

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 25, 1970

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

LOXTON INSECTORY

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding the Loxton insectory?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I know how interested the honourable member is in this question because I think it was he himself who launched this project when he was in office. Following the representations made to the Commonwealth Development Bank, further discussions have taken place between officers of the Agriculture Department and the bank. However, there has been no final reply.

NATIONAL STOPPAGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Last Thursday I asked the Chief Secretary whether the State Government was in accord with the call by the Australian Council of Trade Unions for a three hour national stoppage of work today in protest against the Commonwealth Government's Budget. The answer he gave me was that the matter had not been considered by Cabinet and that at that stage he was unable to give me a reply. A good deal of action has taken place since then; in fact, 13 unions in South Australia, involving about 37,000 members, are at present engaged in a stop-work meeting as a protest against the Commonwealth Budget. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the State Government is in accord with this stoppage? If the matter has not been considered by Cabinet, is the Chief Secretary himself in accord with it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have heard some nasty political questions but I have never heard one as bad as this. All I want to say is that the matter has not been discussed by Cabinet and that my own opinions are my own and I intend to keep them that way.

ABORIGINAL WELFARE

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Can the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, say whether the Government is taking any steps to inquire into and,

if necessary, deal with the question of the harm to Aborigines that was referred to in last Sunday's newspaper?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to the appropriate Minister.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. L. R. HART: On August 13, I asked the Minister of Agriculture, in the absence of the Minister of Lands, a question about the extent of credit available in the Farmers Assistance Fund. Has the Minister of Lands a reply to that question?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In reply to the question of the honourable member as to the funds available in the Farmers Assistance Fund, the amount is \$363,502. However, as the current situation seems to be considerably more serious than that which existed in 1967, the Premier has written to the Prime Minister seeking further assistance in the following ways:

- (a) funds to enable freight rebates to be made available on the movement of stock and fodder;
- (b) provision of carry-on finance for those farmers who are reasonably credit-worthy;
- (c) consideration of and funds for amalgamation of farms in drought areas should this problem arise; and
- (d) funds to assist farmers who may, as a consequence of drought and other factors, be compelled to leave their holdings, should this need arise.

When advice is received from the Commonwealth the Government will consider further the policy to be pursued.

STATE PLANNING AUTHORITY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Local Government to the question I asked last week about appointing a conservationist to the State Planning Authority?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Local Government has informed me that the constitution of the State Planning Authority is at present the subject of discussion. The current term of the authority expires on June 30, 1971. It is intended to introduce legislation later this session regarding the composition of the authority and in formulating this legislation due consideration will be given to the claims of conservationists and others who are seeking representation on the authority.

WHEAT LOADING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Persistent rumours are current in the northern areas of the State that a ship being loaded with bulk wheat at Port Pirie left with about 5,000 tons of wheat short of its estimated loading at that port. From my inquiries I have found that the story (which I cannot fully substantiate) is that the authority failed to transfer sufficient wheat from the temporary silos at Port Pirie to the bulk silos for the loading of the ship. Will the Minister of Agriculture seek clarification from South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited whether this rumour is or is not correct?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be pleased to do that, because I think this matter is extremely important to South Australia, particularly when we are in the situation that, if ships are available to shift our wheat, every precaution should be taken to ensure that wheat is available for the ships. I shall try to obtain this information promptly from the co-operative.

RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question of last week concerning the controversy about the Railways Institute?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague states that it has never been the policy of a Government in office, including the Hall Government, to make available its official records for perusal. The present Government is continuing this policy. The honourable member, however, can rest assured that this Government is also anxious to minimize any delays in providing railway employees with a new institute building, and is making every effort to expedite construction.

GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIRS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On August 13 I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board would take adequate steps to provide for the slaughtering of drought-affected sheep. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am informed that the Gepps Cross abattoirs is at present working seven days a week on the slaughtering of stock for the domestic trade and export

lambs to the limit of labour available. In view of the large number of lambs being submitted, the slaughter of stock for export at Gepps Cross is at present under the direction of the Operational Committee of the Meat Board of South Australia, a committee consisting of representatives of the Government Produce Department, primary producers, stock salesmen, railways, abattoirs, exporters of stock, retailers and the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union. At a meeting held on August 13, 1970, the committee decided to give preference to the slaughter of lambs for export and imposed a total ban on the slaughter of sheep for export for a period of two weeks. The sheep position will be continually under review by the operational committee and the slaughtering of sheep for export will be resumed when the availability of lambs eases.

I think, perhaps, I should correct the honourable member's statement that the board has spent money on the installation of additional facilities "to handle whatever situation may arise in a drought". In recent years the board has incurred substantial expenditure in endeavouring to bring existing facilities to the standards required by oversea inspection authorities but has not increased slaughtering accommodation owing to the serious effects of idle capacity on the economical operation of the works. The board considers that existing space is adequate to meet domestic and normal export requirements but not to meet an emergency created by prolonged drought conditions.

HONEY INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have received a letter from the Commercial Apiarists Association of South Australia under the signature of the Secretary, Mr. J. O. Harvey. This body, since the inception of the Commonwealth Honey Board, has been opposed to being brought under the board's control without an opportunity for a poll. This has caused considerable friction within the industry. Has the Minister had representations from this body and, if he has, does he intend to take up the matter with the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry with the object of seeing whether a poll can be taken in the honey industry to ascertain whether it wishes to retain this marketing set-up, which this body claims is proving ruinous to the producers?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer to the first part of the question is "No"; I have had no direct personal representations from the Commercial Apiarists Association of South Australia, but I do know that representation by letter has been received—I think even while the honourable member was Minister of Agriculture. However, this is a matter to be determined by the Commonwealth. I am quite prepared to take it before the Agricultural Council so that all States can review the matter to see exactly what the other States think of this proposition. Under those conditions, I should be prepared to do that.

POLLUTION

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Chief Secretary was good enough to supply me with a distribution list of the newsletter on pollution of environment, which has been sent out to many people. In fact, copies have been sent to 140 members of local boards of health—to the chairmen, I think. Copies have been sent to many other people but, for some reason or another, they have not been sent to members of Parliament. It may be that the Chief Secretary is trying to shield us from receiving excessive literature. However, many honourable members are very interested in this matter. Will the Chief Secretary consider the question of circulating it among honourable members, if it is not too costly?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to take up the question with the Director-General of Public Health. I cannot see why it cannot be distributed throughout Parliament House. It should not be too costly.

POLICE POWERS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (on notice): In view of the Attorney-General's statement, supported by the Chief Secretary, that the Commissioner of Police is not entitled to comment on Government proposals to curb the powers of the Police Force, is it also the policy of the Government to endeavour to prevent opinions on matters of public interest and concern being expressed by the Judiciary and the Auditor-General?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not accurate to refer, as the question does, to Government proposals to curb the powers of the Police Force. The Government's proposal is to refer to

a committee on criminal law revision the question of police powers and to investigate whether certain powers are wider than is necessary for the effective discharge of police functions. The Judiciary is independent of both Parliament and the Government. In our legal tradition, judges do not enter into public debate on Government policy. The Auditor-General is a public official possessed of certain statutory powers and duties, including the duty of making reports to Parliament. Neither the position of the Judiciary nor the position of the Auditor-General has any relevance to the propriety of a public official engaging in public controversy with Ministers as to matters of Government policy.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (Additions and Alterations).

REFERENDUM (METROPOLITAN AREA SHOP TRADING HOURS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 895.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): This Bill has been introduced with a blatant, political, ulterior motive. It does nothing to solve the problems associated with an out-of-date Early Closing Act. The fact that this Bill is superfluous is borne out by statements by Ministers that it will be carried by at least a 70 per cent "Yes" vote, an opinion that most people possibly agree with. I am not opposed to Friday night trading, nor has any member of the Opposition Party in either House opposed the one question to be contained in the referendum. It is fair to say, too, that the Government did not expect the Opposition Party to oppose 9 o'clock closing on Friday night. That being so, one may ask whether the Labor Party itself is opposed to late trading on Friday night; if it is not, why are we spending up to \$100,000 to get an answer that is already a foregone conclusion?

I think the true answer is that the Government succumbed to trade union pressure to amend the Early Closing Act to reduce trading hours but, when the general public became aware of the moves afoot, the outcry was so great that it sought a way out of its dilemma. This is perhaps borne out by articles in the press in recent times. A leading article in the

Advertiser (a very reputable paper) of August 14 states:

A referendum may offer it a way of escape from a mounting dilemma. It could even present a brave front to sectional demands on the grounds that the public's wishes must be respected.

I am not too sure whether the people's wishes will be respected, even if the referendum is carried. However, what better excuse could the Labor Party have than virtually to enforce a compulsory vote in the industrial fringe areas at the Midland by-election on September 12; hence, this costly and unnecessary referendum has been foisted on us.

The Bill is largely a machinery measure, so inevitably there must be some repetition in this debate. The Government is seeking a "Yes" vote for 9 p.m. Friday shopping to prevail in a defined area. Fair enough! It is seeking the public's views on whether they wish to have late Friday night shopping. However, the Government is not setting out to seek whether the public also has any preference for Saturday morning shopping, though it has said that Saturday morning shopping will continue during its term in office. That is fair enough also! But it is not saying that the policy of the Labor Party in South Australia is that Saturday morning shopping will continue. I think that if we are astute enough we will conclude that, although the Labor Party at present is prepared to accept Friday night shopping, its ultimate aim is to abolish Saturday morning shopping.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Come on! What a supposition!

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Can we get an undertaking on that?

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister, being a convert, possibly has not been properly converted to Labor Party thinking.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You agree then that there are two Parties in the Council? I thought this was a House of Review.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Will the Government undertake that it will not deal with Saturday morning shopping?

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the proper procedure to be adopted in relation to a referendum. In the past I think that this procedure has been adhered to, but why the departure on this occasion? It is interesting to read some of the comments in the Minister's second reading explanation. The introductory sentence reads:

The Government intends to introduce legislation into Parliament during the current ses-

sion to make a complete revision of the present laws which restrict shopping hours.

I do not wish to get involved in too much repetition, but I think I should stress that the proper procedure would have been for the Government to introduce the Bill it intended to introduce so that the public could express, in the referendum, whether it met with their desires. I believe that this is the great weakness in the Bill that we have before us. Also, we must realize that the results of this referendum, if acted on by the Government, will apply only in a defined metropolitan area; they will not apply in areas outside that defined area.

Let us consider the situation of the people in the outside areas with regard to Friday night shopping or their desire to have Friday night shopping. Provision is made in the Bill regarding country shopping districts. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

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

I think most people will agree that the present system is not a satisfactory one and they are prepared to accept its abolition. The Minister went on to say:

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

The local government body will ascertain the views of its ratepayers. I assume that the ratepayers would be the people from whom the council gathered this information. Or would the information be gathered on the basis of adult franchise? No mention is made of this, and no mention is made of how the local government body is to obtain the views of its residents. However, having obtained the views of its residents, it then submits a report to the Minister, who may approve or disapprove of the area becoming a shopping district.

The Minister may also institute his own inquiries in a district. How the Minister would do this I am not quite sure. However, that is the intention of the Government, and that is its proposal to deal with the question of shopping hours outside the metropolitan area. The interesting thing is: on what basis would the Minister decide whether or not the area should become a shopping district? I should think the decision of the Minister would be governed by whether the creation of a late

shopping district outside the metropolitan area would have some influence on the trading within the metropolitan area, not on whether it was desirable or otherwise for the people living in those outside areas. I again refer to the *Advertiser* of August 14 and an article referring to the Minister of Works, as follows:

Referring to the referendum, Mr. Corcoran said: The Labor Party won't be handing out how-to-vote cards on the day, nor, I imagine, will the L.C.L. This is not a matter of Party politics although the Liberal and Country Party has tried to suggest all sorts of ulterior motives. The truth is that the Liberal and Country Party, in its years in office, left the whole situation unresolved.

Admittedly, this may be true up to a point. However, it is also true that the Labor Party took office in 1965 but during the following three years it did not attempt to resolve the problems involved with the Early Closing Act.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We set up a committee to investigate this question.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I say that Mr. Corcoran's remark is unjustified, because the Labor Party made no attempt to do anything in the matter; in fact, it ran away from the problem. In 1968, I attended a meeting of some 400 retailers in Adelaide called to discuss the application of the Early Closing Act, and that meeting was informed by one of its delegates who had attended a deputation to the then Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) to discuss possible amendments to that Act that the Premier had told the delegation the Act was such a hot potato that the Government could not touch it but had suggested to the deputation that it should try to get the Liberal and Country Party Opposition to introduce a private member's Bill. If that is not running away from the issue, I do not know what is.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I wonder where you dug that one up.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I did not dig it up at all; I was at the meeting at which there were some 400 retailers, and one of the delegates who had been a member of the deputation that waited on the Premier reported this to the meeting. Therefore, it is a statement of fact, not a concoction of mine. The fact that this is a hot potato is borne out by a recent article in the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is that why your Government did nothing?

The Hon. L. R. HART: We were in a similar position to what the Labor Government was in in 1965. We appointed a committee when we were again returned to power, and no doubt some of the recommendations this

Government is acting on now were made by that committee. At least I think we must be fair and give some credit to Mr. Coumbe, who was the Minister of Labour and Industry in the Hall Government. Mr. Coumbe appointed a committee; he recognized that the Early Closing Act was out of date, and he was sincere in his efforts to have some amendments and improvements made to it. However, having been a Minister in that portfolio for only a short time, he was not in a position to bring to fruition some of the ideas he had in relation to this matter. We all recognize that the Early Closing Act is a hot potato and that it has been a hot potato for a long time. In fact, Michael Cudmore, in an article in the *Advertiser* recently, said:

When you are handed a hot potato or anything else that is just too hot to handle, you instinctively seek relief by tossing it into the air.

The inference is that the present Government has been handed this hot potato and it is just too hot for it to handle, so it has tossed it into the air. Of course, it has tossed it so far into the air that it is hoping it will not come back again.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It is more an old chestnut than a hot potato.

