that many people do come to the city on Sundays for family outings—they come to visit art galleries and museums and to walk in the parklands, etc.—I believe that the majority of South Australians and Adelaidians will not come within a five kilometre radius of the city square. Secondly, in his second reading explanation the Minister states that, in the seven months of Sunday trading, it was well received by both the retail industry and the South Australian community.

He obviously has good reason for saying that. An average of 72 000 people per week go to the city, which averages out to about 40 000 on a bad Sunday and 130 000 on a very good Sunday. I am not a mathematician at all—in fact, I am the worst mathematician in the world—but this surely represents a very small percentage of the population of the City of Adelaide. It equates to about 6 per cent or the total crowd at a couple of Crows matches. It has also been widely reported

that without this proposed amendment South Australia's capital would be the only mainland capital city in Australia which does not allow the opening of its city for Sunday retail trading.

Some argue that this is a very backward step, almost equating Adelaide with the dark ages. More significantly, they claim it will seriously affect the economy of this State, which we all know was devastated under 11 years of the Labor Government. I am not convinced, despite the statistics flying around suggesting that millions of dollars of tourist money will be at risk, that we will be losers if there is no Sunday trading in the CBD. I am aware that many countries—

Members interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: If the Opposition will shut up for a while and listen it will help. I am aware that many countries and cities in Australia do have Sunday trading. In fact, Malaysia has total deregulation, and I have been shopping in Kuala Lumpur on a Sunday. However, in Germany and other European countries I am led to believe that the shops shut at 12 noon on Saturdays and do not open until 9 o'clock Monday morning. From what I have read I do not believe that it seriously affects the economies of these countries. They seem stable and in substantial growth mode. Provision is also made in the Bill to preserve the interests of retailers and, in particular, small businesses that do not wish to trade on Sundays.

They are not compelled to do so under this legislation. They can please themselves whether or not they open. Many small business people in Hanson have come to me and complained that this will disadvantage them and certainly disadvantage their friends in the city, and it will take a lot to convince them otherwise. They believe that the long hours will make their health fail—they have seen their friends do this—that their business stands a very good chance of crumbling and falling apart and that when they come to sell it they will get nothing for it. They believe that they will be the losers if they do not open and be competitive. Either way, they believe that they stand a good chance of being swept into oblivion.

I believe that the opposition voiced by a cross section of the community in Hanson, not the majority, represents a significant percentage of the electorate, and it is my duty to represent and report the views of my constituents and hear in particular what small business is saying. After all, they are the backbone of this State and nation: they must be heard and not trampled under foot. They can put a Government in or out of power. Just ask the Opposition, the weedy-looking mob that we have there now. In 1993 there was overwhelming opposition to the Labor Government in South Australia not just because of the State Bank fiasco but because it betrayed small business; it let small business down.

Big business continues to have little respect for the little bloke. Coles Myer, Westfield, Franklins, Woolworths, to name but a few of the big corporations, have shown scant regard for small business in the past, and I do not think that they will change in future. I believe that some small businesses will continue to be hanged, drawn and quartered in the future. One would not have to be too smart to work that out, because the big businesses want to monopolise the retail industry.

I have received numerous letters, phone calls and faxes from concerned constituents in Hanson calling for this Government to put an end to Sunday trading in the city. I believe—and it is very basic—that it is all about power: big

business corporations versus small business. It is a sort of David and Goliath resurrected. I cannot think of a better analogy. The Davids this time are small business people who have run family businesses for decades providing personal services to the community, and sons and daughters have taken over family businesses only to see them in deep trouble. These are the people from whom I constantly get phone calls.

I agree with many constituents that the media bias has not helped the cause. The media have blatantly promoted Sunday trading in the CBD. They push a particular barrow and refuse to present a balanced argument, even though many of my constituents have written asking for a fair hearing. I have received copies of correspondence submitted to the media which have subsequently been rejected. There are many empty ghost business houses in Hanson, tombstone monuments, due to the incompetence of 11 years of Labor Government in South Australia. I do not want any more, and they do not want any more: we have had enough.

I also want to voice my opposition to any further proposals to deregulate shopping hours. I refer to Greg Kelton's article in the *Advertiser* of Friday 26 May. I do not know where he gets his information from, but the article is headed '24 hours a day.' He interviewed a Mr Glen Wheatland, who talks about the various stages towards total deregulation in the future. He talks about stages 1 and 2, which have already come to pass. Then he goes on to stage 3 and says that would begin in October 1996. I do not know where he gets this information from. He says that stage 4 would operate from October 1997 and stage 5 would come into effect in October 1998, repealing the Shop Trading Hours Act, allowing complete deregulation. I can assure members that I will fight tooth and nail for my constituents and small business houses in Hanson.

I will conclude by reading from a letter that I received from a small suburban business owner who lives on the edge of my electorate. I believe that this letter echoes the view of many people in my electorate. She says:

Recently I have been trying to raise some response to Sunday trading in the city. The problem—

and she really goes for the media here—

is that through the media only one side of the story is ever printed or heard. I have rung Ministers in Parliament, the *Advertiser* newspaper, the *7.30 Report*, *Today Tonight* and radio stations with little or no response.

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

Mr LEGGETT: My constituent goes on to state:

My major concerns are the misrepresentation to the public by media as a whole. I have challenged two journalists at the *Advertiser*. One admitted the information she had in her report may have been incorrect. A blatant understatement. She stated South Australia received 250 000 international visitors per year. *The Australian* newspaper on 24 February reported 'Adelaide is the smallest gateway'. The article stated that 1.15 per cent of all tourists coming to Australia (799 900) or 9 200 came to South Australia for the quarter ended September 1994.

The lady goes on to mention some of her brief history:

I left school at 14 and was employed from then on mainly in small business. I moved to the city, a wide eyed country bumpkin, worked in a large retail outlet and returned to the country after marriage.

She goes on to state—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: Well, you are an old bumpkin. She states:

I moved [back] to Adelaide 10 years ago, once again bought a small business, watched it grow, worked hard and immensely enjoyed my working environment and people contacts.

She is very much a people's person and that is the whole purpose of small business: relating to people. The letter further states:

Now as a chairperson of a group I have benefited from this, being able to have input and experience at coordinating group activities, promotions and meetings, with special attention to how we can improve our image, position and most importantly goods and services.

She is a very committed small business owner. The letter continues:

To this end I feel as a smaller business operator we are disadvantaged by Sunday trading.

I will mention this very briefly, but she goes on to state:

It is small wonder small traders are concerned. Not being able to get our message across to the media means fairness seems to have been a forgotten meaning when it comes to fair trading for all.

In conclusion she states:

Whatever has happened to our wonderful city of churches—

I suppose one thing is that not enough people go to them—our arts and culture centres, our parklands, national parks, wineries and beaches? Surely, are these not tourist attractions? Let us talk about restaurants and cafes. Some have achieved national status and not without good reason. Forgive me for being facetious in my anti Sunday trading attitude. I am one of the majority who will definitely be hurting with the continuation of Sunday trading.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I know it is not included in Standing Orders but I wonder if it is in Erskine May or the practice of the House of Commons that it is required for the Government to have a Minister in the House at all the times, because on this important Government Bill there is no Minister in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a Minister in the Chamber. Further, it is not a requirement that a Minister be in the Chamber even though in the view of the Chair it is most desirable.

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, could I make it clear that there was no Minister in the House at the point that I raised it.

The SPEAKER: There was a Minister in the Speaker's Gallery at the time the honourable member raised his point of order.

Mr LEGGETT: It is no wonder we have an Opposition that will never get back into Government when you look at all of them over there. I believe in solidarity. I have always been a team player and I always will be one. I do not favour Sunday trading in the central business district. I voiced my opinion publicly in August 1994 and again outside this House last week. I have expressed my deep concern and that of my constituents. I understand the need to promote city life through our growing tourism industry and I believe tourism is beginning to prosper in South Australia thanks to Minister Ingerson when, after 11 years of Labor, we had the greatest slump of all time.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEGGETT: I wonder whether the member for Spence could shut up. I imagine that when he was a young kid he liked to have the last say, but he is not getting it at the moment. The Brown Government has an excellent record since taking office. It has pulled South Australia out of its financial hole—and what a hole, what a canyon—in which this totally depleted mob put South Australia. Many churches and practising Christians in my electorate have shown—

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order, Sir, the member for Hanson refers to members on the Opposition benches as 'this mob'. I ask respectfully that he withdraw on the grounds that the expression is, I think, less than dignified.

The SPEAKER: Order! The term used by the member for Hanson is not unparliamentary, even though I think it would be far better for the member to refer to members opposite either as 'members opposite' or by their district.

Mr LEGGETT: The truth obviously hurts, but I will withdraw it because I did not want to offend the only Opposition member in the House at the moment. Before the member for Spence rudely interrupted me, I was saying that many churches and practising Christians in my electorate have shown concern about Sunday trading on religious grounds. The member for Spence would do well to listen to this. I, too, am a committed Christian. I am reminded of an incident in the New Testament, Mark, chapter 2, verses 23 to 27. I know that the member for Spence is an Old Testament man, but it may be a good idea if he looked at this chapter as well. Christ was challenged for healing on the Sabbath day (he did most of his healings then) and for eating corn, which he and his disciples picked as they walked through a cornfield. When challenged by the authorities, the Pharisees—amongst whom the member for Spence would probably fit quite easily—he said, in verse 27—

Mr ATKINSON: On a point of order: in the list of unparliamentary expressions in Erskine May is the word 'Pharisee'. The member for Hanson has referred to me as 'a Pharisee'. It is contrary to the practice of the House of Commons, which is the practice of this House under Standing Order 1. I respectfully ask that he withdraw that reference.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is not aware—and I want to give some consideration to it—of whether the term is unparliamentary. I suggest to the member for Hanson that he not refer to the member for Spence or Opposition members in any disparaging terms presently as he has only three minutes to complete his speech.

Mr LEGGETT: It was really a compliment because they are upright and righteous men, but I withdraw that in relation to the member for Spence. Christ said that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. We transfer that religious day to Sunday, which is the day on which Christ was resurrected from the dead—the first day of the week. I conclude by saying that my concerns about this amendment are very well documented.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley.

Mr Atkinson: Hear, hear! Good member.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It is nice to be appreciated by members opposite with those comments and I thank the member for Spence. Not only do I support this Bill but also commend the Minister for the way he has gone about the introduction of it. It would not have happened if there had not been a challenge, but as a Government and a Party that respects the separation of powers and believes in the democratic rights of organisations to appeal—that is the resolve of the courts—legislation had to be brought in. I had my say in the Party room, as did many members here, and continue to have that say.

I find it incredible that the members for Playford and Spence continually point at members on the Government side as though we are all gagged and frightened to have our say. They believe that somehow the Government did not introduce the legislation in the first place because it was frightened of a back bench revolt and so on. They continue to believe that

we will not support the Minister. I refer to page 7 of the *Payneham Messenger* of 27 July 1994 where, unknown to the member for Playford, my views on shopping hours were reported under this heading:

Confine extended trade to selected areas: MP

I refer to the article as follows:

Extended shopping hours should only be enforced in certain areas, such as tourist hot spots, in order to protect the interests of small businesses, says Hartley MP Joe Scalzi. Mr Scalzi—who covers an electorate with many small businesses—said the deregulation debate had to take the interests of individual areas in mind. He said there was no doubt extended shopping hours would be a boon for tourist areas but said north-eastern small businesses also had to be protected by the law.

I was quoted:

I don't think you could have the same justification for extended shopping hours in Campbelltown as, say, the city. The Government has to act in the interests of the community so it shouldn't be a blanket policy.

I said this before the regulations were introduced. After the regulations were introduced, in the same way that the Labor Party introduced them for many years, the *Messenger Press* of 24 August in an article headed 'Scalzi backs the shopping compromise' stated:

Hartley MP Joe Scalzi voted in favour of the State Government's extended shopping hours package, despite being a staunch small business supporter because it was a 'good compromise'. Mr Scalzi said although he remained opposed to extended trading hours in the suburbs, he was pleased with the remaining conditions.

In that article I am quoted about the position in the city. To claim that we have not had our say or were not consulted is false. I would put the position in perspective and refer to the history of the shopping hours debate. The shopping hours issue has been and always will be a controversy. In December 1987 the Bannon Government announced it would deregulate shopping hours for furniture and floor covering shops by issuing ministerial certificates, as we did.

On 22 October 1993 the Arnold Government announced that shop trading hours for supermarkets and food stores would be extended to five nights a week, Monday to Friday, until 9 p.m. This decision came into operation three days later on 29 October and was implemented by the issuing of 210 certificates of exemption by the then Labor Government Minister Bob Gregory. In total, the Bannon-Arnold Labor Government issued 883 ministerial certificates between 1987 and 1993 which extended shop trading hours. Further, 568 of these local government certificates of exemption allow permanent extension of shop trading hours.

What did we do prior to the election and when we came into Government? We said that the State Liberal Government would establish an independent inquiry into the retail industry designed to examine all relevant issues relating to trading hours. We said that the State Liberal Government would immediately revoke the late night certificates of exemption granted to supermarkets and food stores at least until the process of independent inquiry was completed. The industrial relations laws would be changed to allow all retailers to enter enterprise agreements. In addition, the Liberal Government would review the leasing laws of State legislation. The Liberal Government, under the premiership of Dean Brown, has done all these things, and because of our competent Minister we have carried out what we promised.

This business about Sunday trading involves not only the city but the whole of the metropolitan area and, indeed, the State. Nowhere have we pushed for the extension of Sunday trading in a blanket way for the whole of South Australia. The

city is different. I said that before in discussions in the Party room; I am quoted as saying it in the *Messenger*; and I said it afterwards. As the member for Hartley, I consulted with my electorate. I was told that people did not want an extension of trading in the electorate I represented. That is what came back to me. Some people who worked in the city were against it. But in the past couple of weeks, the number of people who have come to me in comparison with the number who came to me last year was insignificant. Why? Because they have found that in the city it has not brought about the problems that people would have expected in the suburbs. I speak mainly for my electorate as, indeed, other members have spoken for their electorate. I cannot say that the effects of Sunday trading in the city will be the same everywhere, because that would be foolish. But to boost tourism, no-one can doubt that Sunday trading in the city will be a bad thing.

A couple of weeks ago, I was fortunate to attend Business Asia 1995, and today in Question Time I asked a question about the expense of that. I attended a couple of workshops on tourism. There is no doubt that the representatives from those Asian countries who were here made clear that, if Adelaide was not to have trading on a Sunday or indeed as we have it, there would be a disincentive to tourism. We can go on and on about the small percentage, but it is the gate, no matter how small, that leads the progress. If we did not have Sunday trading in the city, we would be the only mainland State that did not have it.

With every decision there are effects. No doubt some people will be affected by Sunday trading in the city and there are people who do not wish to work on Sundays. I can sympathise with them and understand their argument. If we did not have Saturday afternoon and Friday night shopping, if we went back to the situation of 15 years ago, fine, some people might agree with that, but the reality is that we cannot go back. The reality is that the shops in Melbourne, Sydney and Perth are not closed on Sundays: the reality is that we want to attract more tourists not only to the city but to the whole of South Australia. At the same time, we hear arguments that we should push for more people to live in the city. We want to have that push for people living in the city but at the same time we want to turn off the valves at the heart of the City of Adelaide. We cannot do that; we cannot have it both ways. But this Government has been responsible and has taken all that into account.

We established a committee. We looked at the pros and cons of the effects of Sunday trading in the city. We had Friday night trading in the suburbs; it has not worked and we are flexible enough to realise that that is the case. Members of the Opposition keep telling us that we and the Minister did not have the courage to pass legislation. Well, they sold out the State in three days and there was no resurrection for the State. We had to have a Liberal Government victory to get back on track. I will tell you why they issued certificates in October 1993: because they did not have the guts to pass legislation. They had a Minister of the Government and they had two Independents.

I wonder where the member for Spence would have stood if he had had to debate the issue of extended trading. Where would he have stood? That is the reason, because they would have had more difficulty. I know, because the former member for Hartley was an Independent. They could have introduced it, but they did not, and I can bet you that the members opposite had less of a say than the members for Hartley, Mitchell and Hanson. At least on this side we can put an independent view, discuss it in the Party room and come up

with a compromise that is good not only for members but also for South Australia. That is what it is all about. Instead, these members opposite, these born-again small business supporters, the people who gave us five days trading without our having a say, without having a committee and without going to the people, are telling us that we are too scared to bring it to the House.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: No, I am not; I have it here. We are not scared. We followed the same procedure according to the advice that we were given to extend the shopping hours as we did. But we did not have a blanket statement for Sunday trading throughout the metropolitan areas; we looked at where it would be most beneficial for the State. No-one can doubt and the polls have shown that the people want city trading. There is no doubt that some people will be affected and the takings of some small businesses will be not as high as one would expect, but with every decision there are good and bad points. We are here to make decisions not just for a particular area but for the whole State; that is what we should bear in mind.

The State is getting back on track. If you were at that Business Asia conference, the tourist operators would have told you that Sunday trading is essential if you want to attract tourists. Other important things were noted there as well. I remember quite clearly a journalist from Djakarta saying that not only should we be flexible in attracting tourists but also perhaps we should not just have goods that are made in South-East Asia and China available for the tourists, because tourists from Indonesia can get those goods in those countries a lot cheaper than they can get them here. The message is that we should have more quality goods made in South Australia. We should be promoting ourselves and we should also have some European goods so that, instead of those Asian tourists going to Europe, they could come here to get those goods. There are a lot of lessons to be learnt from interacting with our Asian neighbours and the world community. The religious argument that shopping on Sunday should be banned is a poor argument.

I believe that it is not sustainable in a secular state, although we all have our own beliefs and so on. The Catholic Church which I attend is flexible: it has a Saturday night mass as well, and if you attend on Saturday night you do not have to attend on Sunday. So, in that area, even the church is flexible. I understand that, and I respect the views of others, but they have a choice. From 11 in the morning until 5 in the evening there are many church services which people can attend. I support this Bill; I support the Minister; I support this Government's promotion of South Australia; I support what we are doing to make sure that we put this State back on track, and I believe that having shopping in the city will help in that recovery.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): This Bill needs significant amendment. It legislates for Sunday trading in the city at the expense of and as a trade off against Friday night in the suburbs, to which Labor is opposed. There is, of course, another aspect of the Bill. It provides greater certainty for those who have been previously exempted under a certificate of exemption—businesses, furniture traders, newsagents, petrol stations with food outlets—an aspect that the Opposition supports.

The Government has moved to try to link two issues: that is, Sunday trading in one district alone (the city) and Friday night trading in the suburbs. On the one hand, that is an

expansion of the currently legislated trading hours for one group of people versus a contraction of the legislation governing trading hours in the suburbs. I have heard several members in this Chamber try to argue some sort of ideological reason for this. Of course, that just does not fit: there can be no ideological reason for this. I think we have established that there is a political trade-off, a compromise for those backbenchers who formerly expressed very strong opposition to Sunday trading in the city. Why is this so? I am pleased to see that the member for Colton is now in the Chamber. Members would remember that 50 000 strong petition which the member for Colton heralded as justification for opposition to Sunday trading in the city.

