

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 26, 1970

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

PETITION: SHOPPING HOURS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS presented a petition signed by 10,943 residents of the State of South Australia alleging that the Referendum (Metropolitan Area Shop Trading Hours) Bill now before the Parliament of South Australia in its present form would not give the electors the opportunity of voting for the shopping hours they required, and praying that the Legislative Council would amend the Bill so that the electors might suitably express their opinion on the shopping hours they favoured.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

ROAD SCHEDULES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I understand the Minister of Lands has a reply to my recent question about the forwarding of schedules of roadworks to honourable members of this Chamber who had previously indicated that they had not received them.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Roads and Transport has informed me that all copies were forwarded from his Ministerial office in the week ended June 26, 1970.

PORT ADELAIDE SCHOOLGIRLS

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to a recent question of mine about transport for girls of the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Roads and Transport has supplied me with the following answer to the honourable member's question, which was asked of the Chief Secretary during my temporary absence from the Council:

Following the request of the Headmistress of the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School in April, 1969, for special school buses to be provided for students travelling to their homes after school, the Municipal Tramways Trust's traffic officers investigated this matter. As a result of these inquiries, a bus was scheduled to pick up the scholars at a stop close to the school and to run directly to Osborne. This was designed to avoid the need for the scholars to change buses at Black Diamond Corner. This arrangement did not prove to be successful as many of the students finished school too late to be able to catch

this bus. Further discussions have now been held with the Headmistress of the school on this problem. The Headmistress has decided that the school will be dismissed five minutes earlier and the trust will arrange for the bus to stop at the front of the school. These arrangements should overcome the problem of students travelling to Osborne.

Because of the close seven-minute frequency of the normal Semaphore and Largs service, there is no need for special school buses to be provided to these terminals, as regular buses have sufficient capacity to carry the students concerned. However, arrangements have been made to separate the loading points for these two destinations to overcome congestion on the footpath at the school stop. The Headmistress has been advised of the change being made to the trust's services as outlined above and has expressed satisfaction with the new arrangements.

COUNTRY DOCTORS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In the country edition of this morning's *Advertiser* an article appeared referring to the need for 10 more doctors in country areas and also to the shortage at Kimba and Ardrossan, in which towns no resident medical practitioner is available at present. I believe that the doctor at Ardrossan left recently to take up another position, and the townspeople there are concerned, because of the high risk of industrial accidents and because services have been curtailed at Ardrossan District Hospital. I know that the Minister of Health had something to do with implementing a Government scheme to train doctors under bond and for them to go to country areas after that training, and I am aware that two doctors have been placed recently in country service and that more should be available later. Has the Minister of Health details of further progress in the scheme of training doctors for country areas, and can he say how many doctors are likely to be available to go to country areas in future, as required?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Since assuming office I have discussed this matter with the Director-General, but I should not like to give an off-the-cuff reply about the present position. I knew of the position at Kimba, I think officially, and, having been telephoned about the position at Ardrossan, I made preliminary inquiries. Unfortunately, as much as I should like to say that I can help these towns, we cannot obtain doctors as quickly as we wish. From memory, I understand that

towards the end of this year, as a result of the subsidy scheme that we introduced to assist in training doctors, some will become available. However, I shall obtain a considered report from the Director-General and try to bring it down next week.

MEMBERS' DRESS

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Can the Chief Secretary say whether, in view of the fact that the Leader of the Government in another place has successfully moved for dress reform there, the Leader of the Government in this Chamber intends to move a similar motion, and, (if I am not getting too personal) will he wear shorts in this Chamber during the summer months in the event of that motion being introduced and carried?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not intend to move a motion of that kind. Like the honourable member and you, Mr. President, I am called an old square. I shall always believe in reasonable dress. I think that we can leave to honourable members' good taste the dress that they desire to wear in this Chamber: it is for them to judge. I am sure there is no need for concern about the standard of dress that will be observed in this Chamber. I would never wear shorts here because I am unable to wear them even around the home.