The Hon. L. R. HART: One tosses chestnuts into the air to turn them over. However, the birds are coming home to roost, and the general public has recognized that the proposed referendum is not a genuine effort to put their desires into effect. I am sure that the people are very sore on this point.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Well, what are the desires of the general public?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I will discuss that in a moment.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Come on, what are they? Tell me, and I shall be pleased, too.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The general public does not want the present facilities taken away.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Does that include Sundays, too?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Is that the general public, or a small minority?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Have a referendum on those questions and the honourable member will see what the minority is.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You would have complete chaos if you did that.

The Hon. L. R. HART: What will we get out of the present referendum?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You won't get chaos.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Last evening's *News* had something to say about it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Come off it!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Facilities enjoyed by most people at present are Friday night and Saturday morning shopping. We are not asking the general public whether it desires a continuance of Saturday morning shopping in addition to Friday night shopping: we are asking it only whether it wishes to have Friday night shopping. In its favour, the Government has said that if the vote is "Yes" it will introduce legislation to provide for Friday night shopping, but the Government has not said (and I do not think it is willing to say) that the Labor Party favours Saturday morning shopping in addition to Friday night shopping.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think the policy speech did.

The Hon. L. R. HART: If we considered the categories of people affected by this referendum we would realize that it concerned first-class and second-class citizens as a result of the question to be asked in the referendum. It is to be asked only of people living in a defined area. Thousands of people living in districts on the fringe of this defined area take advantage of shopping facilities available within the area, but they will not be asked for an opinion and will not be given the chance to say whether they wish to have Friday night shopping, or whether they prefer Saturday morning shopping. Possibly this is the Labor Party's idea of one vote one value: it certainly does not give a loading in favour of country people, because they are not being given a voice regarding Friday night shopping in the metropolitan area. We should face the fact that country people are closely involved in shopping in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Most country areas now are free from shopping restrictions: they can open at any time.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Of course they are not.

The Hon. L. R. HART: But this move will take it away from them.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We are not taking anything away from country people.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is entitled to make his own speech. The Hon. Mr. Hart.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Honourable members interjecting have something to answer for and, no doubt, they will do it in their own

good time. I make the point that we are to have first-class citizens in the metropolitan area and second-class citizens in country areas. We have come to understand what this means when dealing with the Electoral Act and the Constitution Act, but I should have thought that we would never reach the stage when we would have this discrimination when discussing the Early Closing Act. It is the policy of the present Government that country people are not to be given a voice concerning shopping hours in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about their own areas?

The Hon. L. R. HART: They have their own areas, but thousands of them are interested in shopping in the metropolitan area. Many shopping complexes on the fringe of the metropolitan area would not be there if it were not for the trade of people who are not living in the defined area. I think I have made the point that this referendum is most unnecessary, and that this is unsatisfactory legislation. However, as this is a House of Review I think it is our responsibility to try to make something out of it and to make it workable and worth while. Therefore, we should consider what alternatives we can introduce to make it effective and acceptable to the general public.

I said earlier that this legislation was introduced with an ulterior motive, and I stand by that statement. I do not think that this issue should be considered on the same day as a by-election, particularly when the referendum will virtually force a compulsory vote in half the district but the other half will have a voluntary vote. After all, under the Constitution, for a by-election for the Legislative Council the voting is voluntary. I think we are justified in considering whether the referendum should be held on a day different from the by-election. I know the Labor Party will say (and it already has) that if the referendum were held on a different day it could be accused of extravagance. I accuse it of extravagance in introducing this legislation, particularly in view of the remarks that I have already made. It has been stated by a Government spokesman that if the referendum were held on a different day the increased cost to the State would be about \$10,000 only. That is not a large additional sum to be spent on a referendum that is estimated to cost up to \$100,000. I believe that the general public wanted the question of shopping hours to be considered outside the issues

associated with a by-election. The other question that we should consider in relation to clause 13, which makes voting compulsory, is that, if the referendum is to be held on the same day as the by-election (voting for which is voluntary), voting for it, too, should be voluntary.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They both should be compulsory.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I think the vote on the referendum should be voluntary. I believe we should consider whether more questions should be asked in the referendum. One could easily add several more questions, but we do not wish to create chaos, as was suggested by the Minister of Agriculture a few moments ago. To have a question concerning Saturday morning trading would not cause chaos. After all, it is a facility that is enjoyed by almost all people at present, so we should ask the people if they wish it to be continued. Also, we have the vexed question of unrestricted shopping hours, on which I make my stand clear. I doubt whether this State could sustain unrestricted shopping hours, because under the wage structure a person working outside the normal Monday to Friday period must receive penalty rates. Perhaps this question would create chaos.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Hear, hear!

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am not suggesting that it should be included in the referendum. The other question we should consider is whether the referendum should apply to the whole State. After all, why should it apply only in the metropolitan area? Why should people not in the metropolitan area not be given the opportunity of expressing their wishes? I know the Government has said it will bring in legislation to enable country people to express their views, but it will not be in the same way because, whatever the country people's wishes expressed by some form of referendum in their own area are, the Minister will still have the power of veto. I do not know which Minister it will be, but I presume it will be the Minister of Labour and Industry who will have the last say. He will be able to say whether a particular area can have early closing or late closing. So it is no good saying that the country people will be given the opportunity of expressing their wishes in due course; this is not true. However, I know that the Government is anxious to get this legislation through.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I cannot imagine why!

The Hon. L. R. HART: I will do all in my power to help it on this but I maintain it is our responsibility in this Council to make this legislation workable, effective and worth while. Having expressed those views, I support the second reading.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): A referendum that is well arranged and has carefully selected terms of reference can give a sound opinion of the feelings of the majority of those people who are being canvassed. By "well arranged", one must mean well balanced and free from extraneous influences; by "carefully selected terms of reference", one must assume that it has been made crystal clear what is desired to be ascertained.

This Bill provides for a referendum in certain House of Assembly districts on the question of trading hours for certain shops in the metropolitan area. To me, what is to be ascertained is not crystal clear. I am sure that, were a referendum held to ask the people involved in this referendum whether they were clear on the terms of this Bill, the Government might get a surprise; perhaps it would not. A well-planned referendum can be an invaluable guide to the Government of the day if it is held on a contentious social or civic issue on which it seeks to feel the pulse of the people, but even in those circumstances it is not necessarily an adequate criterion. There are issues on which any Government can be clearly in conflict with the people; yet, because this Government wishes to introduce ideological principles, however different its views may be from those of the mass of the people, it claims it has the right, even the duty, to use its majority to press through the issue concerned, whatever the opposition may be; and, with an adequate majority in the House of Assembly, it can do this.

To achieve, as I see it, a just and fair result, the terms of any referendum must be carefully chosen to cover entirely all the points to be clarified. Are the facts to be established in this referendum clearly enunciated for the voters to understand? I have said that I do not think so, because only one question is being asked, and on the answer to this one question by a selected number of people several decisions will be made subsequently.

To ask merely whether shops shall stay open until 9 p.m. on Fridays without relating the question to other points already forming part of the weekend shopping scene is almost as pointless and impracticable as asking a man

when he stopped beating his mother-in-law. What alternative types of referendum can there be? They can be voluntary or compulsory; there can be either full voting rights or restricted voting rights. This referendum is compulsory but limited within a section in the context of the State. I have never believed in compulsory voting, because it is allied to authoritarianistic methods. It says, "Having been given the right to vote, you will use it—or else."

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Or else what?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: You will be punished.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You will be fined.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: No, punished.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Well, fined.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: No, punished. This referendum creates an even more obnoxious situation. First, some people in one part of the State will have the right to express a view at least on Friday night shopping in a limited area of the State. Secondly, they will be compelled to attend at the poll (whatever they do with their voting papers) even though abstention may be their desire or in accord with their conscience in some cases. Thirdly, their vote will be used to decide matters for which this one isolated question was never designed. Fourthly, to add insult to injury, the Government has decided to hold the referendum on the same day as the Midland by-election to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Hon. Mr. Rowe.

Surely this is a form of oil mixing with water. The voting on the referendum on shopping hours is compulsory: the voting for the by-election for the Legislative Council is, by Act of Parliament, voluntary. The by-election is covered only in part by the area to be covered by the referendum. Not only, therefore, are referendum voters to be forced to the poll but only half, or less than half, of the by-election voters will be allowed their statutory right to attend the poll if they so desire or, if they wish, to stay away. I have wondered how the mechanics of the two polls will be worked in the compulsory section of the electorates. I presume that a voter will arrive, announce his name and be given a referendum voting paper. Does he then come to a full stop or will he be told, "Your name is on the Legislative Council roll", and will the paper for that be handed to him? No-one will convince me that, in those circumstances, constitutionally the full freedom to choose whether or not to vote

exists. There are so many better alternatives to the referendum in its present terms (or lack of them). It denies expression of opinion to the vast majority of the State. What about the people in the South-East and elsewhere who, too, like to buy food to eat and clothes to wear? This referendum clouds the by-election issue by destroying the spirit and unduly influencing the truly voluntary nature of the vote of more than half the Legislative Council electors by a select electorate. If this question is a burning issue (and we presume that it must be), will the vote in this referendum be in keeping with the so-called right to choose? Extending that same vote throughout the State would give the appearance of more justice. Different days for the two polls would ensure that neither poll unduly influenced the other. The addition of other questions would at least give a clearer indication of the people's views. According to certain straw votes, it is expected that at least 70 per cent will vote "Yes" on the present question. Therefore, why should a poll be held at all? With this in mind, I support the second reading of the Bill on the understanding that more can be said during the Committee stage.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In rising to speak to this measure I indicate that I am opposed to the Bill as it stands. That is not to say that I do not intend to support the second reading, because I believe that in Committee it may be possible to improve the Bill in such a way as to make it more acceptable. However, I am opposed to the Bill as it stands in so far as the date of the referendum is concerned, because I think this is almost an unethical procedure; I am opposed in so far as it is applied to 4½ House of Assembly districts in Midland and it is even intended to divide one particular district in order to conduct a referendum in areas that are probably favourable to the Government; and I am opposed to it in so far as the one inadequate question which it is proposed to bring forward is concerned.

I believe that the bringing forward of this referendum at the time that it is intended to be put to the people is a blatant political move. I think my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Hart, said this afternoon that there would be some repetition in this debate, and I agree with that. I think the Hon. Mr. Hart may have been the person who said that this was a blatant political move, and I must endorse that remark.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: With an ulterior motive.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, I agree with the word "ulterior" as well.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You can't find words to describe it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I agree that it is hard to describe, and perhaps the Minister of Agriculture may find it difficult to describe. Even more blatant, in my opinion, is the move to add the municipality of Gawler and split the electoral district in halves just to suit the Government's purpose. As I said earlier, I am not necessarily opposed to a referendum as such if it is presented to the people in adequate terms and if it is not confused with a by-election. I believe that the Midland by-election (which, as some people have said, is by the law of the State to be conducted on a voluntary basis) and this referendum, which is to be conducted on a compulsory basis, being held on the same day in the greater part of the Midland District as far as population is concerned and the greater part as far as actual electoral districts are concerned (being 4½ districts out of eight) is something that approaches the unethical and is quite unsuitable and unwise.

Clause 3 provides that as soon as convenient after the commencement of the Act the Governor may by proclamation fix a date for the referendum. It has been stated in debate that it is intended that the referendum will be held on September 12. I consider that this is not, as I have said, really an ethical decision because it does tend to confuse a shopping hours question on a compulsory basis with the election, on a voluntary basis, of a member to succeed the late Hon. Colin Rowe. I believe that this is quite wrong, and I oppose that situation entirely.

I believe further that the questions that are to be brought forward should be more detailed. I will go into that in a moment or two. The people who are to consider these questions should have at least a month to consider them and they should have time to consider a "Yes" case and a "No" case. So far as I am aware, there is no actual constitutional provision for a referendum in this State. I wish to quote a few words from the speech which you, Mr. President, made in this Chamber on September 23, 1965, on this very subject. At page 1715 of *Hansard* for 1965-66, you said:

It is a fundamental principle of referenda that a Bill should be presented for the legislative sanction of the people, and that is the procedure where referenda are part of the constitution of a country—

I endorse the suggestion (in fact, what I might call "principle") that a Bill should be presented so that the people know exactly what it is all about and they would be able to record a more informed vote. That matter was raised this afternoon. You, Sir, went on to say:

—and that is the procedure where referenda are part of the constitution of a country. The nearest we have to it here is the Commonwealth Constitution under which occasional referenda are held, and in those cases there is first of all a Bill and then a case prepared for the affirmative, sponsored by the Government, and for the negative sponsored by someone else. That information is given to every elector in order that any person may make an intelligent decision on the issues submitted.

This ought to be the practice with any referendum that is held by a State Government as this one is being held. I believe, first, that if there is to be a referendum the questions should be somewhat more detailed, as I have said, and then the people should be given time to study these questions and make (in your own words, Sir) an "intelligent decision on the issues submitted".

The prescribed question in clause 4 in this:

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

I would suggest that that is quite an inadequate question upon which to go to the people on a referendum, and that it is not a proper use of public money to sponsor a referendum on that question alone in this situation. I would suggest that the question should be widened. The first question should be, "Are you in favour of any change in the present trading hours throughout your district?" (and the answer could be "Yes" or "No"). If the answer is "Yes" the voter could be asked the following questions:

1. Do you favour shops being permitted (and I say, not obliged) to remain open until 12 noon on Saturdays?
2. Do you favour shops being permitted (and certainly not obliged) to remain open on Saturday afternoons?
3. Do you favour shops being permitted to be open on Friday nights until 9 o'clock?