The Minister and a number of backbenchers have quoted from surveys of various groups and individuals in the community. For the information of those Liberal backbenchers who are present, perhaps they might be interested in another survey, the results of which have just been collated. I refer to a survey of 342 members of the Small Retail Traders' Association in the city. One of the questions asked in that survey was: are you in favour of Sunday trading?

It was a simple question, to the point, and 82.7 per cent of small retailers in the city who responded voluntarily to this survey said that they did not want Sunday trading in the city. To the question whether Sunday trading has led to more profit over the whole week, 87.7 per cent said 'No'. The interesting thing for Liberal backbenchers to note is that this survey involved small retailers in the city, not too much different from those in their electorates. This is an important group of business people. Why would small retailers in the city not be in favour of Sunday trading? For the very simple reason that it costs them money, as well as affecting their lifestyle. We have already discussed and recognised the cost of lifestyle to the workers in that industry.

The Minister has stated that nobody is forced to work on Sundays but that workers are choosing to give up their Sundays to work. Well, if we put ourselves in the position of those workers, just what would we choose when the ultimatum was put? If we were threatened with a cut back in the number of hours we would receive in the week, what would we choose? Where are the protections or even the acknowledgments in this legislation that will look after these people? In my electorate I have constituents who work as shop assistants in the city, and I know that because they have come into my office looking for some support in meeting their daily cost of living. Why have they approached me for assistance? Because, since Sunday trading has been operating in the city for the past seven months, they find themselves in the position of having a cut back in the number of hours they are being scheduled for work every week. That, of course, equates directly with the loss in income.

Perhaps they can choose to work on a Sunday; sometimes they are not offered work on a Sunday, but they are being offered less. They are left with a significant shortfall in their earnings. Certainly, some of them are part-time workers. One woman with whom I spoke in my electorate said that she did not work many hours per week in the city retail store, and she did not lose many hours per week, but for her that meant the difference between making it and struggling, so it was a significant amount of money to her. The Minister puts the point that surveys show this and that, but it is an equally valid point that there are sections of the community who are not doing well out of Sunday trading and they need to be recognised and protected.

The Government has talked, as have some of the previous speakers, about the boost to tourism with Sunday trading in the city. The Government supports this claim on the basis that the numbers through the shopping mall are significant. Indeed, it is interesting to consider the fact, and it is a fact, that with all these additional people in the city other tourist destinations near the city such as the Zoo, the Museum and the Art Gallery are noticing decreases in attendances since the advent of Sunday trading seven months ago. Perhaps it is the case that that family who may have gone to the Zoo, bought their lunch and licked their ice-creams wandering around the exhibits now do that same thing window-shopping in the mall.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor has the call. I do not think she needs any help or assistance.

Ms WHITE: It has been indicated to me that regional tourist centres outside the city have noted a drop in their profits since the advent of Sunday trading seven months ago.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ridley will have his chance. The member for Taylor.

Ms WHITE: While I have the attention of the member for Mitchell, I pick up on one thing he said earlier. He spoke about the effect of Sunday trading in the city and about its being a good thing for single mums. There happens to be a lot of single mothers in my electorate, and I can guarantee members that the last thing that mothers, whether or not they be single, want to do with their limited time, if that is the issue that the honourable member is getting at, is bundle their children into a train or a bus or even into the car and drive all the way into the city. Members are much more likely to find working mothers of any description, particularly in my electorate, in Coles or Woolworths on a Friday night than in the city on a Sunday.

In all of this, the message of what the Government is doing through this legislation is interesting. In fact, we listen daily to the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development tell us that the State is moving and a lot is being done for small business. The progress of this debate since the last election would indicate that the message that the community is receiving from the Liberal Government is not a clear message at all. Of course, before the 1993 election we had the Minister making statements indicating that the Liberal Government, if elected, would not support Sunday trading. The Liberal Government was elected with an overwhelming majority—37 to 10, later to be 36 to 11—yet it needed a committee of review to examine the issue. That sends a different message to the community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WHITE: The findings of the committee come down. Do they bring it into Parliament? No, that is too difficult, there is too much dissent on the back bench and it takes a High Court ruling to bring it into Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that members allow the member for Taylor to continue with her speech.

Ms WHITE: It has been a muddled message. The Government had the opportunity months ago to bring this issue before Parliament. It did not fix it then, but it could have fixed it. It could have fixed it without going to Parliament through section 13 by conducting a poll of all those workers, retailers and residents of the city. But, of

course, it did not want to do that: it did not want to put that to the test.

The marked difference in this exercise is that the Liberal position has been a mixed, unclear message to the community and the Labor position has not changed at all. We continuously opposed Sunday trading before the 1993 election and we oppose it now. If the Government were to go through the exercise of finding agreement between the retailers, the workers and all interested parties, we in the Labor Opposition and, I would say, the unions as well, would not object. In summary, this Bill should be amended. It can be amended to improve the situation for a significant group of people in this State, and I ask members of this House to consider this carefully and to act accordingly.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): As I have come to expect over the 15 years I have been here, the Labor Party takes a policy position which is politically meretricious. I invite those members of this place who do not understand the meaning of that word to grab the dictionary and look at it and they will then understand. It is always a matter of going where you get most advantage in the short run for least pain and most delight—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Isn't it? I am sure that will be the outcome, or come of any kind. The contribution made by the member for Taylor takes that view. Let me, for the sake of the House, incorporate a small number of very small tables into *Hansard*, and I assure the House that they are absolutely statistical and relate to market research which has been done recently.

Leave granted.

Political party supported	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Liberal	426	42.6
Labor	338	33.8
Democrats	64	6.4
Other	24	2.4
Not stated	148	14.8
Total	1 000	100.0

Did you know that this year shops have been open in the city on a Sunday?

	% of respondents (sample size = 1 000)
Yes	95.7
No	4.3

Did you know that the future of Sunday trading in the city is now in doubt?

	% of respondents (sample size = 1 000)
Yes	94.9
No	5.1

Did you know that the State Government is strongly in favour of shops in the city being allowed to open on a Sunday if they wish?

(sample size)	% of respondents age of respondents				
	Total	18-24	25-39	40-54	55+
(1 000)	(125)	(313)	(235)	(327)	
Yes	88.4	76.8	87.2	91.9	91.4
No	11.6	23.2	12.8	8.1	8.6

Do you agree or disagree that people should have the choice to shop in the city on a Sunday if they wish to?

(sample size)	% of respondents Political Party					Not stated
	Total	Liberal	Labor	Democrats	Other	
(1 000)	(426)	(338)	(64)	(24)	(148)	
Agree	86.4	90.6	85.2	79.7	75.0	81.8
Disagree	13.6	9.4	14.8	20.3	25.0	18.2

Do you agree or disagree that shopkeepers should have the choice to open their shops in the city on a Sunday if they wish to?

(sample size)	% of respondents Political Party					Not stated
	Total	Liberal	Labor	Democrats	Other	
(1 000)	(426)	(338)	(64)	(24)	(148)	
Agree	91.1	94.8	90.8	81.3	75.0	87.8
Disagree	8.9	5.2	9.2	18.8	25.0	12.2

It has been said that from a tourism point of view it is important for Adelaide to have Sunday shopping in the city. Do you agree or disagree with that view?

	% of respondents (Sample size = 1 000)
Agree	78.5
Disagree	21.5

This year have you been to the city on a Sunday as part of a shopping visit?

(Sample size)	% of respondents Age of respondents				
	Total	18-24	25-39	40-54	55+
(1 000)	(125)	(313)	(235)	(327)	
Yes	41.8	51.2	50.5	46.4	26.6
No	58.2	48.8	49.5	53.6	73.4

In addition, a higher proportion of males (45.5 per cent) than females (38.4 per cent) have shopped at this time.

If shopping in the city on a Sunday continues would you say you are likely or unlikely to ever shop there on a Sunday?

(Sample size)	% of respondents Age of respondents				
	Total	18-24	25-39	40-54	55+
(1 000)	(125)	(313)	(235)	(327)	
Very likely	19.9	32.0	21.4	22.1	12.2
Likely	34.2	37.6	43.1	35.7	23.2
Total—Likely	54.1	69.6	64.5	57.8	35.4
Unlikely	19.5	17.6	16.3	20.9	22.3
Very unlikely	24.1	12.0	16.6	18.7	39.8
Total—Unlikely	43.6	29.6	32.9	39.6	62.1
Don't know	2.3	0.8	2.6	2.6	2.4

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I invite the member for Spence—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, politically so. I invite the honourable member to read the definition into the record when he makes his contribution later.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: What a pity. It must have been of some considerable merit, I am sure. It did not attract my attention. The first table is a survey of some 1 000 or more people in the greater metropolitan area, and the number of voters, political Party supported, indicated a bit over 42 per cent for the Liberal Party, about 34 per cent for the Labor Party and the Democrats' score was around 6 per cent. There were some others at two and a bit and those who would not say anything at nearly 15 per cent. The next table gives a simple yes-no answer to the question: did you know that this year shops have been open in the city on Sunday? About 96 per cent did.

Another question asked: did you know that the future of Sunday trading in the city is now in doubt? And 95 per cent did. In answer to the question: did you know that the State Government is strongly in favour of shops in the city being allowed to open on Sunday if they wish, 88 per cent or so said, 'Yes', and a bit over 11 per cent said, 'No'. There was not much variation between the age groups. The younger you were, the less likely you were to have answered 'Yes'. Another question asked: do you agree or disagree that people should have the choice to shop in the city on Sunday if they wish? Over 86 per cent of people said 'Yes'. Believe it or not, over 85 per cent of them were Labor voters. That is how representative the people opposite, who claim to be members

of the Labor Party, are of the very people they seek to represent here and who have supported them. Of the Democrats, around 80 per cent agreed and, of those others, 75 per cent agreed.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, of the few Democrats in the total percentage of the sample, 79.7 per cent said that they were in favour of people being able to choose to shop in the city on Sunday if they wanted to. The question then was put to them as to whether they agreed or disagreed that shopkeepers should have the choice to open their shops. The question did not relate to whether or not people wanted to shop but to whether shopkeepers should have the right to choose whether they open their shops. Of those surveyed, over 91 per cent agreed and, of the Labor voters, almost 91 per cent—less than 1 percentage point of the overall total—agreed. Over 81 per cent of the Democrats agreed.

They were then asked their opinion of the importance of Sunday trading from a tourism perspective. Over 78 per cent said that, in their opinion, it would be a good thing for tourism. The next question asked was whether they had been to the city on a Sunday shopping this year. Approximately 42 per cent said 'Yes'; more in the younger age group—over 50 per cent—had, and fewer in the 55 plus age group said they had not. However, that is because people are creatures of habit and, once you have reached 55, you are unlikely to change the pattern of your organised approach to your weekly, monthly and annual lifestyle. However, still a significant number of people in the over 55 age group had chosen to come and shop in the city on a Sunday. Indeed, that figure was close on 27 per cent.

The next question asked was: if shopping in the city on a Sunday continues would you say you are likely or unlikely to ever shop there on a Sunday? The total figure for those who said 'Likely' was 54 per cent. The total figure for those who said 'Unlikely' was around 43 to 44 per cent. Again, those in the younger age group—close on 70 per cent—said they were likely to, whereas of the older people—those over 55—35 per cent said they were likely to. Another table which I have not incorporated but which contains statistics to which I will refer asks about the negatives, if there are any, for trading in the city on a Sunday. Around 59 per cent said they did not see any. Clearly, that means that the overwhelming desire of the people of South Australia, following the very lengthy debate in which we have been able to put all the facts on the table, is for Sunday trading. No matter which way you look at it; no matter which age group you ask; no matter what type of voting pattern they may have had in their life—whether they saw themselves as Liberal, Labor, Democrat or Callithumpian—they all say they want it and that they believe it is a good idea from every perspective. So, what is democracy all about? Quite clearly, the Labor Party believes that it will get some advantage from sidling up to the retailers of dear sweet things in small business.

Mr Foley: That is what you did for decades.

Mr LEWIS: I never sidled up to anyone.

Mr Foley: The Minister did.

Mr LEWIS: Not at all. He simply told them what the Liberal Party could deliver in policy terms that would enhance their prospects of survival if they were responsible managers, and that is exactly what we have always continued to do.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I never said anything on the steps of Parliament House.

Mr Foley: The Minister did.

Mr LEWIS: Whatever he said is not relevant to the context of this debate. The most important thing is that we are here to do the people's will. On this issue there has been quite clear and complete public debate and there is very thorough understanding of the issue. That is more than I can say for the sort of legislation that the Labor Party used to rush through this place in the 12 years it was in office. It was its undoing that it did not tell the truth about the consequences of that legislation.

Mr Atkinson: Eleven years.

Mr LEWIS: Eleven or twelve, what does it matter? You are not in office now, and you will be out for double that number of years over the next couple of decades because you have an irrelevant power base. The Labor Party can do nothing to change that unless it angers the people who form its power base and give it endorsement. Any organisation or commercial interest that has an irrelevant power base or service role in the market pretty soon folds. I wish the Labor Party well, but I am sure that I will see the day when it will change from the form where now it is being dictated to by the trade union movement on issues it has to confront.

As I have said, I support the legislation, but I have to tell the House that we are not going anywhere for any great length of time by passing this legislation. It is already possible through legislation that we have proposed for small business people who, in any circumstances, are set upon by their rapacious landlords to be protected from them. In my judgment, we need to take another step in that direction. We have rationed the available retail space. We need to ensure that, in any particular geographic area, the major part of that retail space cannot belong to any one interest. We ought to compel the interesting owning it to disgorge themselves of the majority of it by strata titling shopping centres which have more than six shops on a sliding scale to the point where, if there are 20 shops, no more than 40 per cent can be owned by any one or related parties. That would ensure that there was competition in the rental market as well as a fair price on the capital market for the available retail premises, whether in strip malls or major shopping centres. Then, as a Parliament, we could and should simply repeal this legislation.

It is not the province of the Government to decide when people should or should not worship, play sport, sleep, shop, wash or do anything else. It is a matter for the person who desires to supply the service and the person who desires to buy the service to work it out between themselves so long as it stands within the framework of the existing law, subject to the rights of others, and where the taxpayer would have to pick up the pieces, since—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Not at all. Prostitution, as far as I am concerned and as the member raises the point, is totally deregulated with respect to shopping hours. I understand one does not have to get up to go to work; one has to go to bed, and, what is more, one goes to work at night. One is always into what I call penalty rates and one does not pick up the problems that one creates. That lays the lie to the member's assertions about my attitude to prostitution. The sooner he understands that it is not a legitimate enterprise, the better. Perhaps he believes it is. In any case—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member has already had his chance. If he wanted to say anything about the necessity to deregulate boiled egg, toast and coffee shop providers or anything else, prostitution included, he had his chance. I am

making the case that within the existing framework of the law we need to remove impediments to when a customer decides to buy and when a retailer decides to sell. As the information super highway comes into our homes, shopping hours debates will become increasingly irrelevant, because the younger generation, in greater numbers than the older generation admittedly, will take the advantage that is offered to them of shopping from their homes. The cost of doing so will be much less because retail premises will not be necessary.

All one has to do is to think ahead. There will not be so much impulse buying. One will simply order what one wishes and have it delivered to one's home probably within 24 hours. I commend the measure to the House. I trust that the information provided to me by the Minister (I acknowledge that) from his surveys helps members come to their senses about this matter and that we simply get on, go forward and not waste time on this debate any more.

Ms HURLEY (Napier): It is interesting to watch Government members twisting, turning and winding themselves into knots in order to justify their position on this shopping hours issue, particularly when I am told that over the past 10 years they opposed every single piece of legislation to loosen up shopping hours. It is interesting to see them divided on this issue. The member for Hartley painted it as a refreshing thing. He said that at least Government members have their individual opinion. I inform the member for Hartley that the Labor Opposition has a united opinion on this issue. We are all of one mind about this, and we are all opposed to the extension of Sunday shopping. During his second reading explanation it was interesting to hear the Minister, who, up until now, has been the champion of small business, in a very cavalier way belittle small business and the Small Retailers Association. He spoke dismissively of the Small Retailers Association and said that the retailers association represents a large number of small businesses; and he gave the impression that, together with the other minor associations he read out, they made up the bulk of businesses involved in this issue.

We all know, or at least those of us who have talked to the small businesses in our electorates, that that is anything but the truth. I went around to small businesses and shops in my electorate and spoke to most of them individually to get the views of the retailers in my electorate. They correctly realise that it is not simply a matter of city trading—they know that it would not be long before it spread into the suburbs. They are unanimously and vehemently opposed to the extension of shop trading hours in the CBD on Sundays. They are not opposed on the basis of profit, which the Minister concentrated on, or on whether their business might prosper further; they are opposed because they want to spend time with their families and each other.

These are small, family businesses. I do not care what the Federal Government's definition of small business is. The Minister tells me it is a business with 50 or fewer employees. Most of the small businesses in my area are small, family businesses where the husband and wife work together with maybe another relative or an assistant. They want to be able to spend some time with each other on a Sunday. They want to spend some leisure time with their family and with each other. No matter what the Minister says, Sunday trading to them means that they work seven days a week. They know that and, regardless of their profitability, they do not want that. They have made that very clear to me, and I am sure they have made it clear to members opposite. Members

opposite are twisting, turning and trying to justify their position. It is either that or they have closed their ears and ceased to listen to people in their electorates.

In his speech, the member for Mitchell invited members on the Labor side to go out and talk to some of the people in his shopping centre and espouse our view. I am sure we would be very well received. The member for Mitchell deceives himself in at least one instance if he thinks small business people in his area will support Sunday trading. The member for Mitchell seems to have been deceived in a number of other areas. For example, he mentioned a \$10 000 donation from the SDA to my campaign. I have to advise the member for Mitchell that, if he has intercepted a \$10 000 cheque from the SDA, I need it to pay off my campaign debt because I have not yet done so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HURLEY: The member for Mitchell consistently gets his facts wrong in this Chamber and I am sure he consistently gets his facts wrong in his electorate; I think that he will discover the penalties for that at the next election. Basically the message that the Labor Party is trying to give is very simple.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: How much did you get from the SDA?

Ms HURLEY: I got a couple of small donations from businesses in my electorate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order or certain members will not be here for the rest of the debate. The House has been conducting itself in a particularly good manner. I do not intend to allow it to get out of order. We are here for a considerable time tonight and the Chair will take a firm line.

Mr FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I was going to draw your attention to the same Standing Order to which the Deputy Premier referred in Question Time, namely, the issue of members interjecting, but you have ruled that way, Sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HURLEY: My donation and Labor Party donations are a matter of public record, with the names and addresses of the people who donated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HURLEY: Basically the Labor Party position is very simple, as is my position. Our position has been consistent, so far as I can see, over the past 10 years. Where there has been agreement amongst the major parties concerned with each step of the shop trading hours issue, the Labor Party has gone along with workers and retailers and complied with those demands. Our objection at this stage is that this Government has tried to ram through extensions to shop trading hours out of Parliament and against the wishes of the small retailers and the workers. Now, as a result of the High Court decision, it has been forced to bring the issue into the Parliament, but still has made no attempt to get agreement on that position. It is simply trying to ram through the legislation.