BARLEY STORAGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 19 about additional storage for barley in the coming season?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am informed by the Australian Barley Board that, owing to the seasonal conditions, it is not now anticipated that deliveries of bulk barley to the board will be of the magnitude that was envisaged early in the season and, whilst it may be necessary to introduce a rationalization scheme, it is more than likely that it will be on a more liberal scale than was first thought. I believe that a meeting of the growers organization and the bulk handling company is to be held on Tuesday, September 22, when further discussions will take place regarding the rationalization of bulk barley deliveries.

It is estimated that there will be barley storage facilities to the extent of about 18,000,000 bushels for the coming season and, when processing of the statutory declarations has been completed, the board will then be in a position to ascertain the deliveries, based on the formula agreed upon at the conference

of representatives of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Inc., the bulk handling company and the Barley Board held early this year. It is also anticipated that by September a more accurate assessment can be made of the likely production of barley and deliveries in bulk for the season 1970-71. Obviously, the estimated deliveries of bulk barley to the board this coming season in relation to the receivals based on the formula and storage capacity will determine the extent or otherwise of a rationalization scheme of bulk barley for the 1970-71 season.

COUNCIL VISITORS

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of you, Mr. President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Some years ago it was found necessary, because of certain abuses and because of inconvenience to honourable members who often left their private papers, notes of speeches, etc., on their desks, to display a notice saying that on sitting days no unauthorized people were allowed to occupy the seats of either the Executive or honourable members. I regret to say that in recent weeks this instruction has been flagrantly disregarded. Mr. President, what is your opinion on this matter?

The PRESIDENT: It has been reported to me that the instruction has been disregarded. As the honourable member has said, we have a notice that is displayed whenever the Council has adjourned. Because members' private and confidential papers may be left on their desks, it is not desirable for unauthorized people to occupy the benches. I believe one reason for complaints received this session is that there are several new members of Parliament who are probably unaware of the notice. The messengers will inform those members of the notice so that they will know what is permissible while the Council is in session.

ROAD SIGN

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to the question I asked on August 13 with regard to a road sign?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague has supplied me with a report which states that this sign is used in conjunction with the standard sign "no entry". If the motorist fails to see the "no entry" sign at the ramp exit

then he is confronted with the sign reading "Go back, you are going the wrong way". This latter sign placed half-way along the ramp ensures that motorists do not enter the freeway on the wrong side and thus be exposed to high speed head-on traffic. The sign is used in the Eastern States of Australia and in the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PRAWNING INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: On July 28 of this year, during the Address in Reply debate, I was discussing the prawning industry. I found on my desk this morning a proof of *Hansard* which had been corrected but not returned to the *Hansard* Department, and there is one correction which ought to be made and which I wish to put on record because the weekly volume is now in the hands of the public. I should like the correction made for the permanent record. I wish to have the words "the State Bank" in line 19 of column 2 of page 308 deleted and the words "a private bank" inserted and the words "both sides" deleted and the words "members of the new co-operative" inserted.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 958.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Government has requested that this Bill be passed as quickly as possible because a technical question is involved in connection with the coming into force on September 1 of the Local Courts Act Amendment Act, 1969. The Bill provides for the 3 per cent increase in the living wage, which was granted in 1969, to be applied to the salaries of certain officers whose salaries are fixed by Statute. I believe that such a flow-on to the officers mentioned in the Bill is not usually provided for, but I believe it was approved by the previous Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think it was.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: So, there is no need for the matter to be debated at length. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 19. Page 813.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I oppose the Bill, clause 2 of which amends section 21 of the principal Act by inserting in subsection (1) after the word "directs" the passage "but separate rolls shall be printed and used for any Council election to be held after the commencement of the Electoral Act Amendment Act, 1970". During the past few years we have had the one roll for both House of Assembly and Legislative Council elections, and to the best of my knowledge there have been no complaints about it. I understand that it has worked reasonably well and that it is economical in its form of production. This is one reason why I oppose the Bill. I think such action as this is unnecessary, for the present procedure has acted well in the interests of this State. Secondly, as all members would know, such a move is against the policy of the Party to which I belong. My Party considers that there should be just the one roll for both Houses of Parliament and that voting should be compulsory.