I believe that if these questions were asked of the people there might be some justification for holding this referendum. The proper presentation of it, however, would be to give a "Yes" and a "No" case. I wonder why this has not been done and why such a Bill has not been introduced. I have said nothing about Sunday shopping, because I would be sorry if that operated more widely than it does now. The general public are

catered for, to some extent, by the delicatessens which are allowed to open and which—we are told—will be open on a wider scale. As I understand that some businesses concerned with shopping hours do not wish to make Sunday trading an issue, perhaps the referendum could be confined to the questions I have presented. At present I am checking a petition that has been signed by about 10,000 people seeking some widening of the question on the basis that I have indicated. Unfortunately, there was not time for this petition to be checked completely and available for this afternoon's session. I intend, with your permission, Mr. President, to present it tomorrow afternoon.

If the referendum is to be conducted at all I believe that it should be on the basis of wider questions, so that a more informed answer would be available than would be obtained at present. Also, it should not be held on the same day as the Midland by-election, because this action is not justified. The Government intends to conduct the referendum in 28½ House of Assembly districts, but only in 4½ of those districts would there be any duplication of voting if the referendum were held on a different day. Clause 13 provides that voting shall be compulsory but, although I will not make an issue of that now, I believe that voting should be voluntary at all times. It should be voluntary voting for local government elections, for the Legislative Council, and for the House of Assembly, as it is in many other countries. This would give a more informed opinion, as then people would vote because they were interested and because they had some knowledge of the subject about which they were voting.

Under the system of compulsory voting a person who is uninformed but who votes because he wishes to avoid the penalty and who votes down the card (the so-called donkey vote) may cause a different result from that expected. Firmly believing in voluntary voting, I cannot give any support (to put it mildly) to clause 13. Although I intend to support the second reading of this Bill, I believe there is no real need for this referendum. The Hon. Mr. Hart said that there was an ulterior motive behind it, and I believe that that is the case. I quote a leading article of the *News*, which is usually fairly close to the people and which does not follow slavishly my side of politics.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A good bush paper.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The honourable gentleman on the front bench loves the *News* sometimes and hates it at other times. A leading article under the heading "Poll no Answer"—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is only their opinion.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think it is an informed opinion.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Probably a news boy wrote that editorial.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The article states:

The planned referendum doesn't look like bringing a satisfactory solution to the shopping hours controversy. This is becoming patently clear as public confusion mounts over the whole question of trading hours. The referendum on September 12, based on the single question of whether people want shopping on Friday nights, would merely touch upon the whole complex question of existing trading laws. I believe that if a referendum is held it should be on a wider basis.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You would not let the public have a vote on Sunday trading, would you?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I did not say that I would not let them have a vote on it: I said I thought that it was undesirable.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You could not support Sunday trading?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not. The article continues:

It would not satisfy all segments associated with retail trading, including shop assistants. Even the broader base for a referendum recommended by the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House, Mr. DeGaris, wouldn't cover the situation properly.

With this I do not entirely agree. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris made valuable contributions and suggestions last week. The article continues:

Perhaps it would be best if the referendum were dropped, and the Government called the parties involved together again to try and hammer out the most workable agreement for both the public and the shopping interests.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's been going on for 10 years.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The article continues:

In the end, the best idea might still be the one put forward by the member for Playford, Mr. T. McRae—

it seems that he is a lone wolf and will have to be brought into line by Caucus—

to leave shopping hours, including Friday night shopping, as they are, but stop trading on Saturday afternoons and Sundays. The Government's plan for a 5½-day week for butchers and bakers largely caters for this.

I would say that while most of the article is largely correct this last paragraph is completely correct when it states:

The single-question referendum as it is now has no chance of reflecting what the public really wants.

I agree with that, and it is only because I believe that in Committee we may be able to improve this Bill to the extent that it may be of some use to the community that I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I fully appreciate that the Government is facing difficult problems concerning this whole question. As the metropolitan area has developed, existing laws and regulations have been applied in such a way that we have a differential now in the shopping hours between the older parts of metropolitan Adelaide and the newer fringe suburbs that have established themselves around that older part. It is inevitable that, with the natural increase in population and housing, a problem of this kind will confront any Government. Some efforts should be made to establish a more orderly shopping practice.

In my view, this does not necessarily mean that a Government should take away from people their existing privileges, rights and practices in regard to shopping hours. I do not altogether agree with opinions that have been expressed about Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning shopping in some of these fringe suburbs. I have passed by some of these areas (one I have in mind is near Reynella) on a Sunday morning and have seen many people using the shopping facilities there. They have been doing this now for some years and it has become a part of their routine, but the Government intends to restrict them and stop them from doing this.

The Government should be careful before it finally makes a change that will take away from people in an area such as this some shopping facilities available to them at present. If it does propose to affect the people in that area and stop them from going to the supermarkets on a Saturday afternoon and stop the people in the northern areas who find that shopping on a Saturday afternoon is in their best interests, as customers, it should tread warily.

In these new areas generally, I believe the present powers should remain as they are. I am sure people will vote on this one question in those areas and tell the Government in no uncertain manner that they at least want the Friday night shopping hours retained. What

the people are fearful of, as has been reflected in letters to the press and newspaper editorials, if the Government puts only this one question to them, is what it has in mind ultimately for Saturday morning shopping.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That was in the second reading explanation.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes; I read it.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Does the honourable member not believe what he read there?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer to the matter the Minister has raised about the second reading speech, which I heard. It states that during the present Parliament the Government does not intend to do anything about Saturday mornings. But what does the Government discuss with the union involved? I put it to the Minister that the Government has discussed with the union the question along these lines. It has said to the union that it will not swap Saturday morning for Friday night.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: This is pure supposition on your part.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is, and I am waiting for the Minister to deny it. If the Minister listens instead of talking, perhaps we can enter into a worthwhile debate.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: We cannot listen to suppositions. You have to be honest about it and listen to facts. Hypothetical questions can be rolled out at any time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think the Minister must be on tender ground on this matter.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should forget the private debate and get on with his speech.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think the people are fearful about Saturday morning shopping. They have received an assurance that the Government during the term of this Parliament does not intend to touch Saturday morning shopping, but there is a fear in the public mind that ultimately the Labor Party wants to cut out Saturday morning shopping.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Rubbish!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One reason why I believe the Labor Party simply wants to deal with this one question in isolation on this occasion is that it wants to take this matter in sequence over the years and ultimately endeavour to implement changes as its unions want it to implement them. I think that in the long term people generally will be dissatisfied with and upset by the measures which over a period of years the Labor Party would like to introduce in regard to this whole matter.

Therefore, I repeat that, so far as the outer areas are concerned, my personal view is that the shopping hours should remain as they are and the people who are shopping and enjoying those hours at present should be allowed to retain them and continue shopping. I do not think much harm will be done to anyone if the present position is left as it is.

Generally speaking, I favour Friday night shopping in the inner metropolitan area. I know that amongst shopkeepers themselves there is great opposition to this but, with the development of vast new regional shopping centres in this older metropolitan area, considerable advantage and benefit can be had by people if they have the opportunity for a family outing on Friday night with shopping facilities available.

Similarly, in regard to Rundle Street and the big retailers there, many of whom, of course, have built shops in the outer regions and open them on Friday nights, it would be a good thing if they were given the right, if they so wished (and that is what this referendum will say; it will not force people to open on Friday nights), to open on those nights. However, the question should not remain there. I have some views about the advisability of (in fact, the need for) staggered shopping hours generally for our large stores. I recall that in America some nine years ago I saw examples of staggered hours where some, but not all, of the large emporiums opened on some evenings of the week. There was no serious question of staffing, because those same shops did not open their doors until about mid-morning, so the total hours worked were the same as they would ordinarily have been. This provided facilities for the people, which they enjoyed and used.

The whole question opens up the matter of a heavier load on our transport system, and it becomes a big question. But all that kind of investigation would flow if this matter of Friday night shopping was opened up and shops in the inner metropolitan area were given the opportunity to open on Friday nights. I do not think the question of prices, which has been raised in this debate, is very important, because we have simple examples now where on Friday nights one can buy goods from the large emporiums in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide more cheaply than one can in the larger emporiums within the city of Adelaide.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Is that because it is cheaper to run them?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No; it is largely tied up with the question of volume of turnover. This is what the shops want to develop. This is all part of the fierce competition that exists, and should exist, between large retailers in this State. It brings better facilities and services to the shoppers, many of whom deserve great consideration in this matter.

The Government is not delving into this question in any depth at all: it is really only scratching the surface of the problem in seeking an expression of opinion about only one particular matter. It would be wise to widen the question on which the people's views are sought. I shall support the second reading and consider any amendments that are moved during the Committee stage.

The political aspect of this Bill has been very ably stressed today; it is that aspect which is most important to the Government. The Government is endeavouring to win the Midland by-election through the tactics of holding this referendum on the same day as that by-election. I do not think any Government member would deny that it is a political manoeuvre. It is patently clear to everyone that the Government is taking the people to the polls not with tremendous interest in the shopping question but in an endeavour to win another seat in this Council. I believe that this political aspect takes first priority in the minds of Government members.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): The honourable member who has just spoken has raised many hypothetical issues. One can raise such issues one after the other and endeavour to frame an argument around them to obscure the real position. One honourable member claimed that this Bill was introduced with an ulterior motive. What is it? I cannot even think of one. Perhaps the Opposition can.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you perfectly genuine?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. Secondly, twice this afternoon it has been claimed that the Government succumbed to the demands of trade unions for decreased shopping hours, but I do not know of any deal made with the trade unions in connection with this matter. All I know is that the trade unions want some semblance of sanity and uniformity in trading hours. The definition of the metropolitan area in the Early Closing Act has not been changed since 1926. Now, in 1970, some honourable members are claiming that nothing should be done. Let us have some sanity.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Who is claiming that nothing should be done?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: After South Australia had for many years lagged behind the other States in connection with licensing laws, the previous Labor Government restored sanity in that field. South Australian hotels had to close at 6 p.m., whilst New South Wales hotels, some of which were only 150 yards away from some South Australian hotels, closed at 10 p.m. This was absolutely ridiculous. The same kind of criticism can be made of the present provisions of the Early Closing Act. It is ridiculous that some shops must be closed on Friday evenings whilst shops on the other side of the street can remain open.

The question of defining the metropolitan area was considered very thoroughly. One honourable member said that the country person is being regarded as a second-class citizen, whilst the metropolitan person is being regarded as a first-class citizen. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life, because shops in most country districts are now able to remain open at will. Shops in Naracoorte, Murray Bridge and many other country towns are allowed to do this. Why should we ask people in such towns to vote on a question that has nothing at all to do with them? This matter concerns people in the defined area and, of course, a few sections of people who will vote in the Midland by-election. The Government has been criticized because it plans to spend some money to hold the referendum.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Because you are passing the buck.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If we combine the by-election and the referendum, we shall save money.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Perhaps the price of a press secretary.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Opposition members have said that the more the Government spends the more it will go into the red. Let us be sincere about this matter. If we want to do the State a service, let us save some money. One honourable member said that it would not make any difference; only a very small proportion of the people involved will be asked to vote in the Midland by-election. We have heard that it should be a voluntary vote, not a compulsory vote. The Upper House in South Australia is the only House

in Australia that is elected by a voluntary vote.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about New South Wales?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will concede that point, which is well made. The Upper House in New South Wales is elected by both Houses of Parliament, not by the people. However, in connection with voting by the people, this is the only House in Australia elected on a restricted franchise. Let us not kid ourselves. A few years ago a Senate election and a referendum were held on the same day. I think the nexus was one question and a question on Aborigines was another, but I did not hear any complaints on that occasion from members opposite, apparently because a Liberal Government was in office in Canberra. Correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that most of the members of the Council are members of the Liberal and Country League, or is it the Liberal and Country Party? I do not know whether the Party changed its name or whether it became affiliated with the Country Party. I heard both names mentioned this afternoon. One never hears any criticism of the Commonwealth Liberal Government for having a Senate election and a referendum on the one day.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Because the Constitution states that it must hold a compulsory referendum.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am not talking about a compulsory referendum but about the fact that there was a Senate election and a referendum on the same day. It has been said today that such a thing should not happen, but this has been done by the Commonwealth Government: if it is good enough for the Commonwealth, it is good enough for us. It probably saved the Commonwealth considerable money, and it will probably do the same for this State's Treasury. The Government has been accused of being extravagant in introducing this measure.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: We thought you were elected to govern.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Hon. Mr. Hill claimed that this was a hypothetical question and that the Labor Party would alter Saturday morning trading after the term of this Parliament. The Labor Government is in power today for the term of this Parliament. Should it even now try to do this, the honourable member would be the first to say, "Public opinion might be different in three

years time." The Labor Party is in power, and there will be no alteration to Saturday morning trading. I believe this, and I would be the first one to oppose any alteration to Saturday morning trading.