That is why the Labor Party is united on this issue. That is why the Opposition is united in this because members on this side do not see that there is any agreement on this issue. The Government has promised different things to two groups and then tried to run between almost as if it was hoping that no-one would notice. People and the Opposition have noticed

and the Opposition will oppose this Bill in this place and in another place.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ROSSI (Lee): The member for Hart, who is an empty head, interjects every time someone on this side of the House tries to have a decent debate. He uses the Standing Orders to prevent people on this side from completing their speech, and from now on I will make trivial objections whenever members opposite call us liars or say that we are fabricating the truth.

With regard to the shopping hours issue, on 19 September 1970 a referendum was held by the Labor Party, by members opposite, about what people wanted. I believe the vote was 177 296 in favour and 190 826 against. So, 46 per cent were against and 42 per cent were in favour. Yet members of the so-called Labor Party who claim to represent the views of the majority went ahead and extended shopping hours. The member for Playford referred to the present Government's four to one majority. True, I can say that we followed the example of the previous Government in issuing certificates of exemption. The Government made one mistake because everything the former Government did in the past was wrong and it even got this method wrong in terms of giving out certificates of exemption. We fell in the same trap.

The member for Playford referred to media outlets, claiming that backbenchers on this side of the House would go back on their word to the media to vote a certain way and, when it comes to voting on this issue later today or tomorrow, we might cross the floor. I never told the media that I was prepared to cross the floor on this issue.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: The member for Spence interjects again but, if he speaks to his journo mates about what I said previously about single mothers, he might get his facts straight. The point made is that backbench members on this side have been bullied into conforming to the wishes of the Ministers, but the answer is totally 'No'. In the Liberal Party we practise democracy: members have a say, they have a vote and we work as a team, which is quite unlike the situation of Labor members opposite who do not know what democracy is. The only way they get things done is by union thuggery, and I could go on and on about that. As to tourism—

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Lee has just said that members of the Opposition achieved their ends by thuggery. I think that is unparliamentary and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The word 'thuggee' relates to an Indian group that had strange practices, but it is certainly not unparliamentary to use that term.

Mr ROSSI: You have been using thuggery for the past 35 years and I have proof. My father was involved in trying to avoid your union bullies. I now refer to tourism. People come to Adelaide from the country with a couple of spare days and it is always on the weekend. I refer to the cost and variety of clothing which is always more readily available in cities than in country districts. That is a reason for country people to visit Adelaide. They can see Adelaide, see its museums and also do shopping. While shopping they can also buy bargains.

This year I visited Canberra, Brisbane, Melbourne and Sydney and saw shops such as Myers, Coles, Woolworths and L.J.Hooker: the same kinds of shops I saw in Adelaide I saw in cities interstate. Doubtless, if we travel overseas, and members opposite use their full parliamentary allowance in

doing so, members will see the same kinds of equipment that they see in Adelaide, but prices are cheaper and the variety is greater. At the same time members opposite see the culture of other countries, but that is the same philosophy as applies to overseas tourists coming to Adelaide. They can experience the whole of Adelaide's culture and, for reasons such as tourism, I cannot vote against the opening of shops in the Adelaide city square mile. Of course, I do not have to do the shopping on a Sunday.

Members interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: We will deal with that issue later. For this reason, regarding the experience of the Adelaide-type lifestyle, it is important that tourists get every opportunity to experience shopping, getting bargains, looking at museums and going to various other entertainments. There is no difference between Adelaide, Sydney or Melbourne, with regard to bowling clubs, football ovals and city sky scrapers. They are very similar, yet no-one in this Chamber has gone to these interstate capitals to see how people live and how the roads are made. Of course, the same thing applies to Adelaide.

The member for Playford said that the Liberal Government had made deals with Coles and Woolworths. I remind him that it was a Labor Government who approached Myer, through the unions, and said that the assistants in Myer should be paid a flat increase in wages so that, when they were trading on weekends, it would already be included in their wages. Everybody who worked there would get similar wages, irrespective of whether they worked on the weekend. So it was not the Liberal Government but the Labor Government that made deals with Myer. That was another furphy by the member for Playford.

People who work on Sundays cannot go to church. As a child, I remember coming to Australia with my parents and living in the country. In those days, most farmers had to work seven days a week. They had to milk the cows morning and night. They had to attend to the chickens and all the animals, morning and night. The farmers were lucky if they could get one week out of a whole year to relax and go on a holiday. Most new Australians who came to Adelaide bought a fish and chip shop, and they traded seven days a week, 12 hours a day for about 10 years. Provided they made a profit, they could leave that industry after 10 years and look for something better. Today, members opposite say that this is not the case.

It is not extended shopping hours that is affecting small business. At present, the Lyons Clubs and Rotary Clubs, including the surf life-saving clubs, are affected by the pokies. All these charitable organisations cannot get funds because people spend a lot of their money—wages and pensions—on pokies and not on food items or clothing for their own children. Again, the pokies legislation was passed by a so-called conscience vote, but I understand that members opposite bent the arms of their own members to get the poker legislation through.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: I again object to the member for Spence interjecting with no meaning when a person is trying to give a reasonable speech.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr ROSSI: If you were a religious person, as you say you are, you would not be on that side of the Chamber, anyway, because all Labor has done is to break down the family unit. Most members opposite complain that people go out with their families. They introduced Sunday football, but only one

or two members can afford to go to football matches; the others stay at home. Members opposite also introduced greyhound racing, which again breaks down the family unit. So it is pathetic to say that Sunday trading should not occur because it breaks down the family unit.

I turn to tourism in the country. They are the same types of families; they do the same things as do the city and metropolitan shopkeepers, yet they are required to stay open seven days a week. Do they not have a family? Do they not have Sundays? The answer is that they do. There should not be any discrimination between the city and the country. If there is discrimination based upon the fact that the population of Adelaide is not great enough to support shopping hours in the metropolitan area and the city, then at least shops in the city should remain open for tourism. I totally support the Minister in that regard.

I do not have to say too much about the surveys conducted by the Adelaide City Council independent body and the Government in regard to what people want. In the metropolitan area on Sundays there is the Brickworks Market, there is the trading of fruit, vegetables and fish at Torrens Island and there are the wharf sheds at Port Adelaide that have bric-a-brac and other stalls available on Sundays. People can go to these places, and so they should. There is enough profit there for both the city and the metropolitan area? I support shopping in the city square mile of Adelaide.

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Only a few months ago in this Chamber I debated the ministerial powers of exemption regarding shop trading hours and also my non-support of Sunday or Friday night trading. However, I like many others accepted that a decision had been made and that it was time to monitor the impact of this decision on the wider community. Since November we have seen the popularity of Sunday trading in the city increase, and what was once a very sleepy tourist town has come to life. As did many others, I questioned the validity of major retail stores catering for tourism needs. Again, the proof has been presented, not only by tourists but also by local consumers, metropolitan and country.

We have seen the figures: since the introduction of Sunday trading on 1 November, an average of 72 000 people each Sunday visit and shop in and around Rundle Mall. This figure has varied from a low of 45 000 people to a high of 130 000 people per Sunday. It is also important to note that Sunday trading has operated on the strict basis that opening by retailers and work by employees be on a voluntary basis only. I am pleased that the Minister has again confirmed that no shop should be required to trade on Sunday and that no employee working in a shop during extended Sunday trading in the Adelaide city centre can be compelled to work on that day.

During the past few weeks I have been consulting extensively with my electorate on the shop trading hours issue. I have circulated a letter widely throughout the electorate inviting people to express an opinion, and I have made a point of contacting all my seven day traders for their opinion. The exercise itself has been exhaustive, but one thing it clearly pointed out was that we have had a taste of Sunday trading, it is working, and people enjoy that freedom of being able to make a family day out of Sunday in the city. Some of my local shopkeepers were adamant that Sunday trading was not to be. They were angry when the decision was made. It was not so much the decision that angered them but that they felt they had not had their say. They have now

had the opportunity to gauge the impact of Sunday trading. They know I have consulted widely and those who lobbied fiercely in the lead-up to November now agree that we can accept Sunday trading in the central business district.

Today the *City Messenger* has clearly stated that Sunday is definitely a shopping day in the city. Instead of talking to the politicians, the unionists and the giant retailers, the Messenger Press journalists hit the city streets and talked to the people working on the front line. The comments again showed overwhelming support. I note that the manager of Sportsgirl in Rundle Mall said, 'We have customers who want to shop and staff who want to work.' Then there is the administration manager of Youthworks, Rundle Mall who talked about how the Sunday takings had excelled and that they have a lot of country customers. Her finishing comment was, 'If we do not have Sunday trading, Adelaide will always be little old Adelaide.'

The manager of Canterbury Lace spoke about the incredible response they have had to Sunday trading and asked, 'How are we going to compete with the rest of Australia if we lose Sunday trading?' Wendy's franchisee in the Myer Centre spoke about how sceptical he was at first, but he said that things are getting better and better. He has put on two extra staff to work on Sundays, and I should point out that these two staff members do not want to lose their job. The success stories are endless. Woolworths in Rundle Mall has employed an extra 20 people. That extra employment is creating extra money. Realistically, I do not think that any member present would deny a person the right to a job or their money. I, like many others who were apprehensive about this changing culture of city shopping, have now had time to look at what the decision has meant for Adelaide, and I concede that, although it did not suit us, there are many thousands of people who have benefited job wise, shopping wise and profit wise.

I support the Bill before the House, and I commend the Minister and his team for the hours of effort put into sorting out all the confusion created by the High Court decision. Not only are we addressing Sunday trading in the city centre but we are clarifying trading on Sundays and some public holidays for hardware shops, furniture shops, floor covering shops and automotive spare parts shops. We are including all garden shops and hairdresser shops as being exempt under section 4 of the Act. The Bill addresses the position of petrol stations and employment restrictions on small retailers, an issue in serious need of redress due to its anti-employment effect and the unduly restricted flexibility that has been imposed on small businesses. Trading hours, shop definitions and public holidays are clearly spelt out in this Bill. This alone will correct much of the confusion experienced by many traders.

I mentioned earlier that the views I express in the House today are the views of my electorate. Sunday trading in the Central Business District has been given the go-ahead. In general, Friday in the suburbs is seen as a waste of time: next to nothing is open and it has not received much community support. I believe from consultation with my shopkeepers that the extension of suburban shopping has had the greatest impact on local business, and the Opposition knows only too well what extended shopping hours in the suburbs did to small shops prior to the 1993 election. In finishing, I support these commonsense reforms to shopping hours, and I hope that commonsense will prevail when we come to vote on the issue.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Giles): I oppose this Bill, although I will support the amendments that will be moved by members of my Party.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am surprised that over the past couple of years, together with a few other words, the practice of calling people a hypocrite is within the bounds of Standing Orders. This is the only Parliament in the world where that is the case, but as that is the case I will toss the word around as freely as anyone else.

Mr Atkinson: Along with 'thuggery'.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thought he said something else. He said 'thuggery', did he? They talk funny these Australians.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thought he said something else, and stretched it even more. The biggest hypocrites in this debate without any doubt whatsoever are the retailers. All retailers, whether they be supermarkets, department stores, seven day supermarkets, small retailers, purport to want to do something for the consumer. They do not want to do anything at all for the consumer: it is all about market share; it is about nothing else other than market share. If the maximum profit that Woolworths, Coles or Westfield could make was by opening between 1 and 2 a.m. and having security guards to keep customers out for the rest of the time, that is exactly what they would do. Of all the hypocrites in the retail trade, I think the biggest ones are those who already have Sunday trading. They open on Sundays and they attempt to keep competition out. These people invariably vote Liberal. They mouth all the time about the benefits of the capitalist system, about how competition is what will make this country great: 'It is competition that makes business great; that's what the country needs.' However, if you present them with any competition they do not like it and they want to keep it out. I never had any time for them whatsoever.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Why not deregulate? That leads me very nicely into—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, I have a history in this Parliament for the ten and half years I was a Minister of trying to do exactly that. I pushed it all the time, not just in this area, but in many other areas. I tried to deregulate an egg, a loaf of bread, a few fundamentals like that, including a potato. I tried to deregulate the regulations surrounding the growing and the selling of the humble potato. I tried to deregulate these things but who opposed me? In every division on these issues I was opposed by the member sitting at the table now and all his colleagues.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Bread, every alteration to shopping hours—who opposed it? The Minister sitting at the table now. So, when he is tossing around the word 'hypocrisy', I suggest that the Minister just think about his actions and what is on the record in these areas about him. It is no secret that I have tried to gently lead my Party in the way of broadening shopping hours and, in many areas, I have succeeded. A few of them have been mentioned today, whether it is petrol—and there are so many I have actually forgotten them.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Furniture, garden shops, motor vehicle—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is correct, and I won a considerable number of them.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: How did you do it?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I did it by getting agreement.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: No, you did not.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The overwhelming majority of the people in those industries, including the member for Mitchell, agreed with me. On all occasions, I contacted the employees' representatives concerned, where they had employees' representatives, and I had agreement. The only people I did not have agreement with were members of the Liberal Party in this place. They opposed the lot. Every time any attempt has been made to deregulate from this side, all members opposite who were here at the time opposed it. Campaigns were waged against extended shopping hours by the Liberal Party, but I understand—and I do not know from my own knowledge—that at the same time they were telling the major retailers that they would fix it up afterwards.

The Liberal Party fostered and encouraged those campaigns, sought the cheap cheers on the steps of Parliament House time and time again, organised letter writing campaigns and organised and encouraged the retailers to organise their own staff against any extensions. That is what the Liberal Party has done for the 20 years I have been here, and they did it for five years before that, going back as far as 1970. Whilst I was not here, I remember it well—it was quite an issue. On every occasion this issue has been raised, every member opposite has been on the side of keeping the shops closed. The reason is because it was promoted by the Labor Party. There was no other reason. It was just for a few cheap cheers. I note that the Minister for Industrial Affairs is tossing the word 'hypocrisy' around again.

Mr Foley: We've got a lot of catching up to do.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Have we ever! Probably the most hypocritical act I have seen since I have been here occurred just before the election. The then shadow Minister for Industrial Affairs stood on the steps of Parliament House and told all the small business people and all the media representatives present, 'There will be no Sunday trading.' I do not know whether that is hypocritical; it probably is not. It cannot be lying, because I cannot say that.

Mr Foley: What can't you say?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, I cannot say it is a lie, because I believe—

Mr Atkinson: You can't say that the Minister lied.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I cannot say that the Minister lied, because the Chair would not allow me to do so. But, if he did not lie, what was he doing? I need another word. He certainly was not telling the truth. If the Minister had said after the election, 'I am now the Minister of Labour. Like every other Minister of Labour for 30 years before me, all I want to do with shopping hours is get it right off my desk. I spend more time playing around with shopping hours than something which I would consider more important' (every Minister holding that portfolio, Liberal or Labor, has had that attitude) and if this Minister had said to those people on the steps of Parliament House, 'I meant it at the time. I really did believe it at the time, but I now know better; I have learnt more and now I don't believe that. I am sorry, but I've changed my mind', I would say, 'Fair enough, that has happened to an awful lot of us.' I would have said, 'Join the club, you're not an orphan; there's a whole list of us going

back 30 years who have come to exactly the same view—we want it off our desks.’

How do you go about getting this matter off your desk? What you do not do is say one thing to one group of people and another thing to another, but that is what has happened. Very few people come to this debate with a totally clean sheet, with one exception, and that is the Shop Assistants Union, the SDA. For as long as I can remember, the SDA has opposed every Minister, Liberal or Labor, in relation to the opening of the shops on Sunday. It has always done that. It never gave me an inch. It never gave Minister Gregory or Jack Wright an inch, and it is not giving the present Minister an inch. It has been totally consistent. I pushed it, and the reason why I did not attempt to go all the way was that in all cases it was able to convince me, with documentary proof, that it was representing the wishes of its membership. When I said—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson: Did it represent more than 50 per cent?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, I am afraid that those who are non-unionists can sort out their own problems. The SDA was in touch with its membership and represented completely what its membership wanted, and I would not go against what the workers in the industry wanted. However, I always say to the SDA, ‘Please try to persuade your members to open for longer hours.’ I want them to do so, because I have wanted the thing off my desk. It does not affect me electorally, because my electorate has no restrictions on trading whatsoever. So, I could have sat back and big-noted myself to the union, etc., whilst at the same time enjoying the benefits of a non-regulated shopping district in my electorate.

However, I did not do that. I tried to push it, but I would not push it beyond what the membership of the SDA wanted, and the SDA membership always made it clear to the union that it did not want Sunday trading. I always wanted it to come to an agreement. The SDA will tell you that I pushed it, lent on it, asked, pleaded and implored it. Whilst it held in principle its opposition with its membership, it went to its membership within the big furniture stores and the membership agreed—no doubt some of them reluctantly—that it was desirable that those shops open because they were losing market share to those furniture shops which had lesser floor size and which were opening on a Sunday.

So, the union has never been unreasonable. It has always represented its membership. It has actually polled its membership—and I do not know how many unions do that—and the result has always been the same. The SDA does not exist to look after retailers, either small or large business: that is not its role. Likewise, it is not the role of the board of Coles Myer to look after the union, the unionists and consumers, etc.: its only role and its legal obligation is to look after shareholders. The obligation of the SDA is to look after its membership, and it has done that. It is about the only vested interest involved in this debate that has totally clean hands.

It may well be that tomorrow it will come to an agreement with the retailers over this area, the same as the meat trade union did. I hope that is the case. If that is the case I, and I am sure my colleagues, will be very happy to agree to any changes where the employees and the retailers have come to an agreement. I do not object to the use of the exemptions; our only objection with respect to what the Minister has attempted to do is that there is no agreement between the two principal parties concerned: those who own stores and those who work in them. The customer and anyone else, including

us, are third parties and not the two principal parties concerned.

It is all very well for me to go into a store and enjoy Sunday trading, as I do. I go all hours of the day and night in Whyalla, whenever it is convenient for me. Someone is there having to stand and wait for me to come in, and they are the people I consider more than I do the consumer. As much has been spoken on this topic as on any other topic since I have been in Parliament, and the arguments are still the same. The people involved, with the exception of the SDA, are all trying to protect market share. Pathetic arguments have been advanced today by the Minister as to why it is intended through the Bill to restrict Friday shopping. We hear statements made about trying to expand, about ‘letting the consumer decide’ and about competition, etc., but this Bill absolutely restricts the *status quo*; it reduces the number of hours available for shopping.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is reducing it. This Bill reduces shopping hours in South Australia. The arguments advanced with respect to shopping centres in the suburbs have been an absolute joke. I will be supporting amendments to bring about the *status quo*. I look forward to a Bill to deregulate shopping hours totally when there is an agreement between the two principal parties.