Clause 3 seeks to repeal section 118a of the principal Act, and this would mean the introduction of voluntary voting for House of Assembly elections. In other words, Sir Norman Jude wants to put the clock back more than 30 years. If my memory serves me correctly, it was in about 1941 that both Houses of Parliament (and my Party was not the Government in those days) decided that voting for the House of Assembly should be compulsory. It is interesting to note that South Australia is the only State of the Commonwealth whose Legislative Council members are elected by a certain section of the people by voluntary voting.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: That's why it's the best State.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Is it? I wish I could say that it is the best and the most progressive State. I know that Queensland has no Legislative Council and that New South Wales has a Legislative Council whose members are appointed by the members of Parliament. In Tasmania, as I understand the position, the roll is a voluntary one but, once a person has put his name on the roll, he is compelled to vote. I understand that the position in Victoria and Western Australia is that enrolment is compulsory and that voting is compulsory for Legislative Council elections. This matter was referred to in the last two

Labor Party policy speeches, so there can be no doubt where the Party stands on the matter: it believes that there should be one roll and that every individual should have the right to elect Legislative Council members.

If we want to keep the State democratic and this Council functioning, the least we can do is to give everyone a democratic vote. If we want to be a House of Review and perform the way we did yesterday everyone should have the right to vote, not just a select few people. As I feel sure that this question will be debated more fully later in the session, I will not go into detail on the matter. I formally oppose the Bill and hope that it will not be passed.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the Bill. This private member's Bill was introduced by the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, and I thought that when he spoke on it he brought out some very cogent points, and I commend him for his interest in this matter. I was sorry to hear the Chief Secretary give the Government's view that it opposed the Bill. He was incorrect in saying that there have not been any complaints about the single roll, as I have had many complaints in Central District No. 2 as a result of errors on the single roll.

My main objection to the new system of the single roll is that, whether or not we like it and irrespective of the Party to which we belong and its policy (leaving politics out of it), we should adhere to the State Constitution as much as we can. With the advent of the single roll we saw a state of affairs arise at election time when it was not a true voluntary vote for the Legislative Council.

Voters were forced by law to go to the booths to vote for their House of Assembly candidates, and poll clerks, in marking off the names on the single roll (where it applied) saw the letters "LC" (representing the Legislative Council) after the name and, quite understandably, said to the elector in front of the table, "You, of course, have a vote for the Legislative Council, too." Saying this, the poll clerk handed a second voting paper to the particular voters.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But they were not forced to vote.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is true; they were not forced to vote, but we have to bring some semblance of common sense into the argument, surely. When one places oneself in the position of such a voter and he or she is handed two voting papers, naturally that person registers two votes. That that

occurred was proved by the percentage vote for the Legislative Council in instances like that.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That can be argued along Party lines, but the Constitution of this State says that voting for this Council shall be voluntary, and the only way at that stage of the process of voting in which we can have voluntary voting is to have two separate rolls; the voter should be able to exercise his right if he wishes to and move to the clerk in front of the Legislative Council roll and say, "I wish to exercise my right to vote for the Legislative Council."

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That clerk could be hidden away at the other end of the table so that the voter would forget to ask for a ballot-paper.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am trying to keep the debate away from that aspect. True voluntary voting means that we must allow the voter the opportunity, on his own initiative, to approach the clerk, who should have a separate roll for the Legislative Council in front of him, and then the voter should exercise his wish to seek that paper through that particular roll, if he wants to. That is the core of the problem and the fundamental reason why that point was introduced by the Hon. Sir Norman Jude in the Bill we are now debating.