No deal has been made to my knowledge (and I think I can speak for the Party in general and as a Cabinet Minister who knows what is going on), so the Hon. Mr. Hill should accept my word for this. If he is not prepared to accept my word he can pose more hypothetical questions, but that is the best I can do for him in the circumstances. All that this measure sets out to do is to get uniformity in an area that has not been touched since 1926. In the meantime the State has grown considerably within the metropolitan area, and we have defined the metropolitan area to take in all parts that are necessary at this stage. Once you get outside that area you are in country districts and, with all respect to the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and the Hon. Mr. Hart, the people in country areas are not affected one iota, because if they want to shop in their own town they are at liberty to have their town opened up for trading. However, many of these country towns do not want to open until 9 p.m. on Friday. I could name a dozen small towns in the country that would not adhere to the idea of opening until that time. No doubt honourable members opposite could mention another dozen towns within their own districts.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: That would be hypothetical!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. I mentioned a couple of towns which he knows quite well.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: They might want to open on Saturday afternoon.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Come on! It is not a hypothetical question, because the honourable member knows the situation in small towns. Take Olary, Mannahill, Cockburn or Parachilna; not one of those small towns wants to open until 9 p.m. on Fridays.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Stores in those towns are open at any time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They are not, because in some places there is not even a store. So the honourable member would not know.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Parachilna is the only one without a store.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Is the honourable member sure of that?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Minister is telling the story.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am asking the honourable member, because he does not know. He cannot force me into that issue, because he does not know those towns as well as I do. I have lived in that area all my life and I know those towns as well as I know the back of my hand. These are some of the problems that exist in country districts, and to say that these people should have a say in what goes on in the metropolitan area is, to me, absolutely ridiculous. With all due respect to the honourable member, I do not think he meant it in that way, but that is how it must be interpreted because it does not appear within the metropolitan area. It is not a hypothetical case but a factual case. From my experience of Saturday night trading (and my experience goes back to before the Second World War), in most cases it was beneficial in many ways. War broke out and it was decided to restrict Friday night shopping for good reasons. Since then, we have seen much growth in the metropolitan area outside of the area covered by the Early Closing Act. That area was defined back in 1926 and no great effort has been made to introduce a semblance of sanity into trading hours in this State. They almost got out of hand; a Labor Government attempted to do something back in 1965-68, but was accused of not doing anything.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: What did the Government attempt to do then?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: A committee was set up to inquire into all aspects of trading in the State. I understand that the previous Government attempted to do the same thing, and I would be interested to know what committee it set up and what its findings were. I give the present Government full marks for taking the step it has taken in introducing the referendum. It was not any easy decision. Honourable members opposite may smile. However, I think a referendum is the fairest way of giving the people an opportunity to express their opinion on what they want and do not want. We were criticized in a similar way when the lottery legislation was first mooted. When we said we would give the people an opportunity to decide whether or not they wanted a lottery we got the same opposition that we are getting today.

Let us not kid ourselves on this matter. We are asking the opinion of people who are vitally concerned with this one issue. We have not clouded the issue. It is no good coming up with two or three suggestions in a referendum. Let us be specific about this: a

referendum is never designed to trick or hoodwink the people, but has always been clear cut. The people either want something or they do not want it. In this case, we have asked the people to vote on Friday night shopping. They either want it or they do not want it. No mention has been made of Saturday morning trading, as the Hon. Mr. Hill attempted to imply, but he has been assured on this matter by the Minister's second reading explanation. He has been given an assurance again this afternoon, and I do not know just what more assurance he wants. Let us be quite specific about this, and let us be genuinely interested in the people who are vitally concerned, without trying to confuse the issue any more. We have a clear-cut case before us, and we want to put a clear-cut case to the people to ascertain whether or not they want Friday night shopping. I think we should do this without trying to cloud the issue, because it is in the interests of the people generally that the issue be not clouded.

We should review this matter and in doing so we should consider the people who will be affected. I sincerely hope that members in this Chamber will let sanity prevail and realize that this is a very simple matter and that it is being presented to the people as simply as possible. I think the people want a simple question so that they can give a simple "Yes" or "No" answer to it. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to oppose the Bill. First, in my opinion it is extremely undemocratic. Secondly, I believe it is a blatant piece of political chicanery. Thirdly, it only scratches the surface of the problem of trading hours; and, fourthly, the Government is bound only on the one question of whether shopkeepers can keep open on Friday nights if they so desire. I hope I have made my position quite clear.

I say that the Bill is undemocratic because it covers only a small section of the electors. Secondly, I believe it is undemocratic because advantage has been taken of the day of a Legislative Council by-election to make it a compulsory vote. Thirdly, the fact that we deal only with Friday night shopping is not, to my way of thinking, getting at the core of the situation to which the Minister who has just resumed his seat has alluded. If we have had no revision of the legislation on this matter since 1926, surely now is the right time to have a full-scale referendum on what the people want and not just pass it off with only one question for the referendum.

It must be remembered that in a good deal of this area at present the people have Friday night shopping. This already exists in Elizabeth, Gawler, Para Hills and Tea Tree Gully and in other areas to the south of Adelaide, so by just asking those people what they want is like someone going out to prove that water is wet; it is about as logical as that. It has been said that the Commonwealth Government held a referendum on a Senate voting day. Well, of course it did, because its own Constitution says that it can do that. However, what people did not say anything about was that there was a properly prepared case for both a "Yes" vote and "No" vote, after a Bill was first introduced.

The opposition of those days to the lotteries referendum was only on this matter: it was not on whether we ought to find out from the people whether lotteries should be introduced. It was thought at the time (and, what is more, it has stood the test of time) that had a Bill been brought into the House and had the issues been clearly known many people might not have voted the way they did, because many things were included in that Bill that people did not visualize. I am sure even to this day that many people would have liked to see the issue more clearly defined.

This issue must go very much further than just the matter of whether or not shops keep open on Friday night. Although there have been many statements that are confusing to the public and certainly to me, it would appear that, without there being any necessity for an expression of opinion by the people, the baking hours in South Australia will be restricted to five days. As I understand it, the Government has already undertaken to bring this about. That did not need a referendum; apparently that was one matter on which the Government thought it was on safe ground.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That was stated in our policy speech.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I understand that there were many things in your policy speech. What about this issue? The Government does not have a mandate for this.

The Hon. A. J. Snaad: Yes we do.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This one is on another matter altogether.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No it is not: this is part of the whole system. The Minister cannot pick just the pretty cherries: he has to pick all of them. My honest belief is that the Government at the present time would not like to get an expression of opinion on Saturday morning trading or on Saturday afternoon

trading or anything else, because it would then be bound by what the public voted. However, it has stated that it is prepared to be bound with regard to Friday night trading. Everybody, whether they want to be in it or not, will be bound by this referendum if a "Yes" vote is returned.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: In the metropolitan area.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is not just the metropolitan area: it is a very large section of the State, because the people come great distances to many of these shopping areas. One has only to go to these shopping areas on Friday nights to see the extent of the shopping.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Why do people go to these areas when many country areas are in free areas not covered by the Act?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think people have become used to good Liberal and Country League Government in South Australia over a very long period and that they have become used to having a little bit of freedom to do what they like. The Minister of Agriculture a short time ago said that the main purpose of this measure was to get some uniformity. Well, there is no doubt that it will be uniform, for the idea is that people must either get into line or be out of it altogether. That is certainly uniformity but it is nothing but blatant Socialism—everybody will open at the same time, everybody will get out of bed at the same time, everybody will catch the same train, and it will cost the State much more money. My own feeling on the matter is that we ought to be allowed a little freedom. I am quite sincere when I say to the Minister in charge of this Bill that the whole matter ought to be canvassed thoroughly for all the aspects of what we can do in this matter of trading; it should not be restricted to one paltry thing.

I would not object to the Government's having a referendum at all, provided it really set out to find out the wishes of the people. I also think that the Government ought to hold the referendum on a day other than the day on which there is a Legislative Council by-election in this State. Whether the Government likes it or not, the present law states that voting for Legislative Council elections shall be voluntary. The same Government, when last in office, compiled one roll for the House of Assembly and for the Legislative Council, but as the by-election is being held to fill a vacancy caused by the death of a former member the voting should be volun-

tary. I wish to make one or two other points in view of the likelihood that someone will read the Hon. Mr. Casey's speech later, and get the wrong impression. The Licensing Act referendum was sparked by a motion in another place moved by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Steele Hall, and when it was carried by sufficient numbers in the other House the Government had no alternative but to proceed with it. I want to get the record straight on that point, because the Minister was quick to give us the benefit of his knowledge on some things. In dealing with specific matters in the Bill, all I can say is that it is just a big local option poll.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What's wrong with that?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Nothing, except that voting is voluntary for a local option poll. This is a collective poll on a local option. If the Government is sure of the result, or if the pressures on it are so great that it has to do something in a hurry, then for goodness sake let the Government consider it sufficiently so that we will obtain a more flexible Early Closing Act. I understand that fish shops and poultry shops will be allowed to remain open at all times.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They are doing it now.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The people in Elizabeth know that, but it may not be so in future.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This is in line with suggestions you people made in your Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I want something more than probabilities: I want to know definitely.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Then why not read my second reading explanation and you would know.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Will fish shops have to close at mid-day on Saturday, and if the present facilities—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: A fish shop is an exempted shop.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is what I am asking.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It is now.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Will it be exempted after the new Bill is passed?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The exempted shops will not be interfered with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Sir Norman Jude): Order! The Minister will have the opportunity to reply.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: What is being done is to increase the number of things that may be sold in delicatessens.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: If you knew what's in the Act you would realize there are certain exempted shops.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Where does it state—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: In the Early Closing Act there are certain types of exempted shops.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, but there is nothing in the Bill. What about shops selling garden plants at the weekend?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What operates now with regard to exempted shops will operate in future.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: At present the Lazy Lamb operates—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He won't operate in any case on Saturday afternoon or Sunday.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am not Anna carrying a banner for anyone. I am trying to ascertain whether Lazy Lamb will be able to operate in the outside areas.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't worry about that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There is no need for the Chief Secretary to get touchy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am not touchy, but I do not like those who want to open shops and make things difficult on the Sabbath.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am delighted with my Christian friend and his attitude towards the Sabbath. What happens if these people go to Two Wells and open there after this dragnet is introduced?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It will operate throughout the State.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is interesting, but all people in the State cannot get a vote to decide this question.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Saturday afternoons and Sundays will not be allowed: it has been announced.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It has been made clear about bread baking.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It has been made clear about meat.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not think so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes it has, and we made that point.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If these things are in the—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: If you read *Hansard* you would find out. A statement was made about meat.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have read *Hansard* and the Minister's second reading explanation.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It is not in the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not take much notice of the explanation: I take notice of what is contained in the Bill, because that is the basis on which the Act works. I have asked these questions because these details are not clearly defined and we do not know (and probably the Government does not know) what is to happen, and we are confused. Until the Bill is placed in order I will not support it. I would support a referendum on a question of general shopping hours that would ascertain what people want and what classes of shops they want to remain open, but I am not prepared to buy a pig in a poke, because that is all this is. Many people will have decided what they want to do, but they are likely to be robbed of the privileges they have at present with the question in the referendum in its present form. Alternatives should be available, and it should be a voluntary vote in the same way as voting for a local option poll. Therefore, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): It is astounding how much haze and pollution one can create if one sets out to do so, and I think the honourable member who has just sat down has done exactly that. This is a simple question in a referendum to the public asking whether or not, within a certain area, they want Friday night shopping.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You believe that this is going to be carried?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: People will have the right to say whether they want Friday night shopping in the area concerned. All honourable members are trying to do is what has been done outside: that is, confuse the people. Let us clearly understand that this Bill is dealing with Friday night shopping only.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: But you believe it is going to be carried, anyway.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The clear distinction is that Saturday afternoon and Sunday shopping will be prohibited throughout the State by an amendment to the Early Closing Act.

The Hon. C. R. Story: And delicatessens, too?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Well, make yourself clear.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If the honourable member decides to create a lot of haze and pollution around the place, he does it admirably.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I only seek advice.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member knows as well as I do that this Bill provides for a referendum in respect of shopping hours: it has nothing to do with Saturday afternoon or Sunday trading, which will be dealt with in a subsequent Bill. I did not rise to talk about that. I wanted to reply to the Hon. Mr. Hill and other honourable members who had raised legitimate queries. I want to give an undertaking now and tell this Council that the Premier in another place gave an undertaking that would operate for as long as possible, that is, within the life of this Parliament. We cannot say that nothing will be done in respect of Saturday morning shopping after this Parliament has ended; we cannot commit another Parliament. I know I am not allowed to quote from the *Hansard* reports of this session but, if honourable members look at page 788 of *Hansard*, they will see that the Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. G. R. Broomhill) went further. He said that the Government had come to a conclusion and considered that Saturday morning shopping was essential to the organizations concerned, to the traders and to the community, and the Government had no idea or intention of interfering with it.

I was quite clear in my own mind about it but checked it to make sure I made no mistake. If some honourable members want to cloud this issue and fill it with all the rubbish in the world, they are doing a very good job, but they will not mislead the people, who know whether or not they want to shop on Friday nights. The Hon. Mr. Casey was right when he said that the Government was looking for something within reason that the whole community wanted. The only question in our minds about which we are not sure is the Friday night issue. We have made up our minds on no Saturday afternoon and no Sunday trading, and we will amend the Early Closing Act to provide for that later. We shall be guided by the referendum on the matter of Friday night shopping within a given area. We do not intend to interfere with Saturday morning shopping. That is where I place myself; that is where I stand or fall.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): We have heard some quite good speeches this afternoon and some emotional ones about looking after the interests of and consulting

the people. I believe that probably this is the vital issue involved in the consideration of shopping hours: it is not only the convenience of the people generally but also the position of those people who have developed enterprises under existing conditions and the people who work for them. We must be careful in making any substantial changes that may cause hardship and unemployment. The Hon. Mr. Casey spoke of uniformity as being the answer to all problems, but I point out that many people who are now through their own enterprise enjoying employment in a flourishing business could be put to a big disadvantage with a substantial change in the present trading pattern. Whether or not this referendum will answer the question is doubtful, because there will be people living in the eastern suburbs voting on an issue that could directly affect the livelihood of people living in the northern or southern suburbs. It is not a clear-cut issue: it needs far more investigation.

Many statements have been made that have probably already influenced members of the public. One of them is that this change will mean a substantial rise in the cost of goods and services to the public. As one honourable member has already said today, there is no proof that longer trading hours where they have applied have added to the costs of goods. It is also said that the average person has only so much money to spend. That is true, but it is also true that each person has a choice in spending his money. If some facilities are available and some are not, the priorities can be quite different. For instance, hotels are open until 10 p.m.; also, there are drive-in theatres, T.A.B. facilities on Saturday afternoon and many other fields in which the family money can be spent. The opportunity given to working couples who receive their pay cheque on a Friday to spend their money in the way in which they wish in the late shopping areas does render a service. So there are many issues which have not been raised and which must be raised in arguments for and against a referendum such as this, and time must be given for the public at large to consider these problems.