The sooner that agreement comes about, the happier I will be. Having dealt with this issue myself for many years, I was almost tempted to feel sorry for the Minister. However, the Minister stood on the steps of Parliament House and told these people ‘No Sunday trading’ and then came into the Parliament five minutes later and said that the entire economic welfare of this State depends on it and that, in any event, ‘I did not tell you there would be no Sunday trading.’ There is not one person in South Australia who does not know that that is exactly what the Minister said. The Minister ought to be very careful, as I said, about the use of the word ‘hypocrite’.

Mr BASS (Florey): After listening to the verbal diatribe from the member for Giles, I remind the House that, as Minister Blevins, on 7 December 1987 he said:

Cabinet today gave approval for the issuing of certificates of exemption to furniture and floor covering retailers to enable them to trade at any time they want. . . the relaxation of trading hours for these retailers will be of great benefit to all consumers, particularly families where both spouses work, by providing them with more time to make joint decisions on major household purchases.

After reading that you could very quickly place anything that the member for Giles has said in the rubbish bin. The action of the Labor members opposite is really beyond belief, when one considers that the Labor members who are left from the previous Government were involved in the farce prior to the 1993 election. They were ready to send small businesses to the wall. They wanted to deregulate so that small businesses had to open until 9 p.m. Monday to Friday—they did not give a damn. Who did they do this with? Who were their partners in crime? It was the SDA—the Shop Distributive & Allied Employees Association. I would call it the ‘Silly Dolts Association.’

The Hon. Frank Blevins: They were representatives of the employees.

Mr BASS: So you tell me. That association was so worried about representing the employees that it went to the High Court, had the Minister’s exemptions overturned and jeopardised all its employees in furniture stores, hardware

stores and nurseries—it threw them to the wolves. It did a really good back flip.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Giles has made his contribution. I do not intend that he make another one by interjection.

Mr BASS: It was a very poor contribution, Mr Deputy Speaker. Let us look at the Labor Party's record. It introduced late night shopping in 1977; it deregulated hardware shops in the mid 1980s; it deregulated furniture shops and floor covering shops in 1988; and it introduced five-night-a-week trading for supermarkets in 1993, with 210 certificates of exemption. Labor made all these changes in a heavy-handed way. It deals with big business and big unions and has tried every device to sidestep Parliament and become the standard bearer for using ministerial certificates of exemption.

It is a shame that the member for Ross Smith is not here tonight—and it is obvious that he is absent. He has probably found his car and gone for a drive. He probably got it from the member for Elizabeth. He has done a fine job for the people that he represents: he is not even here. The member for Playford had to step into his shoes, and I suggest that he will probably be in his seat before too long. We have heard much tonight about some surveys that have been done. I think the member for Taylor in her contribution referred to them. I really felt sorry for her with only one other member opposite to support her.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: All members are listening.

Mr BASS: Yes.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Learn some parliamentary manners.

Mr BASS: I refer the member for Giles to the Standing Orders. I know them quite well. He has been here for nearly 20 years and he obviously does not know them. Let us look at the—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BASS: We talk about manners. There is the ignorance of the member for Giles, who obviously does not like the truth. As I was saying, the member for Taylor commented on a survey of 342 members of the Small Retailers Association. Of those 342, 82.7 per cent said 'No' to the question, 'Are you in favour of Sunday trading?' I do not believe in Sunday trading. That might be a bit of a statement for the member for Florey to make. I do not believe in Saturday afternoon trading and I do not believe in hotels and football clubs being open on Sunday. It may be that I am a bit old fashioned; it may be that I believe in the family unit. As I said, 82.7 per cent of those members of the Small Retailers Association surveyed said that they did not want Sunday shopping, and I do not want Sunday shopping.

Let us look at a survey carried out by a respectable independent company. The first question was, 'Do you know that the State Government is strongly in favour of shops in the city being allowed to open on Sunday if they wish?' Of 1 000 people surveyed, 88.4 per cent said 'Yes.' I will not go on, but there were different age groups. In case the member for Giles is as stupid as I think he is, it means that 11.6 per cent said 'No.' The second question was, 'Do you agree or disagree that people should have the choice to shop in the city on Sunday if they wish?' Of 1 000 people surveyed, 86.4 per cent agreed and 13.6 per cent disagreed.

The next question was: do you agree or disagree that shopkeepers should have the choice to open their shops in the

city on a Sunday if they so wish? Ninety-one point one per cent agreed and 8.9 per cent disagreed. I do not believe in Sunday shopping, but I believe in representing the 22 500 people in my electorate. I know that those opposite will say that I am not game to cross the floor. I remind members opposite that it was not long ago in this House, because the small business people in my electorate wanted something in the Shop Retail Leases Act that was not there, that I sat on their side of the House. Notwithstanding that I do not like Sunday trading, I have gone through the file that I hold in my office where constituents have contacted me, and they are strongly in favour of Sunday trading. I represent those people, so I will support Sunday trading simply because I represent the people of Florey. The member for Taylor said that 82.7 per cent of small retailers were not in favour of Sunday trading. Let those people close. They have the right to close, and I hope they close on Sunday. By supporting this Bill I am giving them the right to open if they want to.

Mr Wade: The right to choose.

Mr BASS: That is right. The rest of the people in Adelaide have said strongly that they want Sunday trading in Adelaide. If they want to go into Adelaide on Sundays and some of the shops are open, so be it. I do not like it but that is what the people of Adelaide, where the survey was taken, want. Those small shops in the CBD have the choice. If there is one small business in the central business district that is coerced or has pressure put on them to open when they do not want to, I ask them to come and see me. If there is one employee who is coerced by their employer to work on Sunday, I ask them to come and see me. I will do everything I can to make sure that they are treated fairly. Earlier, when I was going through some notes I saw a page of amendments, and in those amendments—

Mr Brindal: Only one page?

Mr BASS: I looked at only one page. The amendments allow small businesses in the suburbs to open until 9 p.m. on Thursday and Friday nights.

Mr Foley: Everybody wants it.

Mr BASS: The member for Hart is obviously not listening to the public of South Australia. They want the opportunity to go shopping on one night so that if both parents and their kids are tied up during the day on Saturday they can still go shopping together on one night. Thursday night is the night. My small businesses want only one night of trading. They are quite happy with it, and I am pleased to say—and I would like to take a little bit of credit for it—that I have won what my small businesses want: one night in the suburbs.

Mr Foley: What about the consumer?

Mr BASS: They want the opportunity to go shopping on one night, and they have got it. The member for Hart is making rude signs across the Chamber. That is not allowed, but I will go on. I am glad that small businesses in the CBD have the opportunity to open or not open. I do not believe that many of them will open, and I hope that they do not because I do not want Sunday trading to be successful. However, the public of South Australia want it. I will vote contrary to my beliefs because my constituents say that they want it. I therefore support the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I enjoyed the contribution of the member for Florey. I considered his arguments worth listening to, as were the arguments of other members on this side of the House. Some members opposite have made some sense on some points, but it has not been consistent. It is a great pleasure to rise in this place and address this Chamber

in front of two Ministers: it is not a privilege we often have nowadays with so much pressure on them in Government.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I was wondering whether I should wait or go on while the Leader of the Opposition conducts his press conference in the gallery. I find myself in a dilemma over this issue. My views are well known to all members: I do not support Sunday trading, and I find this issue a real dilemma. At the last election I asked the people of Unley to support me and they did. I asked them to support me, first, as myself and, secondly, as a Liberal candidate. So, whether or not I like it, I have two conflicting interests: first, as a member with a right to think and to act in the best interests of my electorate; and, secondly, I am conscious of the fact that when I asked them to vote for me I asked them to vote for an endorsed Liberal candidate, and neither the member for Florey nor any member on this side of the House lightly walks away from the fact that they are a Liberal candidate.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hart, with one of his normal inane interjections, brays like a donkey instead of interjecting with any lucid commonsense. The honourable member talks about being nobbled. I remind this House that, while members opposite prate about having the guts to cross the floor and various other taunts, we could never do that. When we suffered the disadvantage of being in Opposition we faced a team that takes the pledge, a team where, once the Party room makes a decision, for members on that side of the House on this and every other issue there is no matter of conscience and no matter of defying the Party line.

So, were the positions reversed tonight, we would not have been able to ask those sitting opposite to cross the floor because they would all sit there and say, 'Our personal views are one thing, but in fact we cannot go through with our personal views because we have lost the argument and we are bound by Party solidarity'. Members opposite believe in the discipline of their Party, and they sit in this place knowing that members on this side of the House have the right to exercise their individual conscience on behalf of their electorates, yet they tell us to cross the floor when they have not got the guts to do it themselves on any issue. Their Party rules forbid them from so doing, and consistently they hide their own personal opinions behind the fact that they are bound to do it. If the member for Hart doubts that, let him ask half the clergy in Adelaide about the pathetic excuses put up by his members on a variety of moral issues to escape having to make a decision that is at variance with their Party's decision.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Hypocrisy comes cheap in this place. The reason why I oppose Sunday trading—I have put it to my Party and I have lost this argument consistently in the Party room—is not that I am not a Liberal: it is that I am a Liberal. I happen to believe firmly in the Liberal philosophy that says that it is incumbent on Government to provide minimum interference across the board, that the sole province of Government is to regulate only in areas where regulation is needed and that the first prerequisite of a Government is to interfere as little as possible. Members opposite often argue that that means that the Liberal Party is in bed with—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BRINDAL: So, I believe that, because it is incumbent on a Liberal Government to interfere as little as possible and

to interfere only when it is necessary, a cogent argument can be put to say that in this case it may be necessary to regulate trading for these reasons. Westfield Shopping Town in terms of management of a conglomerate of businesses, Coles Myer in the food industry and various other retailers are huge and have market dominance and purchasing power that is not available to the normal small business.

Those businesses quite unashamedly try to use the free market to destroy small and medium-size business. If necessary, they can afford to trade unprofitably and they plan this as part of a strategy. They will trade deliberately unprofitably for one, two or three years solely for the purpose of destroying their competition, knowing that at the end of the day when they control a monopoly position in the market place they can dictate the conditions under which people work and the prices which people will pay. The basis of the argument is this: a Liberal Government can and should ensure that in the market place some protection is afforded to small businesses so that they can survive. That is one of the reasons why I believe some regulation of shopping hours is necessary. If it was truly a free market and all players were equal—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: You are in the negative because you are being quite rude. If you shut up and listen, I might be able to get on with this speech.

Mr Becker: Like a couple of girls!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley has the floor.

Mr BRINDAL: In these days of gender inequality many people of the female gender might object to the remarks of the member for Peake. Therefore, there is some argument that it is necessary for a Liberal Government to regulate shopping hours to protect small and medium traders from conglomerates that seek only their destruction in order to get ever increasing market share. If we look at the philosophy of Coles Myer and various supermarket chains, they talk unashamedly about increasing market share—by opening longer, by discounting prices, by any means they can, if they can drive people to the wall they will do so.

I ask members to consider carefully Bi-Lo supermarkets. Bi-Lo supermarkets were almost an accident. They came about because they realised that there was a level and a price bracket for which the big supermarkets were not catering. They targeted their marketing accordingly, and they grew and grew. In this State they grew to the point where Coles Myer had no option but to buy them out, because they were becoming serious competition. We all know, whether it is in the automotive industry or in the food industry, that we first try to destroy a competitor and, if we cannot destroy them, no matter what the cost, buy them out. One day, somebody might invent an efficient carburettor, and who wants an efficient carburettor? Not BP, Shell or anybody who sells petrol. As soon as an efficient carburettor is invented we should buy them out and bury it deep, because we do not want it to exist.

Mr Becker: What about the orbital engine?

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, what about a lot of what happens? Our society is manipulated by unscrupulous businessmen who seek only to make large profits. If we in this place can do something to protect small business, we can and we should do it. I have argued that, and I have argued it absolutely consistently in the Party room, as every one of my colleagues can attest. Many members have made their points in their speeches tonight, and they deserve absolute credit in this place and everywhere else for doing so. But then we come to

the nitty-gritty of this debate, and a difficult debate it is. Unlike some members opposite, I take my responsibilities seriously. About two weeks ago, I surveyed every small business in Unley—some 1 700 small businesses. I asked them—

Mr Atkinson: What about brothels?

Mr BRINDAL: Well, unlike the honourable member opposite, I know how many brothels are in my electorate, and there are not enough to survey. There is one. He has four and thought there were two, so he did not talk very well on that subject a few weeks ago. I have surveyed all the small businesses, and quite clearly I put the point of view I just put to the House. I said, 'I am inclined still towards that point of view.' Having said that, I said, 'The difference between last time and now is that you've had seven months of trading in the city to be able to tell me how it affected you. Please send me your opinions; please return the survey.' I carefully said, 'While I am prepared to stand up in this Party room and put my neck out for what I believe, I am not prepared to do so if you can't let me know what you think. I will regard a non-return of the survey as a belief that you don't think Sunday trading in the city matters.'

I have to tell the House, at this date—and they have had nearly two weeks—I have 50 replies out of 1 700. That means in absolute honesty I can say to the Minister 1 650 must support Sunday trading. That was the option I gave them. Of the 50 I got back, 47 were strongly against Sunday trading. I will say to members opposite that I will not be so hypocritical. I am sure that the majority of traders in Unley are against Sunday trading. It is a point again which I have put to the Minister, that I believe that the majority of traders in Unley are against Sunday trading.

Somebody opposite said that they are all open on Sundays, and that is true, but I would put to all members of this House that that is the problem for Unley and Norwood, and I heard the member for Hanson speaking on the same subject. Unfortunately, we have three electorates that border the central business district, and the real difficulty for us is that, when the central business district is open, it affects trade in our areas. They are adjacent areas. People might not come from Noarlunga Centre to the city to shop on Sunday unless they have a reason, but they will come from Victoria Avenue and Norwood Parade to the city to shop if they think the city has more to offer than Norwood Parade, Unley Road or Goodwood Road. For me it also comes down—

Mr Condous: They come from Pirie and all over the State.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes; on a deliberate trip, not on a casual basis. The honourable member said they come from Pirie and all over the State and that is true, but with deliberative purpose. You can travel from Unley—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I know the member for Giles can deliberately be obtuse at times and he is nowhere near as stupid as he pretends to this House, but he could try to follow an intelligent line of reasoning just for a change.

Mr Becker: That's the last time I'm buying morning tea.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, and I will never again make a cake for the member for Giles, I assure him. The point is that in Unley you can get into your car on a whim and go into the CBD just as easily as the electors of most members opposite will travel to the local deli; it is that close. Therefore, if the CBD is open on Sunday it affects trade in Unley and Norwood, and the member for Hanson has said that it affects trade in his electorate. To me, representing the small business

sector, that is a strong argument to say 'No' to Sunday trading and even to go as far as to cross the floor. However, tonight I attended a branch meeting and the overwhelming opinion of my branch as consumers is that they want Sunday trading. That is also—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: That is a very important point. You see, Sir; now we are getting down to the truth. I have on the one hand—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Can I have four minutes? I have on the one hand donors who contribute to my campaign and who want one thing and on the other hand people who ensure that I am the preselected candidate and who want another thing, so I am caught on either side of that barbed wire fence. It is often uncomfortable for any of us.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's choices are clear.

Mr BRINDAL: The point is that there are consumers who want one thing and traders who want another. One thing of which I do not think even the member for Hart has ever accused me in this place is cowardice. I will always stand in this place and say what I believe and, if the electors or my college do not like it, they can choose a new member for Unley, but so long as I have the—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Well, unlike the member for Spence, who comes in here repeatedly with a lot of sanctimonious claptrap, never says what he thinks and gives 1 000 reasons why he believes something and never tells the truth, at least I try to tell the truth and say what I believe. He should try to do the same.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It often happens. I will stand up in this place and say what I believe. In this case I will say that I oppose the Minister on this measure and I will continue to oppose the Minister on this measure. On every occasion I can I will tell the Minister what I think, as will a number of my colleagues on this side of the House, and we will maintain our position with the Minister, but the Opposition goes too far if it thinks that that necessarily extends to our crossing the floor. I have an opinion, which I have expressed publicly to the Minister and in my Party room. I also have a loyalty to this Government and this Party of which I am a member. I can become an Independent if I want to. I do not—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence is living in cloud cuckoo land. My electorate has previously supported an Independent and would do so again, but I am a Liberal and I remain a Liberal. I will argue tooth and nail against the Minister. For as long as I can, I will tell him that I think he is wrong, but at the end of the day he is the Minister, I am a member of his Government, and I—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence calls for action and not words. Perhaps we should see it from the member for Spence—lots of talk, very little action. He stands for everything except anything. We have heard so much about roads and all sorts of things, but what has he ever achieved?

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Well, you didn't listen to this speech. If you were less busy giving press releases upstairs and more busy attending to your functions in this House—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: If the Leader of the Opposition enters this place and does me the honour of calling me a hypocrite, I consider that it has been a very good evening, because what he finds hypocritical I find worthy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Minister for Industrial Affairs): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I note that members of the Labor Party are waiting for me to make a statement on this issue as I presented a petition some eight months ago on behalf of 50 000 people. I can say—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: If you listen, you might hear something and you might be educated a bit, which I doubt: it might be a bit hard for you. At that time, I strongly believed that it was wrong for South Australia to have extended trading hours. My belief was that Adelaide's small population of one million people had adequate time in which to shop, and that all we were doing was putting a burden on the community. What I said was right, and it was proved to be right. I said that Friday night trading in the suburbs would prove to be an utter disaster because all that would happen was that the people who normally shopped on a Thursday night would shop on a Friday; therefore the turnover of all supermarkets on a Thursday and Friday combined would be identical to the turnover of the Thursday night alone. I also believed that there was no need for Sunday shopping, and I spoke my mind and was even prepared to cross the floor regarding that matter.

Mr Atkinson: Now you are of a different mind.

Mr CONDOUS: No—just listen. Crossing the floor is a major decision. No-one on this side of the House—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: None of you would ever do so because you don't dare to move. None of you ever wobble. We have seen Norm Foster, the only one who happened to go across—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: Yes, on conscience votes. That's only on conscience votes, not on Party decisions. You never cross on Party decisions, and you wouldn't dare.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: Of course it's solidarity, because you send them to Siberia or to Russia if they cross the floor. You do not have the guts to cross the floor and you do not know what the word 'democracy' is about. It is 'united we stand, divided we fall'. Go to South Terrace. Some of my best mates are unionists, and I hold no grudges against unions, but you are all there together, and the last member of your Party to cross was Normie Foster. You said—

Members interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: On conscience votes! You wouldn't have the guts to cross the floor. The point is that they sent poor old Norm into oblivion, and he has never been sighted since. At least we have the right to make a decision. I will return to what I was about to say. I have now seen this city trading for eight months. The member for Taylor said that people have stopped going to the Art Gallery and the Museum and that they are not going to the zoo.

She says they are all in Rundle Mall sucking on ice-creams. Well, I have to agree with you. There are the Rundle Mall gorillas that I looked after for 25 years, but believe me, people are still going to the Zoological Gardens. I have been there over the past three weeks, and you have not. I have been to the Museum over the past three weeks and you have not. I have also been to the Art Gallery. People are pouring in there. If you had been to the zoo lately you would have noticed that it has been upgraded and there is some of the most magnificent restoration work you have ever seen in your life.