There are, of course, two matters contained in the Bill, and that is one of them. The other one concerns voluntary voting for the House of Assembly voters in this State. I recall that it was late last year when Sir Norman first showed his interest by endeavouring to amend the Electoral Act in regard to these two points. I was Minister in charge of a Bill in this Council at that time—December, 1969. The Bill was a simple one to amend the Electoral Act and, rather unexpectedly, Sir Norman Jude moved his amendments along lines identical to those in this Bill. He pursued his point on that occasion with considerable vigour and, in fact, carried his two amendments by a majority of five, the voting being 12 to seven.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That does not mean much, does it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think the figures are fairly small and simple and, if the Minister wishes to work it out on a percentage basis or tackle it in some other way, that is entirely up to him. He should understand it because of the smallness of those figures: 12 to seven

gives a majority of five. The amended measure went to another place, which disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendments, so it came back here and the process was that it was my duty to seek a further change, that the Legislative Council should not insist on its amendments.

I think the whole history of the matter as raised by the honourable member will be further understood if I read some of the concluding paragraphs of a speech I made at that time, because I think they should be recorded in the report of this debate. This is what I said on that occasion:

I mentioned last night that the amendments came as a surprise; they were thrown on the Council without a great deal of time available to consider them. The Bill was purely a small machinery measure in which Parliament was asked to authorize the printing of rolls for the proposed new boundaries under the amendment to the Constitution Act, and also to continue to print all rolls under the existing boundaries in case of a by-election before the next general election.

Honourable members have had overnight to consider this matter further, and the reasons which I submitted last night still hold good, as far as I am concerned. I urge this Committee not to agree to these two large and radical measures at this time. It may well be that the Hon. Sir Norman Jude might further canvass his proposals in the months to come after the people of this State have had ample opportunity to discuss and debate amongst themselves the merits of both amendments.

It might well then be that the Government would be in a far better position to gauge the extent of public opinion on these matters. It might well be, too, that people generally would have had ample time to inform their Parliamentary representatives what they thought of the two changes. There is no need for me to mention to honourable members that undue haste can be dangerous because in this place we appreciate ample time to consider measures so that when legislation is finally placed on the Statute Book the best legislation possible emerges from a bicameral system of Parliament, which I know the majority of members here hold so dear.

I hope the Hon. Sir Norman Jude will not pursue the matter at this stage but give it further thought; he will have ample time during the next session of Parliament, if he so wishes, to test the views held on these matters. Sir Norman did not pursue the matter, and the Council reversed its decision. Much water has passed under the bridge since that time and the Government has changed but, nevertheless, the honourable member has had an opportunity to canvass (no doubt, both within his electoral district and throughout the State) the general feeling of the people about compulsory voting compared with voluntary vot-

ing. Of the two measures in his Bill, I think this is the more important. I know that honourable members have had time to discuss this matter within their electoral districts, so it is proper for Sir Norman to have introduced his Bill. I support it very strongly.

When we regard Australia as a whole in this matter of compulsory voting, we see that not many comparable or larger countries in the western democracies join with Australia in compulsory voting. I have compiled a list of all the countries that have compulsory voting. Compared with all the nations in the western world, they are very few. The countries with compulsory voting are: Argentina, Belgium, Ecuador—where, incidentally, voting is optional for women; that is an interesting exercise to contemplate—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Do you agree with that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —Guatemala, Italy, Peru, Spain, the United Arab Republic, Venezuela and Australia (except for the Upper Houses in South Australia and New South Wales). That list is compiled from the *Institute of Electoral Research, Parliaments and Electoral Systems*, of 1962. It has been checked with the latest *Statesman's Year Book*, and I think it is correct. But not many countries are involved.

The other great democracies of the world, such as the United States of America, Britain, Canada, France, West Germany, and many others, are not included. In these countries voting is voluntary, and I think it is a significant point in the debate to consider that we are somewhat on our own in pursuing a policy of compulsory voting.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Doesn't our system work all right, or does it?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Are there two Houses of Parliament in all the provinces of Canada?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I was dealing with countries as a whole and was not considering the separate States or provinces. Compulsory voting was first introduced in Australia in Queensland in 1915, and in the next 27 years up to 1942, when it was introduced in South Australia (the last State to accept compulsory voting), change came throughout this country.