The Commonwealth Constitution, as was pointed out this afternoon, provides for a Bill to be put before Parliament and then for a referendum to be taken on the full issue, a case for and against being presented at the same time. The issues should be known in this matter and a case prepared for and against. If the people are compelled to vote, as they will be under the provisions of this Bill, there will be a certain percentage of the population

very much in favour of Friday night shopping and extended hours, another section very much against it, and many people who do not care much one way or the other. This could lead to a completely false picture when people who are not interested are forced to vote on a question like this. It has been said this afternoon that this referendum is to take place in the metropolitan area and Gawler and will not affect country areas. This statement was made by the Hon. Mr. Casey. The Minister's second reading speech states definitely that retail butcher shops throughout the State must not open on Saturday afternoons or Sundays.

Following what the Hon. Mr. Casey has said about the problems of the small country town (and there are many of them) with one store, one butcher shop and one baker, which serve a wide area, I remind honourable members that people travel long distances to do their shopping and collect their material. It is common for these shops to open at any time a customer calls. This is a service that is accepted and understood. I believe there are many people within the metropolitan area who have come to accept Saturday afternoon trading, at least in butcher shops. It is strange that this is to be stopped under the Government's proposal, but it would be possible in other places to buy cooked chicken, fish and rabbit quite readily, or a dozen bottles of beer, but not meat from a butcher. At a time when we have a serious over-supply of stock, we have a proposal uniformly to close the main retail avenues.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You would sell just as much in 5½ days.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: That interjection indicates that still more research should be done by many honourable members into conditions prevailing throughout the State. Any proposal to enforce uniformity in distant areas can lead only to confusion and to placing a burden on people who are getting along happily under present conditions. Although some larger country towns have arranged their own trading hours, the Early Closing Act does apply to other country towns. I doubt whether it is wise to abolish the system of petitioning and counter-petitioning; this system gives the people in an area the opportunity to resolve their own problems. The plan to place this matter under the control of the Minister of Labour and Industry is undesirable.

In introducing this Bill and confining it to the question whether we should have Friday night shopping, the Government is avoiding

responsibility. In press statements, Government spokesmen have shifted ground. The Minister's second reading explanation refers to the question of uniform hours throughout the State for butcher shops and the question of petitioning and counter-petitioning. The Government should put the major points of its legislation individually in the referendum and give the people the opportunity to vote on each question. Opposition members are unable to do this because they do not know the Government's intentions: only the Government can bring forward a full list of the proposed alterations. If a referendum is to be held, it should be held on the whole issue, not on one point only.

It seems ludicrous that a Party which, on the one hand, advocated extended hotel trading hours as a service to the public should, on the other hand, advocate shorter trading hours, also in the interests of the public! Surely the Labor Party is being inconsistent in this respect. Surely it is as important for a family to buy its provisions as it is for it to buy its liquor supplies, as the liquor supplies will keep much better than perishable goods. Of course, it depends on whose care they are left in! In many areas there is a give-and-take arrangement between the local storekeeper and the residents. If a person telephones and asks that meat be kept, the butcher will prepare the order, place it in his refrigerator, and hand it to the customer on a Saturday afternoon after sport. These arrangements have worked very well in the country.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Yet you are prepared to give this away by extending the referendum to cover the whole State. If country people are outnumbered by metropolitan people and if metropolitan people say that they do not want Saturday afternoon trading, country people will be denied the facilities you have described.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I have not advocated extending the referendum throughout the State. I criticized the idea of having uniformity throughout the State without giving a say in the matter to people in the area affected. I refer particularly to the question of petitioning and counter-petitioning. Because people's shopping requirements differ from area to area, they should be left to local petitioning and counter-petitioning. Like some other honourable members I believe that the hurried preparation of this Bill and the attempt to bulldoze it through Parliament indicate that the Government is most anxious that the referendum should coincide with the Midland by-election on September 12. It is a political

trick to avoid the principles of the Electoral Act and, I may add, it is a very clever political trick. The purpose of the Midland by-election is to elect a member to take the place of the late Hon. Colin Rowe and is in no way related to the question of shopping hours.

Because some very heated opinions will be expressed on the question of shopping hours, I believe the issue could become clouded. Consequently, the by-election and the referendum should be kept separate. True, a small saving of money would be made if they were held on the same day, but it would be only a very small saving—perhaps the cost of one press secretary. The additional cost involved in having the polls on separate days would be justified by the need to hold the by-election constitutionally and in accordance with the principles of the Electoral Act. I ask the Government to withdraw the Bill and introduce a more comprehensive Bill that sets out the full proposals.

I ask the Government to allow the cases for and against the question to be posted to each elector in a somewhat similar manner to that set out in the Commonwealth Constitution. I believe that only in this way will a true picture be obtained of the people's wishes. Because of the very great effect any drastic change could have on many people who are making their living either as an employer or as an employee and on any enterprise built up under existing conditions, I believe that this is only good common sense. As some honourable members have indicated that they will move amendments to the Bill, I support the second reading but reserve the right to speak on the amendments in Committee.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): To me, it is ridiculous that the Bill should be introduced at all. We have been told not only by the present Government but also by the previous Government, and by the Government before that one, that this is the central State, the State that is going forward, and the State where all things bright and beautiful will occur. Even in today's *Advertiser*, a press report states that South Australia is possibly the only State in Australia that is showing some vitality. The Council has spent the whole day debating whether a referendum should be held of people in the metropolitan area on whether they should be allowed to shop up until 9 p.m. on Friday.

This is just so ridiculous and foolish that it is pathetic to think that we must waste our time on this type of question in 1970. In any major part of the world today, so long as the population and the economic prosperity allow it, trading hours are adjusted in accordance with demand. In very few countries today are restrictions placed on trading hours, which are determined by the relationship of the storekeeper to the people's needs.

I think it is fair to comment that at Elizabeth a trading relationship has been established between the principal stores open until 9 p.m. on Friday and the population. There have been frequent demands from certain areas within the suburbs of Adelaide that have requested a similar type of service. These people want to give it, and there are people who are prepared to take it. Why can we not get on with the business? Why should we have to go as far as having to argue about a referendum, and having a referendum?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why didn't your Government do something about it if it was so keen? There was no Friday night shopping allowed in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: One Government member said by way of interjection or in his speech that there are none so dumb as those who cannot see. However, possibly there are none so blind as those who cannot hear. We have been told that a referendum will be held. The Minister's second reading explanation consisted of many words, among them being that we should have the best sort of inquiry. His second reading explanation states:

The Government intends to introduce a Bill later in the session to provide that non-exempt shops in this enlarged metropolitan area will not be permitted to open on Saturday afternoons or Sundays. . . . The intended Bill will also considerably widen the list of exempted goods.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Who said that?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Minister in his second reading explanation. He continued:

The Government intends that there should be uniform shopping hours within the enlarged metropolitan area. . . . However, provision will be included in that legislation for a local government authority outside the metropolitan area to apply for the creation or abolition of a country shopping district within its area.

Honourable members have been asked to decide whether there should be a referendum of the people in a certain selected area of

the State. We have been assured that the Government intends to do certain things and that the Government's intentions will be carried out. However, I remind the Government and honourable members what the Premier said on a television programme:

After all, we don't take the position, it seems to me, in the community that every law that we make is going to be obeyed in detail or to the letter. Many of our laws will be disobeyed because the community's view is generally different from the law as it stands.

So to whom do we go for the assurance that the Bill is concerned only with the metropolitan area? What guarantee have I to give the traders of Whyalla who are already upset by the proposed legislation and by the fact that they will not have a chance to have a say on the matter when I read in the *Whyalla News*—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This legislation does not affect Whyalla.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: What guarantee have the people of Whyalla, after the referendum has been carried (if it is carried) in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The referendum will be on shopping hours in the enlarged metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I put the question again: because of the nature of the Minister's second reading explanation (in which he did not lay down what will happen but what happens regarding the proposed Bill that may come before Parliament in the future) what guarantee have the people of Whyalla, who are cosmopolitan, who have been trading on Friday nights for many years, who do not want any change in trading hours and who have expressed this opinion in the press either through their Combined Unions Council or through their Chamber of Commerce? I have the Minister's assurance that this legislation will not affect them, but the assurance does not appear in the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I assure you that a Bill will be introduced, and one of the things will be in regard to the country area where the local government authority can approach the Minister on these matters. Surely the local government authority would work on behalf of the people it represents in the district.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The *Sunday Mail* took a straw vote of some sections of the population some time ago and published a report that 70 per cent would vote for the referendum. The Deputy Premier (Hon. J. D.

Corcoran) also said that 70 per cent would vote for the referendum.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He might be a betting man, but I'm not.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Well, we have to go through this ridiculous rigmarole to decide whether shops may stay open until 9 p.m. on Friday. I presume that Good Friday will be excepted, although it is not mentioned in the Bill. What does this mean? Another Government member said that we have been presupposing certain things, but how can he be sure of what the position actually is? Does it mean that, if the people say "Yes" to 9 p.m. shopping on Friday night, all shops will be open, must be open, or may be open? This is an economic fact that must be considered in relation to the population of the area and to the goods and services that can be provided. In Europe, England and Scotland the system is to have seven-day trading.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is that what you want?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The United Kingdom has seven-day trading; instead of everyone taking Saturdays and Sundays off, there is a staggered work force. Those who work on Saturdays take off the Tuesday or the Wednesday or some other selected week day.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are you advocating that here?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The shop assistants in the U.K. still have their 40-hour week spread over 5 or 5½ days; they give a service to the population where the economic needs require it, and the population is able to get service without all this ridiculous rubbish of the Government's not being able to make up its mind on a thing like 9 o'clock closing. We have the other anomaly, brought up again by the Chief Secretary, that, despite the decision of the people in relation to this referendum, butcher shops will not be open on Saturday afternoon or Sunday.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is quite correct.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yet the Minister said, "What would happen if Lazy Lamb went out to, say, Two Wells?" The Minister then said that these controls would operate State-wide.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: On Saturday afternoon and on Sunday.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes, but State-wide.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The previous Labor Government was instrumental in bringing in 10 o'clock closing of hotels.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Many of your people supported it, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: In fact, the Leader of your Party took the credit for it.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: This 10 o'clock closing of hotels applies to the whole State.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It doesn't operate in every hotel.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It applies on Saturday nights, and if there is a licence for dancing, or for some other reason, drinking can go on beyond 10 o'clock on Saturdays.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: One could get a permit before that, anyhow.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The publican is expected also to supply beer for the barbecue on the Sunday. We have a fairly flexible and reasonable system of handling liquor sales at present. Therefore, a restriction on other forms of trading is ridiculous. I cannot support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): It is difficult to understand the Opposition's reasoning in this regard. We have just heard the Hon. Mr. Geddes say that there is no need for such a thing as a referendum in 1970. He said, in effect, that there should be unrestricted shopping seven days a week throughout the State.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: I did not say that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You referred to trading on seven days a week.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member said there should be unrestricted trading. He said that this is 1970, but I remind him that it is 1970 just as much in Oodnadatta or in Wirrabara, where he lives, as it is in the city. What did his Government do about trading for seven days a week? It did not do a thing about it. He said he was worried about certain selected areas. Well, his Government allowed certain selected areas but not other areas to trade during certain hours, so I suggest that his Government provided for certain selected areas when it allowed shopping to operate on Friday night and all over the weekend in Elizabeth and places like that.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, in a speech on another matter, suggested that I should have no right to reply to a speaker who had said something before me because that speaker then did not have the right to reply to me. How ridiculous it is to say that! How are we to answer criticism if we cannot come back at a member

who has already spoken? That was the most ridiculous statement I have ever heard in this Council. I intend to answer members if they put up bad arguments in this place when I have not previously spoken. The honourable member spoke about hardship, and he said he thought that if this referendum went through there might be unemployment. I suggest that if the referendum is carried there might even be room for more employment, because shops throughout the metropolitan area would be open on Friday nights and possibly many more people would be employed as a result.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan was also perturbed because the suburban people would have voting powers that might affect the people living in the northern suburbs. Surely the people living in the northern suburbs had some effect on the people living in the city and the eastern suburbs, yet they were given the right to trade on Friday nights without there being any voting. The honourable member is suggesting the referendum should not take place because people living in the eastern suburbs might have a say as to what will happen in the northern suburbs. However, he was quite happy for the people living in the northern part of the area to carry on as they liked, knowing very well that it affected the livelihood of many people in smaller businesses in the metropolitan area. The honourable member also said the Government was tying this referendum to the time of the Midland by-election, and he suggested that this was trickery. Well, I suggest that if the referendum and the by-election came at the same time and we did not tie them together the Opposition in this Chamber would be the first to accuse the Government of wasting money. It is necessary for the polling booths to be open on September 12, and this is an opportunity for the Government to save money. If, as I have said, the Government had not taken advantage of this, the Opposition would have condemned the Government for not holding the referendum on that day. What did the Opposition do in regard to trading hours when it was in Government? It had representations made to it in December, 1968, by various bodies of people, but it did not do a thing about it.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: That was after your Government had been in office for three years.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: What did the Opposition say during the election campaign about what it was going to do in regard to trading hours? We have heard the Leader of the Opposition in the other place say that there should be unrestricted trading hours, yet he did not do a thing to bring this about

when his Party was in office, nor did his Party say anything in its policy speech as to what it intended in regard to shopping hours, even though representations had been made to it over a long period. It had had the opportunity to tell the people that at least it would consider the position if and when it got back into Government. However, there was not one word in its policy speech regarding shopping hours; yet people here today are condemning this Government because we are doing something constructive. We are doing something that the Trading Hours Steering Committee supports. That committee represents the Adelaide Central Traders Association, Master Hairdressers Association of S.A., Meat and Allied Trades Federation of Australia (S.A. Division), O'Connell Street Traders Association, Pharmacy Guild of Australia, Port Adelaide and Districts Retail Traders Association, Retail Furniture Association of S.A., Retail Storekeepers Association of S.A., Retail Traders Association of S.A., Rundle-Hindley Streets Ratepayers and Merchants Association, S.A. Automobile Chamber of Commerce, and S.A. Mixed Business Association. All those bodies support the holding of a referendum, because they all believe that there should be uniform trading. I go along with that.