When I spoke to my people down in the Colton electorate, and when I spoke to people in Rundle Mall and asked how they felt about Sunday trading, the response was, 'We have enjoyed it for the past eight months. We do not come here every Sunday, but the convenience is there when we are sitting home with nothing to do, to come into town to enjoy a day out.' The Rundle Mall figures indicate that since Sunday trading started some eight months ago, there has been an average of 72 000 people in the mall every Sunday. One only has to go there, and I do not know whether these members who are standing up tonight have even been to town on a Sunday. I have certainly been at least a dozen times and I have observed families—children together with their mums and dads. I have seen buskers performing. More importantly, I saw the very children who are vulnerable, between the ages of 12 and 18, sitting on the brick pavements in the mall listening to good buskers and enjoying themselves. If we did not have that activity, those kids would be creating havoc within their own community, getting into trouble.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: All right, you keep them inactive down in your electorate and see what sort of trouble they get into. I have seen them in the mall. The cameras have gone in, people are there on Sundays, and the hoodlums cannot stand around in a vacant mall picking them off one by one, mugging them as they come by. Ask the community how dangerous they see Rundle Mall when there are no people in it. You do not have to support Sunday trading. Let us close down South Australia.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: That is all right. The situation changes from month to month, but you are not flexible. You would like to have seen 6 p.m. trading continue for the rest of your life, wouldn't you? Come on, listen, if you cannot move with change in the demands of the community you should not even be in this House. If you cannot meet the demands of the people, what is the good of being in here and giving an opinion? You will vote against it, and you will tell 85 per cent of the people who voted for you and who support you that no longer will there be Sunday trading.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: The Democrats will have the same problem, because 80 per cent of the 6 or 7 per cent who support them say they want to go to the city and have trade on Sundays as well. You did not mind two years ago when you voted for pokies to come in, and all of a sudden—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: All right, you did not, but the majority of your Party did.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: I have seen who voted—very few members. I am not arguing on that score. I am saying that all of a sudden we had 6 000 or 7 000 machines. The hospitality industry expanded. People were going out to these facilities

and people were required to look after the poker machines, to serve food and alcohol, and they are working Sundays. Did you put in a requirement that pokies should not operate on Sundays because it was better for people to be sitting at home rather than looking after the public in the hospitality industry? Of course you did not. You sent them out from their homes in their thousands on a Sunday to look after the hospitality industry and made them work. Now you are saying that you cannot have a few shop assistants working in the city.

For those members who think that their traders do not want to work in their areas on a Sunday, I ask you to go out and talk to the residents in your area, because you will find that they want Sunday trading to continue. But, listen, I do not mind because members on that side of the House have made an art form of closing things down. I can remember that when members opposite were in Government a joke was going around: 'How do you own a small business? Buy a big business and wait, and you will have a small very business soon!' That was common knowledge. Here they are again—

Mr Atkinson: That was when you were seeking Labor pre-selection.

Mr CONDOUS: Who was seeking Labor pre-selection?

Mr Atkinson: You were.

Mr CONDOUS: Where? Stop talking bloody rubbish. You're a bigger imbecile than I thought you were.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the second time the member for Colton has used abusive language. You are being taunted incessantly by the member for Hart and the member for Spence—

Mr CONDOUS: No, it is not that, Sir. He does not—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Colton will be quiet. The member for Hart and the member for Spence are both very close to being warned, if not named. The Chair does not have to give a warning. The Chair has been tolerant and has allowed a lot of good-natured flow, but the need for abusive language and for imprecations and curses is simply not there. The Chair is there simply to determine the feeling of the House and to apply the Standing Orders as appropriate. The Chair is very close to taking action, which would be unfortunate at this stage of the debate. I ask members to observe the propriety of parliamentary debate, to observe the propriety of parliamentary language, and for the member for Colton to proceed in a more decorous manner.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order. The member for Colton referred to me as an imbecile. I ask that he withdraw, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member really calls for an unfair judgment. The Chair is not in a position to assess IQs at this stage of the evening! I ask the member for Colton to be more temperate and less tantalising.

Mr CONDOUS: I will do that. I will speak to them outside the House after, Sir, because it is one of the type of languages that they do understand.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In the interests of consistency, it seems to me, Sir, that if you can be named and expelled from the Parliament for using the words 'frogshit' and 'mongrel', then I would have thought swearing and abusing members in the way that we have just seen at least warrants a withdrawal and an apology. I would have thought that consistency would have warranted a tossing out. He should have been thrown out.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has absolutely no point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Is it only Labor people who get thrown out?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If any single member is affronted by language addressed to them, and the language is addressed specifically to one person, it is the duty of that person to rise immediately.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He did.

Mr Atkinson: I have.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable member, the point of order is being taken by the member for Giles.

Mr ATKINSON: I rose a moment ago upon the completion of your justified admonition to the House to ask whether the member for Colton would withdraw the reference to me as an imbecile.

Mr CONDOUS: I am happy to apologise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Giles was referring to the use of the term sanguinary in more earthy fashion, not to the term 'imbecile'. The member for Giles, for all I know, may agree with the member for Colton.

Mr CONDOUS: Mr Deputy Speaker, in the interests of the House I am happy to withdraw and get on with the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Colton.

Mr CONDOUS: This Government has attracted many new industries to South Australia. Some of the recent ones have been Australis and Galaxy, which is the same company, Motorola, EDS, and both our wine and aquaculture industries are booming. What we have to realise is that, as a city, we are competing with every other capital city in Australia. I believe that if we were to close our city on a Friday the Victorians would be rubbing their hands with absolute delight because one of the selling points of their city, as against ours, would be that we would be seen as the backwater of Australia, the only capital city in Australia that was closed on a Sunday and therefore why should investors come and put money into South Australia, millions of dollars into the tourism industry, when we were closed down—the lights were on and nothing was happening on a Sunday?

I do not like to speak about the member for Ross Smith while he is not in the Chamber, but quite often he is quoted in the paper as saying that it is absolute rubbish to suggest that Sunday trading will help tourism. While it is not the strongest point, one has to remember that tourism is a very important industry that can employ many thousands of young South Australians. The member for Ross Smith can say that it is not an important point, because the Labor Government has a long record, during its term of office, of knocking back some of the most important measures providing for tourism infrastructure.

One only has to look at projects involving the Kangaroo Island residential holiday venture, Jubilee Point, the Mount Lofty chairlift, Victor Harbor, the Flinders Ranges and Wilpena Pound, Marineland at West Beach and the marina at Marino Rocks, which were all knocked back during the last era of Labor, and for which it should hang its head in shame. How do we attract international investment into South Australia when every other city is open for business on Sunday but Adelaide is the odd city out? South Australia will become an absolute joke among international investors coming into Australia.

Do we really care about our children? Are we really interested, because that is what Labor is saying: 'Let's close it down and forget about it. It doesn't matter whether or not the State continues to grow.' Close the stores on Sunday and I believe you will close down South Australia. Close down South Australia on a Sunday and you stop overseas invest-

ment. Close South Australia on a Sunday and you destroy the future of South Australian children. Close—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: No, the honourable member does not like to hear it, because it hurts; he knows, because he went through it. Close South Australia and you take away what the people in this State want.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: I did not say this eight months ago, but the people have had this facility now and they enjoy what they are doing on a Sunday. I do not know whether the honourable member goes to the city to see what is happening. Sunday trading is a big selling point for overseas investors. One only has to look at the decision made prior to the last election when Premier Arnold and the Labor Government gave permission for supermarkets to open five nights a week. In that very brief period more small businesses closed down in this State than ever before. There was no justification for it. The people gave no mandate for it; no-one really wanted it.

The stores were open and all that happened was that the multi-national supermarket companies got a bigger share of the market while our small businesses went to the wall, and the convenience stores were gone. I believe it would be totally wrong for us not to make a sacrifice and be able to use Sunday trading as a selling point for business and investment in this State. It would be selfish. I said that last night to the Small Business Association and I know a lot of people agreed with it entirely. I do not think that it is right for us even to contemplate taking away what the people want in this State. That is all I am doing: I am changing my mind for one reason only, and that is to meet the demands of the people. The member for Hart laughs: he is bound by a decision that has already been made by his Party in the Party room, but if he goes out into his electorate and talks to the very people he represents he will find that the majority want Sunday trading in the city.

Mr Atkinson: How would you know?

Mr CONDOUS: How would I know? Is the honourable member the only one who door knocks? Yes, he is great, and he gets on his treadly—the one they pinched. Even his own electorate stole his bike; that is how much they thought of him. The point is that all one has to do is talk to the residents to know what they want. I am not talking about shopkeepers, who I know are totally opposed to it, but at least 60 per cent of people in the electorates want Sunday trading.

Members opposite can take it away, but I do not mind telling voters at the next election that, although I voted against it, once they had made a decision after eight months of trading that they wanted to retain it, I voted for it to continue but the Labor Party decided to close down the City of Adelaide, to return us to the 1970s and to make the mall a dangerous place. And it will become a dangerous place, because there will be no activity; the only people there will be those who hang around the area wanting to cause trouble and preying on people going to the theatres, window shopping and participating in other activities in the mall. You have to move with the times. When the mood of the electorate changes—and it certainly has changed—you have to change with it. I want to ensure that we return to what we had previously: Thursday night shopping in the suburbs and Friday night and Sunday shopping in the city, giving the 71 000 people who go there every week the opportunity to continue to do so.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): What an extraordinary night I have experienced watching this Government in action. The Labor Party has been totally consistent on this issue, and that is something we cannot say about members opposite and some members to my left—and I use the words 'some members'. This Government does not have a mandate to introduce Sunday shopping. This Government deliberately and quite pointedly said before the last election that there would be no Sunday trading. In fact, when addressing small retailers on the steps of Parliament House, this Minister reiterated that there would not be Sunday trading.

What frustrates and angers me is that it is good enough for the Government to change its position and for members of the Liberal Party to be hypocritical and to break promises but, just because they set those standards, they expect the Labor Opposition to do the same. We will not do that. We made a commitment before the last election; rightly or wrongly we were prepared to go to the public at the last election and say that we did not support Sunday trading, and we have not changed our position. The Government has; we have not. Members of the Government should not bludgeon the Labor Opposition and expect its members to go back on their principles.

I do not want to dwell on the many arguments for or against Sunday trading that have been put in this House tonight: I want to dwell on what we are seeing repeatedly with this Government, and that is an arrogance and a bludgeoning of this Parliament and, indeed, even a bludgeoning of its own members to ensure that they have a consistent position. I was very amused to hear the contribution of the member for Colton. He came into this Parliament with a petition from 50 000 people opposing Sunday trading—

Mr Atkinson: And basked in the publicity.

Mr FOLEY: And basked in the publicity. He was prominent in the *Advertiser* only a few months ago, telling anyone who would listen that he opposed Sunday trading. Something has happened in the past two months. Two months is a short time in politics. I do not know what has happened but I suspect that the Minister, the Premier and other members of the Cabinet have been hard at work ensuring this change, because I can but only quote from the *Sunday Mail* of 14 August 1994 in which the member for Colton said:

I felt strongly about the matter and, as has been my practice in the past, I wanted to protect the ordinary, small business people who have sacrificed so much for the economic viability of this State.

Another article which appeared in the *Advertiser* some days later states:

Mr Condous told the *Advertiser*. . . that he would vote against the Government if it backed extended trading. He said extended trading would hurt small businesses and families. Yesterday, he gave Parliament a petition signed by 50 000 people opposed to extended trading.

Who organised this petition that the member for Colton presented in this Parliament? The petition as quoted in the *Advertiser* was organised by the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association. All I ask is for some consistency. We have heard from members opposite; we have heard the member for Florey abuse the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association. He made extremely inflammatory and derogatory remarks about that union, yet we have the member for Colton who was quite prepared to use that union for his political advantage to get on the front page of the *Advertiser* and to grandstand on this issue.

It is the height of hypocrisy that we have the member for Florey, the Minister and other members prepared to deride the

SDA, yet the member for Colton is prepared to use the SDA for his political advantage. Of course, then the heat is turned up and he is told, 'If you want to be a Minister in this Government, play by our rules.' Other members have had pressure put upon them in other ways by this Government. That is politics, but the Labor Party will not succumb to that pressure.

There are other issues on this matter that I want to raise, and I do not want to dwell on the shameful display by the member for Colton. Since it came to office the Government's handling of this issue has been appalling. This Government and this Minister were prepared to mislead the public of South Australia. What were his actions when he came to the Parliament? As has been the case with this Government when confronted with any issue on which it has to make a tough decision or which requires strength, it formed a committee, which simply prolonged the debate.

When the committee came down with a recommendation that went against what the Minister and members had been saying, the Government said, 'What are we going to do? Clearly our Party will revolt on the issue and we will have the embarrassment of members crossing the floor, so we will ignore the Parliament. We will yet again treat the Parliament with absolute contempt and put it through by regulation.' As events have shown, that was a foolish move, because the High Court of Australia struck down that decision. More importantly, it reinforced the principle that a Government cannot abuse the parliamentary process; it must bring it to the Parliament.

I want to draw attention to another fact. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, referred to Saturday trading. I do not want to repeat the contribution made by the member for Giles but, as he said tonight, every time the former Labor Government attempted to extend, change or deregulate shopping hours, the Liberal Opposition opposed it at every corner. Yet this Liberal Government expects that, because it had that standard, we must have it as well. We are saying that we will not change simply because the political environment is such that the Government wants to milk it for votes. The Opposition's position on Sunday trading, as clearly stated by the Leader and Deputy Leader, is that it opposes and will continue to oppose it until there is agreement between the retailers, the SDA and small business. Until that position is arrived at, we will not reconsider the matter. We will reconsider the matter only when that position is arrived at.

When the former Government attempted to introduce Saturday afternoon trading, what was the position of the member for Bragg? I will quote word for word what he said some few hours ago was the then Liberal Opposition's official position on Saturday trading. In reference to Saturday afternoon trading, he said:

Why did we get into it in the end? Because the union got together with retailers and made an agreement.

He went on to say:

If an agreement could be entered into between employers and employees in the retail award, it could be done.

The position of the member for Bragg, the Minister for Industrial Affairs, only a couple of years ago was exactly the same as that which the Labor Party is putting forward tonight.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It is exactly word for word the position that we are putting forward tonight. There is one simple difference: there was agreement some years ago to effect Saturday afternoon trading; there is no agreement today regarding

Sunday trading. Do not expect us to be hypocritical, because that agreement has not been made. We will stick to our position. Unlike the Minister and unlike the Government, we will not—

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: What is the difference between your position two years ago when it was good enough for the Liberal Party to say that there should be common agreement but it is not good enough for the Labor Party? That is double standards, hypocrisy and it is downright wrong. We will not accept that at all. I thought it important to say that the Labor Party on this issue is a Party of principle and consistency, quite unlike this present Government.

The other issue is Friday evening trading. This is another point where this Party, the Government, has been totally inconsistent. It has put forward an argument that the economic development of the State, the jobs for our children and the right to choose is driving its decision to open up trading on Sunday. At the same time it is closing down Friday night trading and putting out of work many hundreds of people in our community. We have a Government saying that it wants Sundays open, because it will mean jobs, but it does not want shops open on Fridays, because that has to be the trade-off so that some members opposite will not cross the floor. One thing we are not in the Labor Party is fools. We can see what games are being played. You are the mugs, because you have been bought off by a trade-off on Fridays.

It is a funny coincidence that the great movers and shakers in the grocery industry—the great proponents of the abolition of Friday night—are the Foodland group and Independent Holdings. Is that not an interesting fact? The major retailers, Coles and Woolworths, want it but Foodland and Independent Grocers do not. I will draw members' attention to a little fact: who provided the Liberal Party with one of its largest financial donations before the last State election? It was Independent Holdings, admirably backed up by the Foodland group, which supplied a donation of some \$10 000. Independent Grocers whacked in \$50 000.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I did not get a petition like you; that is for sure. Foodland also kicked in \$10 000 and, within months of this Government's coming to power, Foodland and Independent Grocers got what they wanted. I make no suggestion other than to draw the coincidence to your attention.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am not a scumbag. The Minister called me a scumbag; I am not at all.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am prepared to take that one on the chin. I am simply drawing an interesting coincidence: if Foodland and Independent Holdings whack in \$60 000, Friday night gets dropped. Coles Myer, which operates some 200 supermarkets in metropolitan Adelaide and employs hundreds of young South Australians, wants to keep Friday night trading. Coles and Woolworths want to keep Friday night trading. It is yet another inconsistency with your argument. Why do you not at least have the guts to be consistent? Why not, instead of trying to buy off a number of members from crossing the floor, remain consistent? How can you proffer an argument that this decision about Sundays is about jobs when you are closing many more stores than you are opening with this Bill? The Government will be closing many more stores than it will be opening by this Bill.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order and draw your attention to the same Standing Order that was

drawn to the attention of the House yesterday, namely, that it is not appropriate to use the second person pronoun of 'you' in the course of debate and that all remarks ought to be addressed through the Chair. Accordingly, Sir, I invite you to remind the member for Hart to address his remarks through the Chair and not to us collectively or as 'you'.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have heard enough of the point of order.

Mr LEWIS: What's your problem?

The SPEAKER: The member for Ridley will have a problem if he reflects on the Chair. The member for Ridley is correct in that members should refer to other members by their district or title and all comments should be addressed through the Chair. The member for Hart will obviously take note.

Mr FOLEY: As I take note with all your rulings, Sir, I want to round off my contribution tonight, which has been about exposing some inconsistencies with one or two interesting coincidences when it comes to political donations and decisions of Government. We have seen Catch Tim and the way this Government and this Party handles—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I know who got egg on their face over Catch Tim. Ask anyone! It was not us. The Minister should read Laura Tingle's article in the *Australian*. I suspect that that will give him a better appreciation. The important point is that, regardless of the merits for or against Sunday trading, they have not been what is driving this Government. This Government is not about integrity; this Government is not about consistency; and this Government is not about the real issues. The Government has simply found that it is politically advantageous to put forward this debate. So, what the Minister and the Government were saying before the election—and what the member for Colton was saying a mere few months ago—has been washed out the door. The Government thinks that it can change its position because the political winds have changed.

I come back to the point made by the member for Colton, who made a grand contribution to this debate. I must give him credit for having the guts to stand up and speak tonight. I would have thought that, with his pirouette on this issue, the last place he would want to be is standing in this Chamber trying to explain it. There must be a fair bit of arm twisting going on behind doors.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am consistent. I was not the one who took advantage of the SDA to get myself in the paper by bringing in a petition with 50 000 signatures and who then had to listen to the tirade of the member for Florey calling them what he called them. I appreciate that the member for Colton, like me, is only a new politician, but you cannot say one thing and two months later do exactly the opposite. I will conclude with the comment that the Government—

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Colton can continue to rabbit on.

Mr Condous: You made misleading statements.

Mr FOLEY: I have not made any misleading statements.

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I said Coles and Woolworths.

Mr Condous: You said Coles.