The Commonwealth adopted compulsory voting in 1924; Victoria in 1926; New South Wales and Tasmania in 1928; and Western Australia in 1936. I consider that there is a growing public opinion in this State (and political friends of mine in other States tell

me that they are sensing the same change in public thinking in those States) objecting to compulsory voting and favouring voluntary voting.

I think it is appropriate for South Australia to show a lead and some initiative in trying, at least, to canvass whether it will be in the best interests of the people to change from one type of voting to another. Particularly is this feeling noticeable among migrants in South Australia. They come here from countries where voluntary voting operates and they find our system, in some cases, quite objectionable.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But they came here knowing that system was operating.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They came here not knowing all about Australia, but they came because they wanted a new and better life for themselves and their children, and this practice was one of the few rude shocks (if I could put it that way) they encountered when they arrived here. I refer particularly to English migrants, and I have no doubt that if we took a canvass (and perhaps the Government may be interested in taking a referendum, as it is in the mood at present) in Elizabeth—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Someone might get the press to run a poll and you could buy a few thousand copies. This has happened before.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —and asked migrants whether they would prefer to change from the present system of compulsory voting to one of voluntary voting I am sure that there would be an overwhelming majority in favour of the change. As representatives of those people we should give credence to their views, and this is one reason why I believe all members should consider this question seriously.

When I have spoken to English migrants on this point and they have objected to the present system, their main objection was that compulsory voting meant compulsion and that people were compelled, under the law and under threat of punishment, to attend polling booths. It is this general compulsion that is involved in compulsory voting to which strong objection is taken by migrants. Because the trend of migration will continue and because this subject is gaining more and more effect in public discussion, I believe that within 10 years or 15 years positive moves will be made throughout Australia to change from compulsory to voluntary voting.

It is said sometimes that with voluntary voting fewer people vote and that the percentages of those who vote would be a small one. This point is used as an argument in favour of retaining the present system. Most of the comparable elections used as examples to substantiate that view are council elections. It is difficult to equate a council election with a State or Commonwealth election, because the issues are so much larger at the State or Commonwealth level compared with local issues in council elections.

It is interesting to note that in Great Britain, Denmark, and West Germany more than 75 per cent of eligible voters consistently vote at national elections. In the United States of America voter participation has gone from 44.2 per cent in 1920 to a high in 1960 of 63.8 per cent, and that is the last figure I have been able to obtain from the U.S.A. In Great Britain at general elections since 1945 about 79 per cent of the electors have voted.

I consider that this view that one sometimes hears expressed can be rebutted with great effect when we consider the relatively high percentage of votes achieved in other countries. If we changed here the same trend would be evident, and there would be no reason why a vote of about 70 per cent to 80 per cent of the eligible voters could not be obtained.

One of the greatest influences in elections in the last 10 years or 20 years has been the increased use of news media at elections, and the advent of television has played a large part in State and Commonwealth elections. It may be considered that, because of the influence of this kind of publicity, there may be some different effect at elections under either a voluntary or compulsory voting system. However, that is not so in regard to this influence of news media.

I have read with much interest that for elections in Great Britain the growth of mass media has shifted attention overwhelmingly away from individual candidates towards Party leaders, and that effect is noticeable in Australia and in this State today. We have quite comparable consequences as a result of the news media playing a much greater part at elections, but I do not think that that aspect is of great moment.

The strong points that favour voluntary voting are, first, the question of compulsion, to which I have referred, and, secondly, that there is an infringement of one's personal liberty when one is forced to go to the poll irrespective of what one wishes to do as a

result of one's conscience. Dealing first with compulsion, I consider that it does not ensure a well informed vote, and what we need is people who are well informed to vote in our elections. We want to achieve a thoughtful vote. We want more and more people to become interested in politics—and interested to the point of going to the polls voluntarily.