Members opposite had their tongue in their right cheek when speaking on this Bill; they had their tongue in their left cheek when speaking on the State Government Insurance Commission Bill, when they said that there should be fair competition, that there should not be anything unfair. However, they are playing politics, because later they will say in respect of the insurance Bill, "We must make sure there is no unfair competition." People as far out as Gepps Cross must close their doors at 5.30 on Friday evening while people across the street can remain open as long as they like. I think the Hon. Mr. Hill grabbed about 5,000 of those "Yes" voting straws, as he did on another occasion when there was a public opinion poll. He has a mighty big hand and he can grab many straws.

Honourable members opposite say they believe in fair competition. If they do, this is their opportunity to see that fair competition is assured throughout the metropolitan area. I am amazed that they are attempting to stop the people from having their say about uniform hours. It affects not only Elizabeth and the suburbs north of Adelaide but also Adelaide itself. It has affected Adelaide itself in regard to the present trading hours, which are restricted (shops closing at 5.30 on Friday evening)

while other people are allowed to remain open. If the people want Friday night shopping, they are just as entitled to it in the metropolitan area, whether or not they live in the eastern suburbs and are having a say in the northern suburbs. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan would like a poll taken street by street, to the effect that in one street a shop shall remain open and in another street a shop shall not. Why do not honourable members opposite be honest and say, "We believe in fair competition and uniformity of hours", which is the only way to get fair competition?

They are speaking with two voices here, because there are two Bills before them today, which is putting them on the spot: they know they cannot have it both ways. They are making a great song and dance about this matter but they know very well they were not game to grasp the nettle. They were afraid to do anything about the Early Closing Act because of the effect it would have on some people. Because this Government is prepared to let some people say whether or not they want Friday night shopping, honourable members opposite are not prepared to take any action. They are supposed to be the champions of freedom for all, but they were not prepared to do anything about it. They suggest that we do something that they were not prepared to do themselves.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): In my innocence or ignorance, or probably both, I thought that Governments were elected to govern and not to spend large sums of money on passing the buck back to the electors when a sticky political issue arises. If this is to be done on this issue, there are dozens of other issues for which it must be setting a precedent. If that is not right, is not this type of referendum on this type of question rather out of date? We have seen many Gallup-type polls in this country that have given extremely accurate answers to practically all questions relating to the people—referendums, elections, and so on.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They missed out on the last occasion.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not think they have ever been very far out. Probably the farthest out they have been in recent times was in the poll in the United Kingdom, where I happened to be at the time of the general election. I think four or five polls were running at the time; they were all wrong but not very far out, at least from a percentage point of view. If the Government is so unsure of itself that it has to take a

referendum on this type of issue to get an expression of opinion from the people, why should it not employ Roy Morgan or any other pollster expert to take a poll that would give it a complete guide, in my opinion, to the wishes of the people?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: If you were Premier of the State, would you do that?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I would make my own decision.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What would you do?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I would not take a referendum or a poll. If I were Premier, I would try to govern and try to make the correct decision. If I made a wrong decision, I would be answerable to the people at the next election. I emphasize that the remarks I have just made apply not to referendums in general but to referendums on limited questions that it is within the power of the Government to legislate on and are not far-reaching matters like Constitutional alterations, or that type of thing. If a Gallup poll was taken, it would save nearly all of the \$70,000 that the Premier has estimated will be the cost of this referendum. It could be taken for a fraction of the cost, possibly for only \$1,000 or \$2,000. If the Government wanted an accurate result and the Gallup poll showed fairly even thinking, that would be the time to take a referendum, if the Government had to take one. I wonder what the Commonwealth Grants Commission will say about this unnecessary expenditure of \$70,000.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But your people wanted the extra expenditure.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Will it take it off the State grant or what will it do? As far as the Hon. Mr. Banfield's interjection is concerned, I do not know the opinion of my fellow members (no doubt, I shall learn some more during the Committee stage) but I imagine the opinion of all of them is that the Government should legislate on the matter and not waste the \$70,000; but, if it is to waste the \$70,000 and insist on doing this, it should be done on a fair, honest and decent basis. I completely agree with the expressed views of Liberal members in this Chamber on that matter. This afternoon, several statements were made by Government members that were news to me. I should like to study these matters overnight, because I did not know before (and I imagine this applies to other honourable members in this Chamber) that the Government was proposing

to ban Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading throughout the State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That was in the policy speech.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It may have been in the policy speech but I was not aware of it. If it was, I do not suppose every person in South Australia knows this. I imagine that most of the people do not know that that is the intention. I do not know that a statement was made in the policy speech about a referendum and, if it was not—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The statement in regard to Saturday afternoons and Sundays was in respect of the meat trade.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: State-wide?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Meat trading only?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And bread.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: And bread. I am still not clear whether the State-wide ban applies to those two matters or to other matters. If the Government is to put up a referendum that was not mentioned in the policy speech, I do not see why it would necessarily appear to do everything else it said.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have done exactly what you have said: we have made up our minds.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I suggest that the Government make up its mind on these other matters as well. That is one thing that was said today. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone has said that this referendum affects trading hours in the enlarged metropolitan area only. This raises the question of its relationship to State-wide trading. I do not know whether the Government wishes to have consideration of this Bill completed tonight: it is now 5.30 p.m. I would certainly like to study further the implications of this matter. In these circumstances, I ask leave to conclude my remarks later.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No.

The PRESIDENT: Standing Order No. 197 states:

It is not competent to a member to move, while speaking to a question, the adjournment of the debate; but at the unanimous pleasure of the Council he may obtain leave to conclude his speech at a future time, and the debate shall be thereby adjourned.

Since the Council is not unanimous in granting the honourable member leave, he must continue his remarks.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: In those circumstances I shall have to grapple with these questions impromptu. If the people are asked to vote on the question set out in this Bill, they are entitled to vote on the question of Saturday afternoon trading, particularly in view of the statement that it will be banned. Surely, when people at present enjoy this type of trading in various areas, they should at least have the opportunity to say whether they want it to be continued. If a question about Saturday afternoon trading were added, it would cost practically nothing extra.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What about Sunday trading?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If the Minister had given me the opportunity to consider this matter overnight (as I wished to) I would have been able to give him an answer. There are many ramifications to this matter. Why should there not be another question on the ballot-paper relating, say, to Saturday afternoon trading? Why should there not be on the ballot-paper a statement clearly setting forth the Government's intentions on Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon and possibly Sunday trading? Not anything like half the people who will be voting on this matter are clear about the Government's intentions, and those intentions could well affect their vote on the Friday night issue.

We have heard today (the Chief Secretary will correct me if I am wrong, because I think it was his statement) that, if Friday night trading is voted for and put into effect, it will not affect Saturday morning trading. I think the people ought to know this. We all know that people are not aware of every single word that is written in the paper or spoken in this Council. The ballot-paper should clearly tell the people (assuming the Government is taking the referendum on only this one question and has other definite and deliberate views on other parts of the issue) what they are voting on.

Other honourable members have clearly made the point that, normally, before referendums a Bill is passed by Parliament and then the question is put to the people for ratification. Under the Commonwealth Act, cases for the "Yes" side and the "No" side are issued to the people, but that is not to be done in this referendum. If that is necessary in Commonwealth referendums, surely it is necessary in this one. If there is no statement on the ballot-paper of the Government's inten-

tions, there ought to be at least something handed to the people when they are voting, so that they know exactly what they are voting on. It is not proper to take a referendum on only part of a subject without giving the people full information on what will happen in connection with the whole subject.

Regarding the definition of the metropolitan area, I point out that this Bill has State-wide implications. If the people of the metropolitan area are entitled to vote on a question that affects only them, why are country people not permitted to vote on the aspect that the Government will legislate on that will affect them? I cannot see the justice of this, unless (as some honourable members have said) the Government wants a compulsory vote in those parts of the Midland District that favour the Labor Party and a voluntary vote in those parts of the Midland District that favour the Liberal Party. This is the inevitable conclusion that one must draw, and I think it is generally accepted by the public. It is a political move of very doubtful integrity.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If people on the West Coast have Saturday afternoon trading but not Friday night trading, should they have the right to state their views?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes. If there is to be a referendum, and it should be on the whole question, it should be capable of being voted on by every person who will be affected by the whole question—and that means every person in the State. I support the second reading and I will reserve my decision on any amendments that are foreshadowed until I have had a chance to study them and hear the debate on them.

[Sitting suspended from 5.43 to 7.45 p.m.]

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I had the privilege this afternoon of listening to the debate when seated in the illustrious position occupied by you, Mr. President, and I was somewhat dismayed to notice the attitude of certain members to this debate. It was obvious to me that the Government did not know where it was going with regard to this question; it is possible that one could direct that statement to other Governments. However, in this case the Government was extremely concerned and decided to hold a referendum, although a certain political event is to occur at about the same time. I do not blame the Government (except from a moral point of view) because it decided to take advantage of that position.

Having decided to hold the referendum the Government is now hearing the opinions of many people, and I suggest that it is more worried now than it was before it introduced the Bill. To show its broadmindedness the Government decided to hold a referendum on this question. If we think back to the Licensing Act, it included provisions for such things as local option polls. The Minister of Agriculture made some amazing statements today about the Licensing Act, and said that the Labor Party opened up everything, really went progressive, and let the State do what it liked about liquor. I point out that the Bill we are considering is not opening up anything, but it is restricting everything. Can the Minister deny that?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Yes, I deny it.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It is a grave restriction on many people in this State, and no doubt the Government will hear about it. This afternoon the Chief Secretary said (and it was valuable information, too) that he thought we had been misled somewhere but the Government intended to introduce a Bill to amend the Early Closing Act to deal with Saturday afternoon and Sunday closing. I can be corrected but he said Saturday morning closing.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I said Friday evening.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes, the Minister corrected himself, but I am not bothering about that. The understanding of members on this side was that the Government would introduce a Bill (I stand to be corrected but honourable members will know what I am aiming at) dealing with bread and meat, so that there would not be weekend baking or weekend meat selling. That has been the understanding of members on this side. This afternoon the Chief Secretary, when someone suggested that he may wish to correct this statement (and in fairness to him he may) said that the Government would introduce a Bill to amend the Early Closing Act to deal with all shopping—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: For bread and meat.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: —encompassing the whole lot. Did the Chief Secretary make a slip of the tongue?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They talked about all kinds of trading this afternoon.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: As the Chief Secretary made that error, I will accept it, but it was a bad error.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It was not a bad error. We are going to have 5½-day week shopping.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: This is basically a Committee Bill, but four or five matters must be considered including the matter of voluntary voting in the referendum and the matter of having it on a different day from an important by-election for the Legislative Council, because of the death of the Hon. Colin Rowe. The old liquor licensing laws provided that no local option poll (I think that was the name) was to be held in any year that coincided with an election year.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But that is the past; we are talking about now.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am talking about the past, the present and the future. The Minister has had his say.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Bring yourself up to date.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I do not need to be brought up to date. The trouble is to dig up some people who are not knowledgeable on many of these facts. The next point is that to deal with this matter of political morality we could have the referendum, if we decided to have one, on some other day, whether it be on a Saturday or a Wednesday or any other day. I agree with the Chief Secretary that we should not have it on a Sunday. Then, in addition, we have the new metropolitan area, of which we have heard so much recently, as defined in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. Suddenly, for political advantage, the new metropolitan area includes Gawler. In this straggling city that is becoming so vast we are straggling even further and we are going to put Gawler into the metropolitan shopping area. Why not Murray Bridge; let us go the whole hog!

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: There is no by-election at Murray Bridge!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: By what moral argument can Gawler be included in the metropolitan shopping area? Only because of the political desire of the Government to add to the area. I have listened with interest to the debate on this matter and I shall listen with interest to the Minister's reply. In my opinion, this is a matter for the whole State. When the Chief Secretary pointed out that the Early Closing Act was going to be dealt with by his Government, he also said that the Government had made up its mind. You will recall, Mr. President, that he said, "This is one subject

on which we have made up our mind." What he had made up his mind on was that the amendments to the Act should be for the whole State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is right.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Now we have a referendum on a limited area of the State. Is this quite the clean potato? There is just something wrong about it, and something that has a very nasty smell to me. When we come to the actual referendum itself we find just the one simple question. The Chief Secretary has pointed out that it is a very simple question. He is not interested in Saturday or Sunday: he is interested only in Friday nights, and that is all he wants. His Deputy Premier has already stated publicly (he has no worry at all about it) that it will be passed by 70 per cent of the people. Much has been said about economy. The Government was not so certain about this matter three weeks ago, but if it is now so certain that this will be carried by a 70 per cent vote why worry about the referendum at all, particularly on September 12?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Many people think it will not be carried.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: It rather staggers me why it is necessary to hold the referendum. Having listened to very cogent arguments by honourable members this afternoon on this matter, surely it should be perfectly obvious to the Government that if it wants to get the opinion of the people, when it is going to this great expense of a referendum, more questions should be asked. Why not take the opportunity of asking these questions? Is it going to cost more to print another line in the voting paper? No. The point is that the Government does not want to embarrass itself on future occasions because, despite rising public opinion in these matters, it knows perfectly well that in the background the Trades Hall and the unions are saying, "This is our policy and you will carry it out; we will have five-day trading; no more and no less." The Government cannot deny it. Therefore, I say that if we cannot get some amendments into the Bill I may find myself in opposition to it in the final stages.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I think it is time someone lodged a protest against this type of legislation which has, over the last five years, bedevilled the South Australian Parliament and stopped decent legislation going forward. This Bill is a shonky Bill and a snide Bill, and there is no need to argue about that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: In other words, it is crook.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: It is as crook as it is possible to be. When so many things are going wrong in this State, it is a great pity to see the things that have to be done obstructed by this sort of silly business. The people in Elizabeth are being dragooned into giving away the very few privileges they have just for the sake of the completely simple political advantage that the Government desires to take.