Mr FOLEY: I said Coles and Woolworths. The Liberal Party opposed the former Government at every turn, at every corner and at every attempt to bring in reform to shopping hours in this State. Before the election it was opposed to

Sunday trading. It had members such as the member for Colton and others putting out newsletters before the election opposing Sunday trading. You simply cannot treat the electorate with that sort of contempt because, when it comes around to polling next time, and when the barrage of oncers opposite have to face up to their electorate, they will not get away with those sorts of double standards and with treating the electorate with such contempt.

I suggest that any member sitting under 4 or 5 per cent should think carefully about these issues and whether they want to have a career in Parliament after the next election. They should think about that because the electors will see through a Government that continually breaks promises, rubs their face in it and tries to preach to electors what they should have. At the end of the day, if I was a member sitting on a margin of less than 5 per cent, I would be thinking carefully about how I vote on this issue. A hell of a lot of shop assistants and families will be affected by this measure and, if the Government has duped and misled them and if it wants to continue with that deception, it will be on the political heads of those opposite because I suspect that on election day they will be called to account.

Mr BECKER (Peake): The previous speaker said he thought that the debate was not up to the usual standard. The Opposition has put up quite a pathetic performance in dealing with this issue not only tonight but over the past 25 years. This issue raised its head 20 years ago at West Beach in my previous electorate when the then Minister of Labour granted an exemption for a Foodland store to open from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. seven days a week. There were eight permanent jobs and 115 part time jobs. In the wonderful Dunstan era it was the Labor Party that killed that business and killed those jobs for young people in the area. Never let me hear that the Labor Party is consistent in its protection for and support of small business.

We all know the track record of the Labor Party, and I am tired of hearing of political donations and allegations that this or that company donated so much to the Liberal Party. I have no idea how much they donate and I am not interested. However, we do know that the union movement in this State spawned the ALP. It is the sponsor, protector and promoter of the ALP, and of course we would expect the trade union movement to make sure that the Labor Party was given plenty of funds. The Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association and all other unions have a vested interest in protecting the rights of the workers, their members and their political Party. What worries me is that in the last State election we saw some ALP candidates spending \$60 000 to \$70 000 to get re-elected or elected to this Parliament. Let us get that issue straight, for a start.

I was a white collar worker who worked in a bank 5½ days a week. When we won Saturday closing I rejoiced like everyone else. It was great to be able to work five days a week and have two days off for leisure. I appreciated that. No-one starved or went without anything because, so far as the banks were concerned, everyone had plenty of money. Most shops closed at about 12 o'clock on Saturday.

I warned this Parliament years ago that if we extended trading hours for butchers we would put a third of butchers out of business, and that is exactly what happened: over 33 per cent of butchers throughout the metropolitan area failed and lost their businesses. They lost everything, including their houses, and they had to face the agonising experience of bankruptcy. We then looked at petrol trading hours through

a select committee. We had the disadvantage of oil companies opening service stations on the city fringe and, by deregulating service station hours, I said that we would put a third of those businesses in the metropolitan area out of business, and that is exactly what happened. If we throw open and extend shop trading hours, we will put hundreds—if not thousands—of small businesses at risk.

I estimate that 15 per cent of small businesses such as the small corner deli, the little grocery, the supermarket and ancillary small business shops are now in financial difficulties. At the beginning of this year we knew that at least five shops would close on Jetty Road, Glenelg, yet it is one of the busiest retail precincts in the metropolitan area. It is a goldmine, the golden mile.

Some years ago, when A.V. Jennings looked at the establishment of a Woolworth supermarket and shopping complex at Glenelg, it predicted that the small businesses on Jetty Road would continuously change hands until each type of trader would find their niche in the market and that there were so many butcher, frock and specialist shops that half of them would disappear. In those days, there was not even a coffee lounge or an ice cream shop. What do we have now? We have more ice cream shops than anything else, a couple of butcher shops, two fruit and vegetable shops where we had four. They are open seven days a week. We should ask them what they think of Sunday trading. It is shoulder to shoulder down Jetty Road, Glenelg: everybody is having a drink, a cup of coffee at one of the new coffee lounges that have opened up, and an ice cream. Those who are selling frocks and specialist items are getting very few traders. Yet the Grand Hotel attracts just as many international tourists percentage wise to its premises as the international hotels in the city.

With regard to the extension of shopping hours, I feel for the people who have to work, who have to keep open their business and for the small family business. If the family business does not involve three or four adults or teenagers, it will never exist. What causes that? It is nothing but utter greed. 'Greed' is the key word in the whole situation. The Adelaide City Council would not have a clue what goes on outside the square mile of Adelaide, and it does not care. Rundle Mall contains a huge investment by the former Labor Government, some \$700 million in the Remm building. Under the Bannon Government, the Labor Party was prepared to go to \$1 billion to finish those premises. It was ripped off by the builders union in that State. Some people who worked on that site are still on workers' compensation and will be for a long time. They were told, 'Comrades, keep the site going. Keep building because, as soon as you have finished it, you'll go down to Glenelg and you'll build Jubilee Point.' Thank God Jubilee Point never got off the ground or we would have had so many people on workers' compensation by now from the builders' trade that we would be importing builders.

The whole trouble is that that huge, ugly building we have in Rundle Mall is now worth about \$200 million—a fraction of what it cost—and we have to bring in Sunday trading to try to justify its sale. That is what it is all about. Seventy two thousand people on average go into the Rundle Mall on a Sunday. It is not even worth considering. The reason that we find that John Martins, Myer, Harris Scarfe and David Jones want extended trading hours on Sunday is that they want a slice of the leisure dollar. Nobody realised until the Crows football team was established and a group of pretty smart little businessmen got behind that operation that they would pull in 45 000 people consistently at Football Park. They enjoy the football, and it costs them plenty of money to go to

the football. It is not a cheap day's entertainment any more. We bring in the poker machines, and thousands of people go to the local hotels. Some still go to the clubs, but it was the hotels that got the deal of a lifetime out of that.

The hotel industry did not believe its luck. The hotel industry has been a very good supporter of the Labor Party over the years. It was the unions that insisted that, if the Labor Party did not give poker machine licences to the hotels, there would have been no deal for the licensed clubs. Again, that proved that there was a leisure dollar, that proved that there was money there to be spent. The major retailers in the city said, 'Hey, there's all this money lying around. We want it. These people should be buying lounge suits. These people should be looking at buying consumer goods on Sundays instead of going off to the football or to the hotel and playing poker machines.' This is where it all started. As to this little myth of bringing the tourists into the City of Adelaide, 12 months ago we found that 1 per cent of all international tourists coming to Australia landed at Adelaide Airport. Can you imagine getting off flight QF82 at Adelaide Airport? 'Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It is five minutes past five; welcome to Adelaide, Australia's most beautiful city.'

They have to land at Adelaide at 5.5, because they are not allowed to break the curfew in Sydney before 6 a.m., but it is all right to screw Adelaide. It is okay to come into Adelaide at 5.5, but they dare not fly into Sydney. Don't tell that joke to me. It is 1 per cent. Do we have to open for people coming in at 5 a.m. wanting to go down Rundle Mall a couple of hours later to do their shopping? For God's sake! They have just flown in from Singapore, where you can get duty-free goods and you can buy the best products in the world. If you are looking for duty-free cameras or any other items, we import them from Singapore, Hong Kong and Asia. We cannot make the things here; we do not have any way of doing it. We cannot compete; the unions will not allow it. But we must have shops open for Sunday. The only uniquely Australian things we have are a few Aboriginal artefacts and opals. We do not have them in Adelaide; we have to import them from the country into the city.

Do not tell me we have to open shops on Sunday, that we must put family businesses and small family investments at risk, because that is what we are doing—15 per cent to 20 per cent of the people have invested their life savings, their life work, and their heritage into these little businesses, and now we want to bankrupt them. The previous Labor Government was told in 1992 by the deregulation unit which looked thoroughly at the shop trading hours in the city that 1 000-odd licences had been issued over the years—some 1 072 ministerial certificates—and hundreds have been issued since then. It was said that the idea of shop trading hours and its precursor legislation was to control shopping hours in order to protect the working conditions of staff and prevent the exploitation by employers. In practice, the legislation has evolved into an Act which protects small business relative to big business.

I have not heard one person stand up in the Labor Party and protect the rights of the workers over this issue. They might make out they have, but all they have done is attack the Government. Not one of them has yet stood up and said, 'I believe in the people and I believe they should be given a fair and reasonable go as far as employment is concerned.' I challenge the Minister and anybody to tell me how many permanent jobs have been created by the extension of shop trading hours in Adelaide on Sunday. How many part-time jobs are there? In contrast to all the permanent jobs there

were, I believe the bulk of the jobs are now part-time. Nobody has a guarantee of permanent employment in South Australia any more, and what a shame that is; what a shame we have allowed that to slip. There is no such thing as permanency. When you do not have permanency in employment you have lack of confidence. That is why retail sales are not growing to the level that people want us to believe and why there is a shift in retail sales from the leisure activities in the metropolitan area to Rundle Mall. That is what is behind the whole sad, sorry saga: the city wants to take the money that is available out of the local suburban areas and put it into the city.

Unless the city gives free car parking I could not care less; I would not come into the city to shop. I do not go away overseas or interstate on holidays to go shopping. What the hell for? Why would you want to go on a holiday to go shopping? You go sightseeing, you go to be educated and to find out what the other countries are doing and you look at what they have to offer. You decide that before you choose where you are going. I have never heard such nonsense about shopping and tourism. If you want to go shopping overseas and you are looking for artefacts, those tourist shops are open, anyway. We really are not kidding anybody; we are not doing a damned thing for the size of this city or for the economy of South Australia or to boost the confidence in this State or this city. I am absolutely staggered at the level of the whole debate and the attitude of most members in relation to this issue.

If the Parliament cannot resolve the matter, if it cannot decide, there is only one thing to do, and that is to hand the whole thing over to local government. Local government will make the decision, because it will be guided more directly by the activities of retailers in their area. I have demonstrated the situation with the Adelaide City Council. If the Adelaide City Council believes that shops should be open, let it wear it. If the Glenelg council believes that Jetty Road should be open in competition with Marion, let the Glenelg council make that decision in the same way as the Marion council.

It is obvious that there are too many vested interests of members opposite in this House so that insufficient consideration for all those involved is being given by everyone. Everyone has lost the plot. Who is missing out in this whole issue? You are kidding yourself if you believe you are giving consumers a fair go or doing them a favour. I am damned if I will be told by the *Advertiser*, which cannot even report surveys accurately—it negatively turns them around—that the vast majority of people want Sunday trading. Of course they want it, once or twice a year, but they do not want it every week. When the temperature gets up to a magnificent 5° in the middle of July and it is cold and wet and raining and there is sleet, how many people will go down Rundle Mall looking in shop windows or wanting to shop in the stores? There will not be 72 000 people, particularly if they have to pay for a car park in which the greedy Adelaide City Council has a vested interest.

No-one has come up with any logic on this issue at all. You can travel the world and visit some of the most beautiful cities. They do not have aero-bridges at their airports, but we have to have them here because every other city has one. Some of the arguments with which people come up in this city indicate that they are living in a fool's paradise. Salt Lake City is a beautiful place where thousands of tourists gather every weekend to attend the Tabernacle and hear the Mormon Choir sing. That is one of its biggest tourist attractions. The

shops in Salt Lake City are not open on Sunday. They do not depend on it; they do not have to have it.

An honourable member: They're all out on their push bikes.

Mr BECKER: They're all in church or looking at the beautiful scenery and mountains, skiing or participating in other leisure activities. If you visit Sacramento, the capital of California, one of the most densely populated and richest states in America, and if you go down the mall in that city, you see that the shops are boarded up. They do not have a 'Closed' sign on them: they have had to be boarded up. In America, businesses go broke week after week. They work on commission; they do not carry much stock that they own themselves. If we extend trading hours—and this is the beginning of opening up the whole thing and deregulating all trading hours—we will not see shops full of stock owned by retailers; it will all be sold on commission.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Well, if it's sold on commission now, I'm surprised. However, what annoys me is that, if you go into most shops in the city and ask for a big ticket item—I am talking about something worth several thousand dollars—you are told that you will have to wait many weeks. No-one can deliver it. You cannot walk in and say, 'I'll have that.' You will have to wait for the manufacturer to make it. Then, if something is wrong with it, the retailer is not interested; he has no obligation whatsoever. The retailer says, 'Go and see the manufacturer; it's got nothing to do with me.' What have we done to retailing in the city? We have created a market situation. They want the consumer, but they could not give a damn about the consumer.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I would like to go back to a 5½ day trading week. We extended hotel closing past 10 o'clock. Down my way there were 53 motor vehicle accidents in 18 months when they gave the local hotel an open disco licence. The young ones were wrapping cars around Stobie poles along the Patawalonga as though it was going out of fashion. So, let us be honest. This is a small city and a small State. We have the most beautiful city in Australia. Let us keep it that way and look after the workers and give them a fair go.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): One of my colleagues said in his contribution that he could see South Australia closing down. Certainly that was the case when those opposite were in power. It is worthwhile remembering that just at this moment. When we debated trading hours some time ago, I was not keen on Friday night trading or extended trading in the metropolitan area. I stood by that. That was after quite a lot of consultation with my constituency. There was also much consultation about the importance of getting the State going and of having a vibrant city, one that was accessible to tourists and those who wanted to come here on a weekend and spend some time capitalising on the many opportunities available.

I remind this House that, when the Labor Government was in power, it made 850 exemptions under the exemptions provisions. The Liberal Government has made about 110, and it is very important that my constituents remember that when they are inundated with propaganda by the Labor Party saying what a sham it is that the Liberal Government has been making these exemptions.

One of the opportunities before the whole world, and before much of Australia, but not South Australia until recent times, has been the tourism opportunity. Those of us who

have travelled overseas a little know that, when you are a tourist, you do not worry whether it is a Friday, Saturday or Sunday: when you are in a town for a short period of time, you want to shop whenever possible. If South Australia, and particularly Adelaide, is ever to capitalise on present opportunities for tourism development, it is absolutely imperative that we have a vibrant city and a chance for people to come in and shop.

Let us for one moment look at our conventions. One of the things for which I give some credit to the previous Government is that, whilst generally it neglected tourism in this State, it did a fairly good job when it came to conventions, and our Government has continued to make sure that that grows. But the fact is we are still missing out on many of the other benefits, because we are not in a position where we can offer people the opportunity to fly in here on a Saturday to prepare for their convention, to look around the shops, and to do a bit of cheap, quality shopping. Contrary to what one of my colleagues said, the shopping in Adelaide is far superior and cheaper than in places like Singapore, and perhaps it is time he got out of this State for a while and looked at other cities so that he realised that.

Let us consider for a moment what the Victorian Government is doing. It is putting together promotional packages, to pull people out of Adelaide to go on shopping trips to Melbourne for a weekend. In the situation that our State currently faces, there is no way that I as a member of Parliament, who has been put in here to help the team get this State back in order, can allow shopping trips to Melbourne to be offered to Adelaidians because the shops will not be open in Adelaide if this Bill does not pass. The opportunities are immense and it is time we started to capitalise on them.

I am not keen to see employers or employees forced to open or to work. If that were the case, I would oppose this Bill. I know that many people do not want to work on a Sunday, but there are many people who do want to work on a Sunday—not many, I might add—and they have been in contact with my office, as have some of those who would prefer not to work on a Sunday. The fact is that this Bill clearly allows non-compulsory opening for employers, and employees will not be forced to work on a Sunday if they do not want to. However, it will give other people who want to work the opportunity to get in and earn a few valuable dollars.

We have seen that the Opposition Leader and members of the negative Party opposite are committed to continuing to pull down this State. Every time we come up with a project or a development opportunity for this State, they want to knock it and oppose it simply because they think they will score a few political points and it might help them get back into power. If we can lift our tourism and get some stability back into the economy of this State, in about 2½ years when we start to see the benefits of our tourism packages and the opportunities of returning vibrancy to the city, people will see what this Government is about, and Mr Rann and his negative Party opposite will be in opposition for quite a bit longer.

It is about time we got rid of the cobwebs in this State; it is about time we realised we are in the twentieth century and about to go into the next millennium; and it is about time we started to compete on a decent basis with all our trading partners, not only the other States in this country but also overseas countries. For too long people in this State have been used to decline and nothing happening, and it is about time we realised that this Government has to turn that around.

With respect to this Bill, it is clear and documented legislation, which I am pleased to see, because it takes away the uncertainty that has been there in the past for employees, employers and the general public. If there are any proposals for extensions of shop trading hours over and above what is in this Bill, they will have to come back before this Parliament. I point out that it is the Parliament that votes and makes the decisions, not the Government. The Government introduces the Bills, but it is up to Labor, the Democrats and the Liberals to vote and make a decision on behalf of the people of South Australia.

From that point of view, I am very pleased to see that it is in legislation and, if there are any other amendments that have to come through, it gives everybody in this Parliament the opportunity to debate it out. As I have said to my constituency, and as I said in a letter to the SDA—albeit that it did not report my letter fairly when it sent the propaganda around through my electorate before—that I only support Sunday trading in the square mile of Adelaide, the City of Adelaide. I do not support extended trading in the metropolitan area. I do not support any form of extension anywhere whatsoever outside of the City of Adelaide. That is what I said and it would be nice if the SDA were to be honest with that and let people know that that is what I said. I clearly said I was against Sunday trading across the board, but in the best interests of the development of this State we have to be prepared to be a bit flexible.

We have a job to do in this State, and that is to get the State going again. It will not be an easy job. It will not be easy because we have a Federal Government that is out of control and wants to control everything simply by raising and lowering interest rates. It will not be easy because we have not got a union movement, unfortunately, by and large, or an Opposition that is prepared to work for this Government with this Government for the people of South Australia. The union and the Opposition's agenda is to knock and oppose, to pull down and to continue to tear down wherever they can any opportunities that are put before this State.

I, for one, am not prepared to support that and I believe that this Bill is balanced, from the point of view that no-one will be forced to work, as I said, and that there will only be trading in the City of Adelaide, plus allowing those people who the Labor Government allowed to trade such as the garden centres, the seven-day-a-week supermarkets on the corner and the furniture operators to continue to trade. Many of them have been in contact with us and their employees, I might add, and said that they are used to working on Sundays, they appreciate the penalty rates and they want to be allowed to have the opportunity to continue to work.

I would like to quickly mention Austin and Vancouver, as two examples. Austin is a sister city to Adelaide and, not all that long ago, it was in dire trouble, but it realised that it had to lift its game and get on with the job and today it is a vibrant city. It is a vibrant city that has grown and grown in population base. It has had Motorola and IBM come in. It has Sunday trading and it has an enormous tourism market and people from within the State, overseas and interstate come to shop. That is one example of what can happen if you are prepared to be a bit lateral in your thinking and have a go at these things.