We should educate the electors to take politics seriously and become well informed on all political matters, and we should give those people the option of going to the polls. If we do those things we will get a better result than we do at present. The aim of politicians and political Parties should be not only to secure a vote from the electors but also to awaken an interest in politics by individuals. This most important goal should be borne in mind by all politicians. If a voluntary voting system operated here, we would have the opportunity to achieve that goal.

Politicians and political Parties would place far greater emphasis on the need to awaken the individual's interest in politics and, by so doing, they would hope to secure his vote. So, I cannot stress too strongly that people do not want this kind of compulsion. People who throughout their lives have experienced a voluntary system find it a great change to live under a compulsory system, and they object to it. The question of one's personal liberty being infringed by this compulsion must also be seriously reckoned with by democrats everywhere. Under our system one is forced, under threat of punishment by law, to go to the polls. One writer put it as follows:

Although they may have a moral obligation to vote—

because everyone should take an interest in politics—

that moral obligation does not need a legal obligation to underpin it.

We have (and I do not put forward this question as an extremely important one, but it ought to be considered) the question of the donkey vote, where people go to the polls and, not wishing to exercise a vote, simply vote down the ballot-paper or give first preference to one candidate and no thought to the other candidates to whom they give their preference votes. Sometimes that can create a final result that is completely different from the result intended by those who voted in that way. That problem would be largely overcome if a change was made.

Party machines have less work to do under the present system, but I do not think that that is a valid argument for compulsory voting.

Political Parties have a duty to do more than put their case to the people in the knowledge that the law forces those people to exercise their vote; political Parties should pursue their campaigns with greater vigour, and they would have to do that under a voluntary voting system. Consequently, election campaigns would be improved, and politicians and political Parties would put more effort into their campaigns than they do at present.

There would be less Government expense in running an electoral department under a voluntary system. All the problems of chasing up people who fail to vote, checking the rolls, and matters of that kind would largely be overcome if the voting was voluntary.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Would there not be more work for the department if there were two rolls instead of one?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The compilation of two rolls might involve extra work but, if voluntary voting were introduced in the House of Assembly, the task of writing to people who did not vote and the months of work involved in chasing them up and considering their submissions would be eliminated.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If there was voluntary voting, would you agree to one roll?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I strongly support the two-roll system because, irrespective of trying to marry up the two rolls (where some advantage could be gained for one Party or the other), true voluntary voting for this Council ought to be kept apart—even apart from a changed voting system for the House of Assembly. I commend the Hon. Sir Norman Jude for introducing this Bill, of which we had notice last year.

From inquiries I have made in my electoral district, I am more and more convinced that many people in the community favour voluntary voting. I do not think this will be the end of the matter in this State or other States. I believe that in the next 10 to 15 years we will be hearing much more about it. After a period (it may be 20 years) the whole of Australia, including the Commonwealth itself, will revert to a voluntary system. I strongly support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to support this short Bill which was introduced by Sir Norman Jude and for which action I commend him. It has only two main clauses. Clause 2 provides that section 21 of the principal Act should be amended by including a passage to ensure that separate rolls will be printed and used for any Council election to be held after the commencement

of this Act. Clause 3 provides for the repeal of section 118a of the principal Act.

I would support very strongly the action of Sir Norman Jude in this matter. I believe that voting for the Legislative Council should be truly voluntary and, of course (as the Hon. Mr. Hill said earlier this afternoon), it has not been so since the advent of the combined roll because in effect every person who has the letters "L.C." in front of his or her name is offered by the assistant returning officer or the presiding officer a voting paper for the Legislative Council, and from memory I think that at the last election the voting for the House of Assembly on its roll was 92 per cent and the voting for the Legislative Council on the Council roll was 95 per cent.

Therefore, the provision of voluntary voting was largely overcome by the combined roll. For that reason, I support very strongly the move by Sir Norman Jude to institute and maintain separate rolls even if voluntary voting becomes the order of the day for the House of Assembly, because I believe that the separate roll is a further safeguard to see that voluntary voting still obtains for the Legislative Council.