There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone who looks at this legislation and at what has been said by the people who are putting it forward that at Elizabeth and in areas south of the Flagstaff Hotel there will be no more trading on Saturdays or Sundays, when in these areas many people have built up a big business over the last few years. This is what will happen under this legislation if it is passed in its present form. These people will be giving away these privileges and getting nothing back in return.

I am not going to dwell on the point regarding the happy coincidence of the referendum's being held on the same day as the by-election for the Midland District. I think this inevitably shows the dishonesty of the situation. However, Mr. President, I think it is necessary to point out that these people are being given the privilege of being forced to vote and to give away the advantages they have. This situation has arisen through neglect and through the very simple fact that over the years things have just been allowed to go on as they have been in the past.

You will recall, Mr. President, that when the Early Closing Act first came into being it raised deep resentment amongst many people. It was passed because the majority of people seemed to want an Early Closing Act. However, it did not by any means go forward initially with the wholehearted backing of the South Australian community, for at that stage it was a very controversial measure indeed. Over the years the Act has applied in Adelaide and it was extended to the metropolitan area as it then stood. It has been left on the Statute Book as a controversial issue.

In the intervening years a great privilege has been given to the outer metropolitan areas that were not within the ambit of the Early Closing Act. This privilege will be taken away—have no doubt about that—as soon as the referendum in its present form is passed. Is this understood by those people who will be forced to vote, having been given the privilege of voting under compulsion?

There is dishonesty in having the referendum on the same day as the Midland by-election—make no mistake about that. I think everybody in South Australia now appreciates how dishonest this is. I oppose this Bill. There is no doubt that anybody with a reasonable conscience and with no axe to grind will oppose it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I do not know when I have listened to so much rubbish about a Bill before today. It has been called "dishonest", "indecent", "immoral", "unlawful", "unconstitutional", and all the rest of it by some speakers. I am sure that you, Mr. President, would not allow an unconstitutional Bill to be brought into this Chamber. I think the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said we ought to take it away and introduce something else that was lawful and constitutional.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Those words were not said in the debate.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: If that is not saying that this Bill is not lawful and constitutional, I do not know what is. However, despite all the things said by honourable members, I appreciate the fact that the Council has discussed the Bill today as it has. I will try to answer questions asked in the debate that need answering.

A revision of the present laws concerning shop trading hours has been under consideration for nearly five years. In October, 1965, when I was Minister of Labour and Industry, a committee was appointed to inquire into the desirability of relaxing some of the restrictions in the present laws regarding shop trading hours in South Australia. This specifically concerned the situation of small shops and exempted goods. The committee, when it reported to me in June, 1966, indicated that there appeared to be some aspects of shop trading laws more in need of consideration than those included in the terms of reference to the committee. The wider questions were then examined and by the end of 1967 the position had been reached where the Government was ready to introduce legislation. Unfortunately, although we received a larger number of votes in the general election of 1968 than any other Party, the events that then occurred denied us the opportunity to govern.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: When was this?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That was 1968. In 1967 we were prepared to introduce legislation. In the next session of Parliament,

although we got a majority of votes at the election, we did not get enough to take office. However, once the redistribution of seats took place, we were able to govern again. With the change of Government, the new Minister sought the views of interested parties on this very vexed question of shop trading hours, and no objection can be taken to that action. In answer to the Hon. Mr. Hart, the Government did not set up a committee. He swore black and blue when speaking this afternoon that we set up a committee and that the new Minister, when he took office, set up another committee, but no committee was set up by the previous Government and there is no report. The only report was from a committee in 1966, so the Hon. Mr. Hart was way off beam there as he has been on other things he has said.

However, the previous Government had plenty of time to make up its mind in the two years it was in office, but all that happened was that a Bill was introduced late last session to extend the list of exempted goods and exempted shops. I agree with the proposals contained in that Bill but it did not go nearly far enough. Let me make it clear that in the Bill to be introduced after the referendum we shall provide that all goods proposed to be exempted under the Bill that was introduced into another place last November by the then Premier will be exempted, with two or three additions, and the shops that were proposed to be exempted in that Bill will continue to be exempted in the Bill we shall introduce. We propose to deal with the whole question of shop trading hours this year, and I have outlined the Government's intention in my second reading speech.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: We go for it wholly and do it properly.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: You know what you are doing!

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The pressures for Friday night trading to be permitted in the areas immediately surrounding the present metropolitan district grew so substantially in the two years we were in opposition that the Government decided it should give the public the opportunity of expressing its views on this aspect. The Government has been criticized for not deciding the matter itself. On the other hand, we have made a definite decision not to permit trading generally in the metropolitan area on Saturday afternoons and Sundays.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And the country?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That was said this afternoon.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No, only for bread and meat.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: All the country stores are not going to close on Saturday afternoons?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No. The honourable member is putting words into my mouth.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I am repeating what was said.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I said here this afternoon by interjection that it is as difficult to make these honourable members understand a simple statement as it was when we were in Government previously. I tried to educate them in industrial legislation; they knew nothing about it and they still know nothing about it. When we try to give them a simple explanation, apparently it is too simple for them: they look for ulterior motives. They are so busy looking for the ulterior motive that they cannot see the forest for the trees. On this Bill, we have been criticized for not giving the public the opportunity of expressing their views on whether Saturday afternoon or Sunday trading should be permitted. In the metropolitan area there is no substantial demand for shops generally to open on Saturday afternoons and Sundays—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How do you know?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE:—that is, other than exempted shops, and the Government has made a decision that in the metropolitan area, as defined in the Bill, shops generally will close at these times. As a result, it is suggested that the one question which it is proposed will be asked in the referendum is a loaded one.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Wait and see.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Government has prepared a statement on cases for and against the referendum. This answers the complaint that was made here this afternoon that in the referendum both sides of the question are not being put. Proper cases are being prepared and will be published when the Bill has been passed.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Prepared by whom?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: By the Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: On both sides of the question?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. However, this cannot be done until the Bill has been passed. How do we know how this Council will mess around with the Bill through the amendments that have been foreshadowed? Consequently, we cannot publish "Yes" and "No" cases at present. The following is a letter (signed by the Secretary for Labour and Industry) sent out last week in regard to the arguments for and against:

The Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. G. R. Broomhill, M.P.) proposes to have published the arguments for and against the question to be asked in the proposed referendum regarding shop trading hours. As you know, the question is to be: "Are you in favour of shops in the metropolitan planning area and the municipality of Gawler being permitted to remain open for trading until 9 p.m. on Fridays?" The Minister invites you to submit any points to be included in the arguments either for or against Friday night shopping, so that nothing will be overlooked in presenting the different views to the public.

For your information, I attach hereto a copy of arguments for and against which has been prepared in this department: no doubt there are others which you will be able to suggest be added. As it is important that this be prepared without delay, the Minister asks if you would let me have any proposals you wish to have included not later than Thursday of next week, 27th August.

That answers the allegation that we do not plan to let people know the two sides of the question.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Minister is going to be his own devil's advocate.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The two sides of the question will be published, as is done for all referendums. Now that the Leader of the Opposition has got the answer, he is not satisfied with it. He has his answer: what he asked for has been supplied. The referendum will be restricted to the metropolitan area because it does not appear to be fair or reasonable to ask country electors to express their views on what should happen in regard to shop trading hours in the metropolitan area nor, indeed, would it be fair for metropolitan electors to be asked to express their views on country shopping hours.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that before the referendum is taken the Government should introduce a Bill containing all proposals, explain it fully and supply explanations for and against to every elector, as he claims that the only way public opinion can be gauged from such a question is for electors to know in the first place what the Government intends.

This has been done when introducing this Bill. It is exactly why the second reading explanation on this Bill mainly dealt with what will be included in another Bill. The Government has explained exactly what is intended.

So that there can be no misunderstanding, I repeat that the Bill to be introduced after the referendum will provide for Saturday morning trading whether or not the referendum is passed. The Government will give effect to the decision of the majority of electors in the metropolitan area, as defined in the Bill, regarding Friday night trading. The Government believes that uniform shopping hours should apply in the whole of the metropolitan area as defined in this Bill. The Bill will require shops (other than exempted shops) in that metropolitan area to close at 5.30 p.m. on Mondays to Thursdays inclusive, at either 5.30 p.m. or 9 p.m. on Fridays, depending upon the result of the referendum, and at 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays, with no trading on Sundays or public holidays.

The Leader also objected to voting at the referendum being compulsory. The argument seemed to be that voting at no election should be compulsory; therefore it should be a voluntary vote at the referendum. Voting at all previous Commonwealth and State referendums has been compulsory. This will be a vote of House of Assembly electors, for whom voting in elections is compulsory.

I also announced the Government's proposals relating to shop trading provisions in country districts in my second reading explanation. The Government proposes to introduce legislation to provide that the present country shopping districts should continue but the present system of petitioning and counter-petitioning should be abolished. In other words, those country districts in which there are now no restrictions on trading hours will remain unrestricted, except for butcher shops.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: This is entirely different from what the Chief Secretary said this afternoon.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member could not have listened to him.

The Hon. C. R. Story: This is entirely different from what we have been told.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is only what the honourable member thinks. What I am saying is in line with my second reading explanation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the Minister is safer when he has the protection

of the Chair and does not indulge in cross-Chamber discussion.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am not frightened of anyone in this Chamber except you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a matter of being frightened: it is a matter of Standing Orders.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The present Early Closing Act does not apply in many country districts. This situation exists not only in sparsely settled areas but also in some country cities and some large towns: for example, in Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Naracoorte, and in all towns in the Barossa Valley the Early Closing Act does not apply. Wherever the Early Closing Act does not apply, shopkeepers are at liberty to open and close their shops at whatever times they wish. There does not appear to be any point in having a referendum in any country area where there are at present no restrictions on shop trading hours. I have previously said that there are many places where the Early Closing Act does not apply.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are many areas where it does apply.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Under what the Government proposes there is provision that, where it does apply, this can be altered so that it does not apply in future. There is provision in the proposed Bill for this to happen and I am sure that, whichever Government might be in power at the time, if (in a district covered by the Early Closing Act) most people said that they did not want the provisions of that Act, the Minister would listen favourably to them. Indeed, he would be very foolish not to carry out their wishes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the Hon. Mr. Virgo and local government elections?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know what the Leader is referring to and I do not intend to answer questions that are not specific.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Minister of Local Government is offside with local government generally.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Regarding local government provisions, I do not think the honourable member, when he was Minister of Local Government, always carried out things that I approved. In fact, in regard to a certain referendum in the newspapers, I do not think his actions were to his credit. Wherever the Early Closing Act does not apply, shopkeepers are at liberty to open

and close their shops at whatever times they wish. There does not appear to be any point in having a referendum in any country area where there are at present no restrictions on shop trading hours.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But how about those areas where there are restrictions?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know what the Leader is talking about.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are certain areas in the State where the Early Closing Act provisions apply, and they are being denied a vote.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This is for the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Government will apply 9 p.m. closing to areas outside the metropolitan area if the referendum is carried.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It will not. Mr. President, I am sure that you understand what I have been talking about, but no other honourable member seems to be able to understand it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They don't want to understand.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I think the Leader's question was quite simple.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The referendum refers to a particular part of the State, and to that area only.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have explained it, but the Leader cannot absorb it. All the Leader is trying to do is to get every other honourable member as confused as he is himself and he hopes that, as a result, he will confuse people outside.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will it apply outside the metropolitan area if 9 p.m. shopping is carried in the polls?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I announced the Government's proposals relating to shop trading provisions in country districts in my second reading speech. The Government proposes to introduce legislation to provide that the present country shopping districts should continue but that the present system of petitioning and counter-petitioning should be abolished. In other words, those country districts in which there are now no restrictions on trading hours will remain unrestricted, except for butcher shops.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How about the areas where the restriction applies now under the Early Closing Act?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: If the Leader reads the Bill, he will see that it is restricted to the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I realize that; but supposing that the referendum is carried for 9 p.m. closing, what will happen to country districts that are under the Early Closing Act now?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: They will not be altered from the present situation. The question included in the Bill asking whether electors are in favour of shops being permitted to remain open for trading until 9 p.m. on Friday would be obviously inappropriate, as shops outside shopping districts can do this at the present time. Similarly, any proposal to widen the question asked in the referendum would be inappropriate. In the various submissions made to this and to the previous Government regarding amendments to the Early Closing Act there has been one point on which there has been no divergence of opinion, that is, that the present position of petitioning and counter-petitioning for the creation or abolition of a shopping district is outmoded and should be abolished. However, even though this view has been widely held and advocated, no suggestions have been made as to what alternative procedure can be adopted.

There seem to be three alternative ways by which shop trading hours in country districts can be regulated. They are as follows:

- (1) by giving members of the public in the area concerned the opportunity to express their opinion. This can be done either by a system of petitioning or by a local option poll;
- (2) by empowering the local-governing authority in the district concerned to decide whether or not there should be restrictions on shop trading hours within its council district;
- or
- (3) the Government making a decision whether restrictions should apply.

The Government's proposal that I outlined in my second reading speech is an attempt to have a more flexible arrangement than at present. The strong objections to the present system indicate that it is impracticable to continue on this basis. Difficulties could arise in leaving the decision to the local-governing authority if there were marked divisions of opinion in the council so that, in some cases, a decision on a matter could be by the casting vote of the mayor or the chairman. To overcome those possible difficulties, the proposal is to have applications for the abolition or creation of a country shopping district to be made only by the local government body concerned, and it would be expected that effect would be given to the

views of the council in most cases. However, if it appeared that there were strong divisions of opinion in the district or among the members of the council, provision would be made for the Minister to make other inquiries: he could, if he thought necessary, arrange for a local option poll in the district concerned.

That should answer the Leader's question, though I do not know whether he knows the provisions of the Early Closing Act. The Act is not a local option poll. Under its provisions, people in an area can go around and collect names and petition for an area either to come under the Act's provisions or to revert to a position outside the Act. When a Minister receives petitions of this nature he gives the opportunity for a counter-petition to be presented by people on the other side. This is not a local option poll but a petition. I have seen some of these and, in common with these types of petition, if you hand a person a pencil and ask him to sign the petition, he will invariably sign it. Some of the petitions I received as Minister of Labour and Industry contained the signatures of people who signed both petitions.