In 1985 Vancouver had an unemployment rate of 15 per cent. Today it has doubled its population and its unemployment rate is 5 per cent, because the unions, the Opposition and the Government have been prepared to work together. There is an opportunity here for all of us—the unions, the

Opposition and the Government—to work together in a balanced way and that way is to support this Bill. For too long this State has been in the backblocks. It is about time we came up with fair compromises such as this Bill and gave those who want to develop this State and those who want to work the opportunity to do so.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I will be brief compared to other speakers this evening, but I place on record my support for Sunday trading with respect to this Bill. Quite obviously those who have been in the House this evening would have listened to and appreciated the fair logic and support that has been strongly and logically put by my colleagues. They have covered the issue in detail and have given the surveys and the statistics on the public record, which indicate that the vast majority of the public of South Australia want Sunday trading, something in the order of 60 per cent in terms of the surveys that have been well-documented and presented here this evening.

I will not dwell on this, however, over and above this I would like to take a little different tack and, in placing my support on the record, give a perspective from my electorate. I want to raise a couple of issues in this regard. First, from an international perspective we must not just be open for business on Sundays for the future of our State's economy but we must be seen to be positively and actively going out of our way in the strongest possible manner to indicate to our international clients that this State is ready and open for business, and that we are going out of our way to ensure that it suits them, the customers.

Something that members may not fully and readily appreciate is that this State is more dependent on exports than any other State in Australia. We have the highest export output of any State, whether it be fresh, value-added or manufactured product. More than any other State, South Australia is highly dependent on exports for its economic income. Given this, it is quite clear that our future economic dependence is totally dependent on the growth of those exports. I use the example from my own electorate of local horticulture products but more particularly wine. My electorate is responsible for something like 70 per cent of the wine exports out of the whole of Australia.

Whether it be processed or value-added products, our region is regularly hosting and dealing with international clients. Before entering this place I was closely involved with some of those international visitors who are importers to their countries, particularly in the Asian region. They are used to coming here. Sometimes they arrive on Sundays and sometimes they stay over weekends. It is appropriate that I mention that only last Friday I had the pleasure of hosting in my electorate the new South Australian commercial representative from Hong Kong, and she spent all of that day in the Riverland. As our agent, particularly with our State's renewed export focus into China and Taiwan out of this Hong Kong base, she is particularly valuable in terms of liaising with our exporting companies. On Saturday she spent a similar contribution in the South-East, and then Sunday she left for Hong Kong. That is a typical example of how our international clients come here and spend time on a Sunday. Over and above that, of course, they have friends and associates. We want, need and will get those friends and associates here as visitors.

Not only will it be an indication of our commercial intent to be open for business on Sundays, but it is important to recognise that some of this additional trade will be icing on

the cake in terms of the trade that will be generated and available to them with the central business district being open on Sunday. It is totally unrealistic and illogical for Adelaide to be out of kilter with the rest of the mainland capitals and not open on Sundays. It will be impossible for South Australia to ever be competitive or give the impression that it is ever likely to be competitive.

I conclude by noting the reaction and impact that Sunday trading has had with respect to my electorate. Naturally, there was some initial concerns from small business proprietors that Sunday trading in the central business district would mean some loss of trade to their businesses. I would have to say that over the past seven or eight months since Sunday trading has been in progress practically no complaint, comment or concern has been expressed from my country region in terms of the impact of Sunday trading. That is because retailers in my electorate have exhibited very strongly to the local community that they are particularly competitive; they offer a full range of quality products; they offer good service and they offer it at competitive prices.

Therefore, they have been particularly competitive against some of the major city retailers. Over and above that, without attributing any uniqueness to my region, it is worth noting that, in terms of Sunday trading, for many years it has been in competition with Mildura. The local community has adjusted to that opportunity, as have the local businesses. I believe that, if consumers from my area have had in mind making a particular purchase from the city, perhaps from a large retailer, they would have come to Adelaide to purchase it on a Friday night, Saturday or, in fact, Sunday. Given that situation, there is no doubt that my constituents are particularly happy with the option they have and hopefully will continue to have with the passage of this Bill, and that is the opportunity to come to the central business district in Adelaide on a Sunday.

Mr Venning: They can come over the bridge.

Mr ANDREW: Exactly; I thank the honourable member for his interjection, because the infrastructure provision announced today to construct a bridge between Berri and Loxton will facilitate that extra cohesive shopping ability within the Riverland community. In the interests of the future economic growth of South Australia and of maximising the quality of our Government services, we have no option but to exhibit to the international community our intention to have business open in the city on a Sunday. I commend the Bill to the House and look forward to its speedy passage.

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): Before I relate some of my own ideas about this Bill, I would like to record a little bit of history. Prior to the High Court challenge by the union which represented the shop workers, 883 exemptions were issued by Ministers Blevins and Gregory between 1987 and 1993. None of those were challenged by the union on behalf of its shop workers, even though those exemptions introduced radical changes to shopping both for the worker and for the community. For example, there was total deregulation in the form of extended shopping hours for furniture shops to provide for trading all day on a Sunday; extended hours for service stations, hardware shops and automotive spare parts retailers; and, to top it off, on 26 October 1993 five nights a week trading was introduced for supermarkets via a certificate of exemption. Where was the union then?

I am currently in receipt of a letter from the union secretary thanking me for my previous stand on shop trading hours and seeking my continued support. I put it on record in

this debate that both my previous and current stands have absolutely nothing to do with support for his union. It is a stand in support of the workers which his union should be representing and which it should have represented in the past, and I took that stand because their union did not. In fact, the union did quite the opposite. Behind the back of union members, the union actually did a deal with Coles and Woolworths supermarkets for them to open on Friday nights as an extension, with the full knowledge of the previous Labor Government. It needs to be clearly understood by the union secretary that any action I take is not in support of him and his union but, in reality, is taken despite their existence.

For the member for Napier to say, as she has previously in this debate, that the Labor Government has been consistent in this matter is absolutely incredible. Where on earth was she when all those deals were taking place? Where was she when the extension of shopping hours to five nights a week was taking place? I do not think that the honourable member understands the word 'consistent'. I was opposed previously to Friday night shopping in the suburbs and also to Sunday trading, and I remain so opposed.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hart is out of order.

Mrs ROSENBERG: I am pleased that the Bill before us acknowledges that Friday night trading in the suburbs has been a failure and it is to be dropped. Sunday trading in the city has been a success both for businesses and for the consumer. Surveys and statistics have been bandied around this Chamber tonight to both support and not support this fact. It depends on the questions you ask and the answers you want them to provide for you. On average it is estimated that 80 000 people visit the CBD on Sundays. I am not quite sure how they work out those figures but they are the figures with which we have been presented.

This basic fact alone shows that CBD Sunday trading has worked for both the trader and the consumer. The tourism aspect of Sunday trading is one of which I have yet to be convinced. I am certainly not convinced at this stage that an international traveller would say, 'Yes, I am going to Adelaide because they are open on Sundays.' I do not believe and simply cannot accept that argument.

My concern as the member for Kaurana is the effect this matter has on retailers and constituents in my electorate. Retailers in my electorate remain opposed to Sunday and Friday night trading. The basis of their objection is that they contend that they have lost trade because of the CBD Sunday trading. On average, they say that they are trading 6 per cent less since Sunday trading started in the city. If so, I suggest that part of that downturn has been due to Keating's interest rate fiddle as much as the CBD trading. I further contend that some of the effects on local turnover involve the scare campaign by the failed Labor candidate who tried to convince people that Colonnades was not a safe place.

Yesterday I met the Colonnades Centre management and viewed the average figures for income for April 1994 to April 1995 as a rise compared with that for the same period in 1993-94. The period includes the time that Sunday trading has occurred in the city and the Friday night trading extensions. I should like to put those figures on record. For the Colonnades Shopping Centre during that time the coffee and take-away shops increased trade by 6.1 per cent; fresh food and specialty by 4.8 per cent; fashion by 5.7 per cent; casual fashion and sportswear by 17.4 per cent; menswear by 8.3 per cent; footwear and sportswear by 12.1 per cent; fashion accessories by 9.1 per cent; and the major stores, Coles, K-

Mart and Myer, increased by 2.2 per cent. The centre's overall increase in trade during that period was 4 per cent, including the major stores. As with all other regions in South Australia, retail trade in the Colonnades area has been up across the board. The figures given to me by the management of Colonnades were supplied to it by the retailers themselves.

The real issue for the tenants at Colonnades is the extension of Sunday trading. What they really fear is that the allowance of CBD trading on Sundays will eventually extend to Colonnades and other suburban areas. This is the same issue that the centre management is interested in and in fact wants. That is the basis of my continued opposition to Sunday trading.

This Bill is about a lot more than Sunday or Friday night trading, and it is a pity that the main debates have concentrated on such a small section of this Bill. I support the Bill overall. For instance, I support what constituents have shown in the past that they support over many years; that is, Thursday night shopping in the suburbs; all day Saturday trading; an extra day of trade for hardware and building materials; an extra day of trade for furniture; an extra day of trade for floor coverings; an extra day for motor vehicle parts and accessories; and full trade licences for service stations.

I repeat: I support the Bill overall, but it must be noted that for one clause, and one clause only, I am opposed to it. I look forward to the Bill going into Committee so that the voting by all members can be put on record concerning each clause.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I oppose the clauses of the Bill that relate to Sunday trading. My opposition to Sunday trading is well documented both prior to and after the election. I do not see that anything has changed since the introduction of Sunday trading under this Government that changes my view or that of my electorate. The vote on this matter will show that I am consistent in what I say. The electorate can count on my word. If people criticise me for that, so be it, but I went to the election with a commitment not to support Sunday trading. I wrote to the whole electorate on that matter and gained positive support from that stance, and I am consistent on that stance in this matter. Prior to the election, when the Labor Government changed shopping hours, the Blackwood district lost between 20 and 25 per cent of its turnover.

Under the current scheme of arrangements with Sunday trading, the loss in Blackwood is now somewhere between 10 and 15 per cent. As a representative of a major retailing strip centre in Blackwood I do not see why I should be voting for legislation that will essentially take 10 to 15 per cent of Blackwood's turnover and give it to the city. There is no doubt in my mind that this policy basically says, 'Support the city, stuff the suburbs.' In his speech tonight—and this is the argument summed up, in my view—the Minister stated:

... there are only three important issues [in retailing]: location, location, location.

The Minister then went on to state:

Anyone who understands the retail industry would know that the biggest single threat to the City of Adelaide and the CBD is not the extension of shopping hours on Sunday: it is Westfield Marion, Tea Tree Plaza, West Lakes and all of the major shopping centres around the city—

in other words, the suburbs—

You only have to look at the movement of traffic away from the City of Adelaide by consumer choice. They are the people who actually pay our businesses. Those who actually come in through the door, the consumers, have moved away from the City of Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza, Salisbury, Marion and so forth.

As I understand it, the Minister and some members of the Government are saying that this argument is all about giving the consumers choice. If the Minister is saying in his speech that consumers have chosen to shop at Marion, Tea Tree Gully and Noarlunga, surely that is the consumers' choice. The Government is saying in this legislation that it will now close the suburbs, not give the consumers that choice and let them shop in the city. Well, surprise, surprise! If the suburbs are not open, you wish to shop and the only place you can shop is the city, then obviously you will go to the city. It does not surprise me that when you disallow certain areas to trade the other area gets the trade. It does not surprise me that 70 000-odd people go to the city to shop on Sundays.

If the Government is serious about consumers' choice then let us have the courage and open it up to consumers' choice and let the suburbs open Sundays to compete with the city. I do not support that view either, unless the Government totally deregulates the labour market to get rid of penalty rates. I am advised that I should put on record that I apparently have a conflict of interest in this matter, because I run a retail business that trades seven days a week. I have three retail shops in the paint industry, and I am advised that my conflict of interest is that, if Sunday trading does not go through, my paint shops will make more money. I do not know of a paint shop in Rundle Mall. I have not seen Watty, Dulux or Solver in Rundle Mall. I think Harris Scarfe might sell a bit, but I am not sure. I do not have a competitor in the Rundle Mall or that area we are talking about in Adelaide, so I have nothing to gain from opposing this legislation.

I will make a deal with those members who suggested I have a conflict: come and have a look at my books and my business and, if I am making money out of Sunday trading, I will vote with the Government. But if I am making a loss out of Sunday trading, you vote with me. That is the deal I put to every member of the Government who suggests that I might have a conflict in this matter. When you are paying \$22 an hour for someone to serve a bit of paint, there is not a lot of money to be made on Sundays. Some people suggest enterprise bargaining. It is all right to go out and enterprise bargain when you have a large work force, but when you have only a small work force—one person shops—it is very difficult to offer the employee anything more than they are already getting with double time.

What do you offer an employee who basically works in a shop on his own? If you give him a day off and replace that employee, it still costs you the day's wage, so the employer has not gained anything. That arrangement suits the employee, not the employer. For a one person business, enterprise bargaining is very difficult. It is all right to say that Sunday trading is a positive thing for small business. As someone who has been in it for 10 years, I do not believe it is. I believe it is anti-family and I believe essentially that Sunday trading is anti-small business.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr EVANS: Someone may ask a really interesting question: if my business loses money on Sunday why am I open? Let us examine this. There are three other retailers of paint within two minutes of my shop at Blackwood.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr EVANS: They call it competition, that is right. So, if I do not open, they go to the Banner store and buy a tin of Dulux and, once you start painting with Dulux blue, you find that it has a different sheen level and a different colour than Solver blue. So, you paint your whole house with that paint and we lose the whole sale. We might have picked up that

sale on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday or Sunday but, because we are not open on Sunday, we lose the sale. To ask, 'Why are you open?' really shows a total lack of understanding of the retail business. We open to maintain market share.

I quote to the Government its very smart decision this week. What did the Government do when Queensland dropped its share trading fees? We dropped our share trading fees. Why did we do that? Because of the retail business we were going to lose business. We did not have to drop our price for the share transaction fee but we did, because we were going to lose market share. Those people who sit there and say that you do not have to open as a business I believe are wrong. Those people in the Government who say that you do not have to open will tomorrow present a budget that adopts the very philosophy of 'We do not want to lose our market share; we will adopt the same policy as the next bloke'.

So, do not point the finger at small business and say that it is silly to open if it is losing money on Sundays, because it is protecting market share. The member for Unley summed it up pretty well tonight when he said that the deregulation of shopping hours is nothing more than a grab by the big boys for market share over the small boys. I do not mind going on record as saying that this little wood duck will support small business at every opportunity. It absolutely fascinates me how representatives of the farming community—that great protected industry out there with various tariffs and all sorts of subsidies that protect it—when small business puts up its hand and says, 'Don't deregulate us, because the shopping hours are our protection over the big boys, our tariff or subsidy (not a money subsidy but a subsidy that the community pays)', come out and say, 'Hang on a minute, we do not mind coming down and shopping on Sundays; we will vote for it'. Maybe we should get rid of some of the Australian tariffs and let the big markets come in. Let us then hear the farming community scream. Let it scream when its tariffs are taken off.

The Sunday trading section of this legislation, as I have consistently argued, is basically against small business and I disagree with it. There has been a lot of talk about the great creation of employment. You do not have to be really smart to work out that, if you stop people trading in the suburbs and allow them to trade only in the city, every dollar spent in the city is a dollar not spent somewhere in the suburbs. I admit that some tourists come to South Australia: from the survey I saw I think it was 12 per cent, which leaves about 65 000 people from the suburbs going to the city on Sundays. So, the 65 000 people spending their money in the city on Sundays are not spending it locally. Logically, that means that, for every job created by money spent in the city on Sundays, that is one less job available to someone in the suburbs.

Why you would want to make people travel to the city, use public transport on a Sunday, have a higher subsidy for the public transport system and have more cars on the road, when they could quite easily shop locally if we only let them open their shops, is beyond me. It does not add up. I put on the record the cost to my business (which apparently creates a conflict for me). If I pay \$22 per hour, the extra two hours of Sunday trading by opening 9 to 5 and not 10 to 4 will cost \$6 800 per year. If I enterprise bargain down to the normal hourly rate, it will cost me an extra \$3 800 a year. These are not big dollars, but we are not talking big business—we are talking small business. That is what this policy will harm.

This policy says one thing to me: it says that small business people should mark down in their diaries tonight and

mark down in their diaries when the Labor Party tried to deregulate the shopping hours. There is absolutely no doubt that full deregulation of shopping hours is somewhere on the agenda. If small business is silly enough to ignore total deregulation of the shopping hours, it is its own fault.

Ultimately, there is no doubt that the free market thinkers will dominate the agenda and we will find somewhere down the track—I suggest within the next five years—that the market will be totally deregulated. If we think that argument through logically, do members believe that Westfield will sit there and say, ‘We are happy not to trade on Sunday’? Will Westfield be happy to have all that invested capital sitting there while Government member after Government member says that we have to attract investment to the State? We have Westfield sitting out there with all its capital tied up in shops, so will we say to Westfield, ‘You cannot trade’?

If any small business thinks that that will happen for long, they are kidding themselves. The small businesses of this world should understand clearly that ultimately this Parliament will deregulate shopping hours. I wish to put on record that I will not support that unless there is total deregulation of the labour market. I place that on record as a warning to all people that ultimately Westfield will put the pressure on and that area will be opened up.

If Marion opens, I will be arguing that Blackwood should open up because the strip shopping centre at Blackwood will otherwise be destroyed. The argument inherent in this debate concerns the right to choose. A big retailer like Coles Myer can run that argument. However, when we compare Coles Myer with a single person retailer there is a difference. To start with, we do not see the Government spending \$3 million on the shopping precinct at Blackwood, but it will spend that money on Rundle Mall. Taxpayers’ money will help fund the city, and that is fine.

Coles Myer has enormous buying power, but how do one or two person shops compete with that buying power? They do not. I refer to the displays in Coles Myer and other retailers who do not pay for the display racks. They say to suppliers, ‘If you want to put your shirts, shoes, ties or whatever in our store, you pay for the rack.’ In fact, some stores actually hire them out to suppliers, yet the little one person retailer does not get that advantage. Members should check the rents paid by a one person retailer compared with Coles Myer per square metre because they will see the disadvantage faced by the small retailer.

The Government can go down the track of saying to small retailers, ‘Bad luck, you are not getting any support’, but it should not expect me to back it. I will not do that. We have to stand up and say that small retailers and businesses are important to the community and that they should have some input. I will not vote for a concept that is basically going to take 10 or 15 per cent of the trade out of my area and give it to the city. I do not see any benefit in that to the State at all.

Another benefit that big retailers have over small retailers is the flexibility of staff. With only two or three employees a retailer has little flexibility to shift staff around, so training programs and the like become difficult; it is difficult to entertain and, if you trade seven days a week, you have to do it after hours. It is not much fun running training programs on Sunday night on a weekend, but it is part of the business and we do it. Members need to look at the total package enjoyed by the big retailers and not by the small retailers. Ever since the shop trading issue arose I have been on record as saying that I oppose Sunday trading. Certainly, I am disappointed that a number of Government members who

previously reflected strong opposition have changed their position.