A local option poll is completely different from a petition and a counter-petition. The Leader said that that is what is in the Act now, but he does not even know what is in the Act. He spoke today about the Early Closing Act, but he does not know what it is all about. The main objective would be to give effect to the clearly expressed wishes of the residents in the district concerned, as expressed either through their local government authority or, if necessary, by voting on the question. As it would be probable that there would be marked divisions of opinion only in a small number of cases, it does not seem to be necessary to provide for a poll to be held in every case.

This is an indication of the Government's proposal which will be included in the Bill to be subsequently introduced, so that the public will be aware of the whole situation. This proposal is made in the light of widespread objections to the present system and in the absence of any suggested alternatives. If any improvements on the Government's proposal are introduced in Parliament, the Government would be prepared to consider and accept appropriate amendments that would ensure its objective of giving effect to the wishes of the residents in the district concerned. There is no real basis for the suggestion that the referendum should be State-wide, because in so

many country areas there are not, and never have been, restrictions on trading hours.

I was surprised at some of the things that were said about this matter this afternoon, especially the extravagant language when members were speaking about immorality, snide dishonesty, and calling for an honest and decent basis for the question. We have been receiving no help from newspapers about this matter. Letters supporting the proposal and others opposing it have been published, but I know that the Minister has been told by one trader, who supports the proposal, that he had written to both daily newspapers stating that he wished to congratulate the Government on introducing a referendum but, despite the fact that he had telephoned them several times, he could not get the letter published.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are attacking newspapers now.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That illustrates the bias that has been introduced into this debate.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It goes on about every question.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are attacking the newspapers.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Everyone is doing his best to confuse people about the Government's proposal. The Government is doing what it thinks is right by asking the people who will be using the facilities. It has been said that we are imposing restrictions, but if the referendum is passed shopping hours will be extended in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Not all of them: you are restricting certain areas.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You are putting the boots into people.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This Bill does not do that.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Some people have said that the referendum will be passed but I do not know whence they obtained their information.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Your Premier said it would be.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Mr. Corcoran said it would pass with a 70 per cent majority.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That was his personal opinion. If the referendum is passed it will mean some extension in shopping hours in some areas. That is what the Government has said and what I have tried to tell members today. It is not a Bill that will introduce restrictions, but is a Bill introduced in order to obtain the opinion of people on

what they want in the metropolitan area, and that is why it has been introduced.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): A petition was handed in this morning signed by many electors in the metropolitan area, but it has been impossible to handle it with the available staff. This is one reason why I shall ask the Chief Secretary to report progress.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is not my Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am sorry. Will the Minister in charge of the Bill report progress to enable the petition to be presented? Many statements have been made today by Ministers that have caused considerable concern, and matters have been raised about which members have had no previous knowledge. The Chief Secretary said that the Bill, if carried, would apply to the whole of South Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is for bread and meat, and you all know it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is a new departure, because if I read the press reports correctly—

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hate to do it, but I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understand that in Committee we talk only about a particular clause, but what the Leader is saying has nothing to do with the clause before us.

The CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has asked the Minister to report progress and he is giving his reasons.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The clause relates to metropolitan area shop trading hours, but I ask the Minister to report progress to enable members to consider what has been said in the debate today so that they may draft amendments relating to matters that have been raised.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): As I consider that the Leader has made out a good case, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 893.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): At the outset I say that I am the South Australian director of the Australian advisory board of a large mutual life and fire and

general office with world-wide interests. I have received this appointment since the defeat of the previous Government. The fact that I have this appointment does not influence my thinking on this Bill in any way at all, but I do not want any misunderstanding to arise as a result of that appointment. I am taking into account what I believe to be the thinking throughout my electoral district when I speak to this Bill. I support the second reading.

The people of the State have had ample opportunity since 1965 to consider the question of a Government insurance office. The question was posed by the Labor Party in its policy speech prior to the 1965 election, at which the Labor Party won office. It was also submitted to the people in the Labor Party's policy speech prior to the 1968 election, at which that Party polled well. Again, it was put to the people by the same Party in its policy speech prior to the 1970 election. Because this issue has been brought to the people's attention over a considerable period, it is fair to say that it has been fully considered by the people.

Because the Government has dropped its previous proposal to include a life insurance section in the Government insurance office, the Bill comes to us now in an improved form. It stands as a clear, single question: does the State want this office or not? There are no other political motives involved: it is simply a matter of a particular Party's political policy. It is, of course, a typical example of pure Socialism, an instance of the State's entering a field previously occupied in South Australia only by private enterprise. As a result of detailed discussion of this Bill during this debate, some amendments have been foreshadowed. In connection with Ministerial control of the proposed Government insurance office, clause 12 (1) provides:

Subject to this Act and the directions of the Minister not inconsistent with this Act, the commission is hereby authorized and empowered—

The clause then lists the powers item by item. I do not oppose Ministerial control. I fully appreciate the views that have been advanced by opponents of this clause. As a result of my short experience as a Minister, I believe that we have reached a stage in this State and in the Public Service where Ministers must accept full responsibility for the boards that fall within their sphere of influence. Consequently, the appropriate Minister should have the kinds of power provided for in this Bill.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Would he have to attend board meetings?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No; I do not think that that is contemplated.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: If he does not join in the discussions, I do not see how he would know what was happening.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: He would not get involved to that degree. He may decide that he should closely consider the work of a board because its activities have aroused public comment. In this case it would be the Minister's duty and prerogative to inquire from the Chairman what were the reasons for the board's decisions and actions. At present the blame, in the public mind, falls on the Minister's shoulders in matters such as this.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He has no hope of controlling all the details of a board's operations.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the past 10 years there has been a great increase in the amount of publicity associated with decisions of Government departments, Ministers and boards, but I am not in any way critical of that increased publicity. People are taking a far greater interest in politics and public affairs than they did 10 years ago.

People in increasing numbers are being educated to look more closely at public affairs and political matters. This is a very good thing, but it means that, when the public queries a decision involving a Government insurance office, for instance, the person to whom the public looks for any explanation and at whom it levels criticism is the Minister. I believe that years ago when the State was smaller in every respect the complete independence of boards of this kind was an extremely good thing in the interests of the State.

However, I believe that the State has outgrown that form of administrative structure and has now grown to a position in which the Minister must accept responsibility and, if he accepts responsibility, I think he must have the right to direct, as the Bill provides. I believe, too, that the right should be used only sparingly, although there may come a time when it must be exercised. If the right is provided in the Bill, he will be able to exercise it. So I do not oppose that aspect.

I have also heard the point mentioned that some change ought to be made to the legislation to ensure that business which now rests with private companies and which comes from principals of either Government departments

or boards of a semi-government nature will be left where it is. The proposed office should not be able to influence unfairly that business and draw it away from the existing private companies.

Unless this State insurance office obtains some of that business it will not have a hope of succeeding financially and, if this is so, the State will bear the losses. It will be extremely difficult to ensure that that kind of influence cannot be introduced as time passes. It would be unfair on private insurance companies that have been giving splendid service to people and parties associated with State Government departments, Government boards and semi-government bodies to lose some of this business. Those companies have done nothing to warrant the kind of competition that will come as a result of the introduction of this Government office.

While I have not been able to peruse any proposed amendments along these lines, I think it will be difficult to prevent that kind of thing happening. I think that that change will be inevitable and that existing companies will lose business they would otherwise have retained if the Labor Party had not introduced this socialistic measure. If the Government gets to the stage of implementing this measure and of setting up the insurance office, it should tread very cautiously in the early stages.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said last week that quite often insurance organizations established over hundreds of years with offices here could not make fire and general insurance pay at present and that many of them in the main were gaining their income from investments that had been made from reserves built up over these long periods of time. When one considers that fact and looks at the prospect of a new office of this kind being established here, one realizes the great financial difficulties that it will face. The only way, therefore, unless the Government is prepared to commit a great deal of the people's money (and that is what State funds are)—

The Hon. C. R. Story: How much will this project cost?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not think that we have been given any estimates of how much it will cost. The matter has been keenly probed on this side of the Council as to what feasibility studies were undertaken and how much money the Government was prepared to risk in this area. However, the answers have been either non-existent or unsatisfactory.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We got that information.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I hope you will give it to us when you reply.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There is no answer to it. The Government does not know where it is going from the point of view of finance. This is an extremely serious matter, because the new office will be faced with accruing losses for many years. I base that statement on the experience of old-established and efficient companies that have been in business for a long time, possess the know-how, and have trained and efficient staff at all levels to implement their policies. The Government, with respect, would be well advised to start this operation in a very small way, build it up slowly over a long time, and have the whole operation based on the principle of trial and error to see how it will work. It may well be that, over a period of time, public opinion will alter on this question, compared with what it is now.

If the office incurs serious and increasing losses, the people's view on this whole question may change. So if the Government takes things carefully, treads warily, starts off in a small way and builds up slowly, it will be a safer means not only from the financial aspect but also from the political aspect. I reserve my right to consider any amendments that will be placed on the files, but the thoughts I have expressed are my feelings on the measure as it stands now. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.
It is mainly designed to provide for the 3 per cent 1969 national wage increase to flow to those officers of the Crown whose salaries are fixed by Statute. Previously, the small increases in the living wage, which have flowed on to public servants, including permanent heads, have not been granted to these Crown officers but, in this case, it seems reasonable

to increase their salaries by amounts equivalent to those already granted in the Public Service.

The Bill is divided into nine Parts. Part I, which consists of clauses 1 and 2, deals with the formal parts of the Bill: clause 1 sets out the short title and arrangements of the Bill, and clause 2 provides that the Bill, except Part IX (which amends the Local Courts Act Amendment Act, 1969), is to come into force upon the Governor's assent thereto, while Part IX is to come into force on the day on which the Local Courts Act Amendment Act, 1969, is to come into force.

Part II, which consists of clauses 3 and 4, amends the Agent-General Act. Clause 3 is a formal enactment, and clause 4 amends the Agent-General Act so as to increase the expenses allowance of the Agent-General as from January 1, 1970, from £3,240 sterling a year to £3,375 sterling a year. The Government considers that the 3 per cent component of the Agent-General's salary should be added to his allowance component, as the break-up of his total emoluments is rather less favourable to the allowance component than in other States.

Part III, which consists of clauses 5 and 6, amends the Audit Act. Clause 5 is a formal enactment, and clause 6 increases the Auditor-General's salary as from January 1, 1970, from \$16,500 a year to \$16,995 a year.

Part IV, which consists of clauses 7 and 8, amends the Industrial Code. Clause 7 is a formal enactment, and clause 8 amends the Industrial Code so as to increase the salary of the President as from January 1, 1970, until the Bill becomes law, from \$16,500 a year to \$16,995 a year, and the salary of the Deputy President from \$14,000 a year to \$14,420 a year; but, on and after the date the Bill becomes law, the President is to receive a salary at the rate of \$18,000 a year while the Deputy President is to receive a salary at the rate of \$16,500 a year.

I should here explain that the 3 per cent increase in the salary of the President and the Senior Judge of the Local and District Criminal Courts would bring it up to \$16,995 a year, whereas the 3 per cent increase in the salary of the Deputy President, the Chairman of the Licensing Court and the judges of the Local and District Criminal Courts would bring it up to \$14,420, but the Government considers that the salary of those judicial officers should, as from the passing of this Bill, be further increased to \$18,000 in the case of the President and Senior Judge, and to \$16,500 in the case of the others, in order to

attract suitable persons to those levels of the Judiciary, and because a comparison of the salaries of those judicial officers and officers exercising similar jurisdiction elsewhere in the Commonwealth reveals that the present salary structure is less favourable to the judicial officers in this State.

Part V, which consists of clauses 9 and 10, amends the Licensing Act. Clause 9 is a formal enactment, and clause 10 amends the Licensing Act so as to increase the salary of the Chairman, as from January 1, 1970, from \$14,000 a year to \$14,420 a year and from the passing of this Bill to \$16,500 a year. As I said earlier, the Chairman is one of the judicial officers whose salary is being increased to \$16,500 a year.

Part VI, which consists of clauses 11 and 12, amends the Police Regulation Act. Clause 11 is a formal enactment. Clause 12 amends the Police Regulation Act so as to increase the salary of the Commissioner of Police, as from January 1, 1970, from \$15,200 a year to \$15,656 a year. Part VII, which consists of clauses 13 and 14, amends the Public Service Act. Clause 13 is a formal enactment.

Clause 14 amends the Public Service Act so as to increase the salary of the Chairman of the Public Service Board, as from January 1, 1970, from \$16,500 a year to \$16,995 a year and the salary of each of the other Commissioners, as from that date, from \$14,000 a year to \$14,420 a year. Part VIII,

which consists of clauses 15 and 16, amends the Public Service Arbitration Act. Clause 15 is a formal enactment.

Clause 16 amends the Public Service Arbitration Act so as to increase the salary of the Arbitrator, as from January 1, 1970, from \$14,000 a year to \$14,420 a year. Part IX, which consists of clauses 17 and 18, amends the Local Courts Act Amendment Act, 1969. Clause 17 is a formal enactment. Clause 18 amends the Local Courts Act Amendment Act, 1969, so as to increase the salary of the Senior Judge from \$16,500 a year to \$16,995 a year, and to increase the salary of each judge appointed and performing duties for the purposes of the relevant part of the Local Courts Act from \$14,000 a year to \$14,420 a year until the Bill becomes law, and thereafter the salary of the Senior Judge is to be \$18,000 a year and that of a judge is to be \$16,500 a year. For the reasons I have outlined earlier, the salaries of these judges also are being increased under this Bill by more than 3 per cent. Although the Local Courts Act Amendment Act, 1969, is not yet in operation, the provisions of clause 18 will have retroactive effect when that Act comes into operation. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.50 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 26, at 2.15 p.m.