Members interjecting:

Mr EVANS: It is all right for the Opposition to say ‘Yes’ and tell me about numbers on petitions, but I could spend weeks attacking its small business record. We need only look at what the Federal Labor Party is doing with taxes on business to understand that its small business policy is even further off the mark than this one. So I would not like the Labor Party to say it is necessarily doing a good thing for small business. Something has changed in eight months, because a number of Government members previously were on record as saying that they opposed Sunday trading. I do not know what has changed in eight months.

So, 70 000 people roll up to the city to enjoy it. Previously they shopped in the suburbs, and I guess that those retailers in the suburbs who see their MP vote against their trade and give their trade to the city will consider that in due course. It disappoints me that so many members have changed their mind.

Again, I wish to place on record my opposition for it. I understand the Labor Party is moving an amendment. I will be voting against the concept of Sunday trading. I am not naive enough to believe that that will be defeated, so the Government’s Bill will get through this place intact. We do have the numbers here. Ultimately I will be voting against the concept of Sunday trading, but I will vote for the Bill. It will rest with the Democrats in the Upper House, and no doubt they will come up with the blue moon option. In other words, they will probably support Sunday trading on every third Sunday after the fifth blue moon, because that is about the only point of compromise that they have not come up with.

It will be interesting to see where the Democrats go on this one. At one stage they supported the idea of areas like Marion opening. We then raised the concept that that might affect Blackwood. Mr Elliott lives up that way, and he suddenly realised that he had better change his mind. So the Democrats have taken a lot of positions on this one, and I will be interested to see where they end up. Ultimately, the negotiations will be between the Democrats and the Minister. I can only hope that some commonsense comes out of it.

If it is all about consumer choice, the safest way to proceed is to put it to a vote—just put it out to a referendum when the Federal election comes up in about three or four months. If it is really all about consumer choice, let us leave it for three months and put it to a vote. I have no doubt that there would be heated debate on this issue, but that would be a good thing for the community, and I do not see anything wrong with that. Many people will oppose it, because many people believe in the family unit and in the opportunity of small business people having the day off. Having a wife and four children and having run a family business for 10 years in the building, plumbing and retailing industry I can speak from some experience as to the effect a seven-day business has on the family. Some people say, ‘If you don’t like that, go and do something else.’ I accept that, and that is an argument that can be put.

However, when people say that they do not realise that we are competing against major retail stores that can change over their staff every seven or eight hours, that makes it very difficult. I do not think that the Government has necessarily thought through the effect this will have on the family unit. Again, I place on record my opposition to Sunday trading. I have consistently opposed Sunday trading, and I promised my electorate that I would oppose Sunday trading. If that means

voting against my own Government to be loyal to my electorate, I have absolutely no problem in doing that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): First, I would like to praise the member for Davenport for the integrity and courage he has shown tonight, even though the speaking order was arranged so that the Government members opposed to Sunday trading would not be reported in the *Advertiser*. We know what it is about—making sure that they speak after the deadline.

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. In fairness to my own Government, I must say that I requested—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There is no point of order in this, Sir.

Mr EVANS: The Leader is suggesting that the speaking order has been rigged.

Members interjecting:

Mr EVANS: I specifically asked to go last.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): Order! I have heard enough. There is no point of order, although I understand the honourable member's grievance.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This Government has a record majority, a massive majority—

Mrs ROSENBERG: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You can do what you like. Go on, keep going.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

Mrs ROSENBERG: I believe that the Leader has reflected on the Whip. I also had no choice but to speak late because I had to go home to my family and come back.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government has a record majority, a massive majority, and there is something extraordinary about tonight's Bill—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I believe it is a requirement of this House that, when somebody takes a point of order, they are entitled to be heard in silence. The Leader of the Opposition clearly did not adhere to that Standing Order and in fact flouted the Standing Orders, and I ask you, Sir, to rule accordingly.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order, although I understand what the honourable member is saying.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand; we might say it has nothing to do with the Standing Orders, and perhaps we might invite the Speaker to come back into the Parliament. There is something extraordinary about tonight's performance by the High Court to force this Premier—

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. No member of this Parliament, including the Leader of the Opposition, should ever reflect on the Chair, irrespective of what their personal view might be, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw his reflection on the Chair.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order because I do take offence. I ask the Leader of the Opposition not to reflect on the Chair.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know you are sensitive, Sir, and therefore I apologise. Okay; let us get on with this. It took the High Court of Australia by a majority decision to force this Government to have the absolute guts to risk a few of its

members having the courage and integrity to actually cross the floor. That is what it is frightened about; that is why it did not put this into the Parliament before—because it was frightened that the member for Davenport and a couple of others might have the gumption, courage and decency to stick with what they told the people. This Minister went out on the front steps of Parliament and made a solemn pledge to small business that there would be no Sunday trading during the term of this Government. That is the pledge he made and the pledge he will not keep. My guess is that only a couple of members will be prepared to stick by their categorical promises to small business and who will have the guts to cross the floor, not just to follow their conscience but also to honour their pledge to the electorate. That is why the member for Davenport deserves the credit of all members of Parliament—and he can quote me in his election pamphlets if he likes. He has the guts and the courage to stick by what he has said.

There are very few others who will do so in his Party. It is not the Party: it is the Harper Valley PTA, and you are all Harper Valley hypocrites in the process. Let us go through what members opposite said. It will be very interesting to see what various members said who spoke about Saturday afternoon trading a few years ago. The member for Stuart, a member of great principle, said about Saturday afternoon trading that it was an attempt at the destruction of small business. He said that the Bill for Saturday afternoon trading was not designed to assist small business and provide more opportunities. Instead, the member for Stuart said it was put forward at the behest of those people who were organised and powerful and who had commercial might and muscle. The member for Stuart said he could not support the legislation because it had not been sought at the behest of the little people. Instead, it had been introduced to appease the Rundle Mall traders.

Mr BECKER: I am sorry to have to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition, but could he explain who is the member for Stuart?

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr Brindal: Who are you talking about?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am referring to the former member for Eyre.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Okay; we have corrected it. Let us talk about the member for Unley. He is in a bit of trouble with the Premier, because we know what he thinks of the Premier and we know what faction he is in. We know he wants to see the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development in the top job, because that would guarantee him a seat in the Cabinet. We know that. What did he say a couple of years ago when talking about Saturday afternoon trading? He talked about how small traders would not and could not survive if trading hours were extended. He said that small business had told him that their trade does not increase that much with an increase in trading hours and that all an extension of Saturday trading does is compel them to stay longer in shops and have less contact with their families. He said that those who would benefit would be the large retail conglomerates. He said part of this whole debate was driven by huge retailers which have a disproportionate share of the market but which are not satisfied and want even more. He said monopoly and monopoly trading are always to be resisted, and reminded this Parliament that many nations had built immense power by encouraging small business. That was the member for Unley.

Let us see what he does tonight. We know exactly that he is trying to think of another way of greasing around the other faction to advance his own position at the expense of his electorate.

Let us talk about the member for Peake, the former member for Hanson, whose party I attended last night along with the Speaker's Party to celebrate 25 years of integrity and principle in this Parliament. What did the member for Peake say? He strongly opposed Saturday afternoon trading. He talked about the importance of small business and the lives of its employees. He was really concerned at that stage. He said:

Generally, the employer picks on middle-aged people because they know they cannot afford to lose their job. So it is usually the older and more loyal employee who is forced to work on a weekend. He feels obligated—

says the then member for Hanson—

to work because he has too much to lose by way of long service leave and, if he is lucky, superannuation.

The then member for Hanson said that at about 50 years of age no-one would want to give you another job. He said that the philosophy of the major supermarkets such as Woolworths and Coles is to increase their turnover continually each year by about 3 per cent, that they do not care from where they get it, etc. He said that Saturday afternoon trading was to help the Myer-Remm development to become viable. So it goes on. The former member for Hanson said:

We can do what we like to encourage tourism in South Australia, but we should not kid ourselves when we say, 'Let us bring Japanese tourists to South Australia because they will walk around with big fat wallets and travellers cheques.' They are the shrewdest tourists of all. They always look for great value in the dollar and they are not very generous. What they seek one can find anywhere else in Australia. So there is great competition for the tourist dollar in Australia. Tourists will want to go out of the metropolitan area and look elsewhere.

That is what the then member for Hanson said, but let us look at what he said tonight. He went on to say:

Members can go to Coles or Woolworths on Saturday morning and see the number of young people working, most of them part time, who will be denied the opportunities to participate in regular sport or recreation activities. Netball is one of the biggest participation sports in South Australia and dozens if not hundreds of young women will be denied the opportunity to participate in regular Saturday afternoon competition.

What crocodile tears from the then member for Hanson, the now member for Peake. He said:

A Government that interferes in this type of arrangement with retailing in this State is unwise. We should leave the legislation alone.

He finished by saying:

Nothing will be gained, nothing will be achieved except a lot of bankruptcies and a lot of heartbreak for people who do not deserve it.

What hypocrites these members of Parliament are! Twenty-five years of integrity marred by one night of extraordinary hypocrisy and contempt for small business. Let us go on to the Minister for Industrial Affairs. What did he say? He said:

I now refer generally to what small retailers say about the extension of trading hours. It seems to me that we must put down the whole picture today. We do not just want a few one-sided attitudes. Many small retailers are scared of extending trading hours to 5 p.m. They do not see any increased opportunity. They see only extra costs.

He went on to say:

The Government of the day needs to protect small operators from unfair trading conditions because there is no doubt that the big operators can look after themselves.

That is what this Minister for Industrial Affairs told this Parliament about Saturday afternoon trading. It is all a bit curious, because we are also talking about Friday night trading. These absolute champions of private enterprise and deregulation suddenly decide that we will have Sunday trading but not Friday night trading. I happen to be a former Minister of Tourism. I know how important Friday night trading is when attracting tourists to this State. They fly in knowing that they can shop on Fridays. That is the argument we are hearing about Sunday trading. These are the people who want to close down Friday nights for visitors. They want to close down this city.

The fact is that every study has shown that in country areas where there is total deregulation more money is spent on Fridays and on Friday nights than is spent on Sundays. Yet, it is Friday nights that this Government wants to close off, wipe out. What hypocrisy! Private enterprise and competition—that is about a sop for keeping more of them from crossing the floor tonight, for keeping more of them from doing what they promised to do at the last election. Believe me, there will not be one small business person or shop employee in your electorates who is not told about your hypocrisy. Just watch this space, because it will be brought home. You will be known as hypocrites in your area, and you know who I am talking about.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is threatening members on this side in the exercise of their vote, and that is clearly against Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has been listening carefully to what the Leader has said. If what the member for Unley has said was correct, he would have a point of order. I do not believe that the manner in which the Leader was saying it is contrary to Standing Orders.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We all really know what this is about tonight: this is about political donations. It is about a bigger sling at the next election from Independent Grocers; it is about a bigger sling at the next election from Foodland. That is what it is about. It is as crass and as craven as that, and they know it, I know it, and you know it.

We also heard tonight of the number of jobs that have gone down in the big department stores. The member for Spence said that 100 employees have lost their jobs at David Jones and John Martins since the Minister's experiments with Sunday trading in the city. I know he is worried about the legal advice he has been getting. Four strikes and you are out—or was it three strikes and you are out? When this Minister goes to court, you would not want to be on his side. I can picture this scene in his office: turning to his CEO he would ask, 'Am I a good Minister? What am I doing wrong?' You can just see this pitiful, pitiable scene.

There are some other matters that need to be discussed tonight. We recognise that every member in this Parliament who is fair dinkum about their job knows that this is about a total Sunday trading. We know what it is about: close off Friday night; this is the thin edge of the wedge; pressure will mount from Westfield and others; and eventually we will have Sunday trading across the city. Members on the backbench who have been appeased by Friday nights will have to face their small business supporters in more ways than one. In your heart you know I am right.

Some members tonight have shown total hypocrisy. They have been sat upon. The member for Coles has been working around, threatening them that perhaps one day, in 15 years from now, they might become a parliamentary secretary to some hapless junior Minister. Everyone will be bought off along the way. We know what is going on. I am telling members tonight that getting rid of Friday nights is the symbol and the signal that we will end up with Sunday trading across the suburbs.

I will let you know what my position is on this. My position now is the same as it was when I was Minister for Business. The simple fact is, if you want Sunday trading, that is fine, but get the agreement of the union, the workers, the small business and the big business the way it has been done before. Have the guts to negotiate, instead of getting a rush of blood to the head, ending up in the courts, hoping to beat them in the courts. The High Court will listen to the Minister for Industrial Affairs, and he is 5-0, four times in a row. What a hapless record for a Minister!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There is one member of Parliament who deserves a special mention tonight, and that is the angry member for Colton. We saw all the publicity:

Government denies backflip on shopping hours. Meanwhile, the Premier Mr Brown rejected Opposition calls for him to discipline the member for Colton, Mr Steve Condous. Mr Condous told the *Advertiser*—

no doubt exclusively—

on Tuesday that he would vote against the Government if it backed extended trading. He said extended trading would hurt small business and families. Yesterday he gave Parliament a petition signed by 50 000 people opposed to extended trading.

He was not opposing it on the front steps; there was no media coverage. Big old Steve, the former Lord Mayor, almost independent, was coming before the Parliament to stand up to his Premier. He is the only one big enough to have the guts—yes, big enough to have the guts—to stand up for small business, the way he did as Lord Mayor. Where is he tonight? How will he vote? He will not have the guts, because he still has that faint idea in his mind that his pledge to the people that he will become a Minister within nine months might just come true in 29 months, 39 months or 49 months. He is the only one who believes that. The member for Colton said:

I felt strongly about the matter, and as has been my practice in the past, I wanted to protect the ordinary, small business people who have sacrificed so much for the economic viability of this State.

It is Harper Valley PTA—the champion hypocrite of them all. He is the biggest hypocrite of them in all in more ways than one. The Minister knows what this is all about tonight. It is about a pay-off; it is about donations at the next election; it is about the next big donation from Foodland and from Independent Grocers—happy to repeat that on any occasion; very happy. Saw the last return and hoping for a bigger one next time. You have betrayed small business. If you want to be a fair dinkum Minister and not weep to your CEO about your performance, then come before this Parliament and negotiate a deal with the unions, the employers—the big ones and the small ones—and then we will salute you, for once, for having some credibility, some honesty and some decency. There is only one thing that I have heard so far in this whole run-up of the last 16 months, and that is that this Government made a whole series of promises it wanted to break, that it intended to break, but it did not need to make any promises at all.

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not the ordinary practice of the House to have a debate interrupted for a personal explanation. There will be ample time for the honourable member to make a personal explanation tomorrow. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The whole of this Bill seeks to put into legislation what has been accomplished through certificates of exemption in past years, in the case of the Sunday trading in the past seven months. Therefore, there is nothing new in the legislation. We have had it before the community; it has been out there in reality for a long time, with the exception of the Sunday trading section, which has been in only since last year. I do not intend to go over the arguments that have been put by many speakers in this debate tonight. They have been canvassed very well. But I do have concerns with regard to clause 5a(1)(d), which provides that the central shopping district in the City of Adelaide can open from 11 a.m. until 5 p.m. on a Sunday.

One may wonder why I am concerned when one can appreciate that a multitude of stores such as service stations, small supermarkets, furniture shops, hardware stores, nurseries, chemist shops, cafes, food shops in general, and many other shops that already open on a Sunday. Of course, they are employing many thousands of people. Sunday trading has been with us for a long time. It is interesting to hear the intensity of the debate tonight as to some of the implications with respect to people working or not working. I recognise those arguments, but I feel that they can be dealt with by looking at the stores that are already trading. In fact, almost all the businesses in my electorate of Goyder that are under 200 square metres can trade on a Sunday now.

We have Sunday trading throughout the electorate of Goyder but, of course, that does not apply in reality because many choose not to open and they have that right. Certainly that is a key ingredient of this Bill too: that stores and also employees can choose whether they wish to work on Sunday or on any other day. I have particularly been concerned with comments such as those expressed to me in correspondence I received recently. I quote from correspondence of a constituent of mine:

This whole business is in opposition to God's word and you will only harm yourself and the image of your Government to pursue it. Get rid of all trading on Sunday and do not introduce Sunday trading in the city.

Over the past years I have expressed concurrence with the sentiments of those views and, as a result, I have expressed opposition to Sunday trading, basically on religious grounds as a Christian. However, considering the comments I made earlier about the number of shops that are open and how our society continues to operate I have made it my business to delve further into this issue. I particularly thank the President of the Lutheran Church for his assistance in helping me consider aspects of this as it relates to biblical truths. I quote from the Bible, St Mark, chapter 2, verses 23 to 27.

I will not quote it all but it is the question about the Sabbath, and it relates to Jesus and his disciples walking through the cornfields, the disciples picking some of the grain, processing it in their hands and then eating it. The question is raised by the Pharisees of the day:

Look, it is against our law for your disciples to do that on the Sabbath.

In fact, the punishment in the Old Testament was death to people who transgressed laws against the Sabbath. It was death through stoning—it may not have been death but it could have been. As a result of that, Jesus said:

The Sabbath was made for the good of man; man was not made for the Sabbath.

I believe we have to consider that very carefully. Perhaps we are putting the Sabbath, or the equivalent in this day and age, as the all important and not letting man orientate around it. A similar verse occurs in Luke, chapter 6; and in chapter 14 there is also reference to Jesus healing a sick man on that occasion. Jesus said to the Pharisees:

Does our Law allow healing on the Sabbath or not?

In fact, they would not say anything, but Jesus did heal the man. He sent them away and then said:

If any one of you have a son or an ox that happened to fall in a well on a Sabbath, would you not pull him out at once on the Sabbath itself?

But they were not able to answer him about this. Again, it is interesting that, from a Christian point of view, Jesus seems to put to the people, 'Don't you put the Sabbath above everything else; man also is allowed to live and conduct other duties.' The final quote is from Colossians, chapter 2, verse 16:

So let no one make rules about what you eat or drink or about holy days or the New Moon Festival or the Sabbath. All such things are only a shadow of things in the future; the reality is Christ.

In other words, Christians should not get tied up in a knot over rules about whether one can or cannot have Sunday trading on religious grounds. The worship of Christ is the overriding consideration. The Government's role is to regulate the well-being of the State, and in this case the city, whereas the Church's role is to work on the spiritual well-being of people. In this respect, I would suggest that churches are seeking to cater to the spiritual needs of Christians by

increasingly holding Saturday evening services, Sunday morning and evening services and even weekday services. There are strong arguments both for and against Sunday trading, Saturday trading and night trading and those arguments have been put forward by many of the previous speakers. Also, everything in this Bill has been trialled for a minimum of six months as I mentioned earlier and, in most cases, for much longer than that.

I conducted a brief survey of shop assistants myself in the Rundle Mall recently and I was interested to find that their responses varied considerably from the responses that I gained last year when I did an *ad hoc* survey. Whereas last year they expressed many reservations, it was now clear that there was a choice for assistants as to whether or not they to work. I did not come across one who was being forced to work. Some of them said they would not work on a Sunday, and I uphold their right to say that and am pleased that this Bill also assists in that respect. I have thought long and hard on this Bill and, weighing up all the consequences, it has my support.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PAEDOPHILES) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 1 June at 10.30 a.m.