The Chief Secretary in his speech used the words "democratic vote", or some words to that effect. Whilst I appreciate that his Party holds a particular point of view, I question the use of the word "democratic" in that instance. It is all very well to refer to a democratic vote, but if a person is compelled to exercise a vote I do not think that is democratic. I suggest to the honourable gentleman that he has a think about whether in fact compulsion is democratic.

We all know that throughout the world the great majority of countries have voluntary voting, and I think it would be true to say also that the great majority of countries have a bicameral system. We can think of a few places here and there which do not have this, but I believe that it is a system which has been well and truly tried and that the voluntary vote provides an informed vote. I have spoken about this matter previously, and I have said (and I make no apology for repeating it) that I believe voting should be voluntary at all times. I believe it should be voluntary in all strata of government in Australia, from local government to both the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly in this Parliament and also to the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why don't you tell us where this system has broken down?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe that the voluntary system is a better system because we get an informed vote. In a voluntary voting system we have coming to vote the people who are really interested and who have some knowledge of what they are voting on, whereas with the compulsory vote we bring in everybody including the people who, as the Hon. Mr. Hill said earlier, exercise the donkey vote merely to avoid a fine. Those people vote straight down or straight up the card and they do not contribute anything to an accurate and worthwhile result of an election. I believe it is right that people should be able to vote—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How many donkey votes did you get?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I would suggest that the average is about 2 per cent of the total poll; that is what I have been told. I imagine that possibly the Chief Secretary also received 2 per cent. However, I believe that under the system of compulsory voting an uninformed person may have an undue influence on the result because he votes only in an uninformed manner: he merely wishes to avoid a punishment such as a fine. I have heard people say that this country is going backwards and that this is a backward State. I do not agree. I still think it was a mistake that voluntary voting was discontinued in 1942. Many countries still apply voluntary voting; for instance, Great Britain, and I do not think that anyone would suggest that Great Britain, on balance, is a backward country or is slipping backwards. Perhaps it slipped backwards in the last six years, but it is going ahead again now.

I support the Hon. Sir Norman Jude's effort to introduce voluntary voting again throughout this Parliament. Section 118a was introduced in 1942 to provide compulsory voting for the House of Assembly, but voting for that House should be voluntary, too. As the Hon. Mr. Hill said, the Party machines would have to work harder and more interest would have to be shown in politics if voting was voluntary. I have mentioned these things before, but I do not intend to say more now. I merely wish to commend the Hon. Sir Norman Jude and to support the second reading.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I support the Bill. It is obvious where I

come from, and I speak with some experience of the value and importance of voluntary voting in other countries. In Britain people have to think why they are voting. In Australia, my experience has been that many people go to the polls because they are compelled to do so; they think very little about it. Bearing in mind that about one in five of this country's population has come from overseas countries that have voluntary voting, I assure the Government that these people are puzzled by our compulsory system. One in five means that about the population of Tasmania, South Australia and Western Australia has come to this country or has been born of parents who have come to this country since the Second World War, and that is why an increasing number of people are becoming interested in voluntary voting.

By interjection, an honourable member today asked where our present system had broken down. I think it has broken down as a result of the large number of informal votes cast at election after election. A number of people have told me (and I am sure that other honourable members would subscribe to this statement) that they spoiled their ballot-papers because they did not wish to vote for any of the candidates offering. Why should a person be forced to go to the polls when he is disillusioned, fed up and unhappy with all the candidates and all the Parties' policies? I have said before (and I cannot reiterate it too strongly) that a person should have a freedom of choice and the right to go to the poll and cast a vote: he should also have the right to stay away, and not be punished for doing so.

Issues become important when a person has to think why he must vote, but they are less important when he is compelled to vote. Regarding democracy, I remind the Council that Plato said that democracy is only a temporary staging point between aristocracy and dictatorship: we are somewhere midway between the two points. When we say to a man or a woman, "You will vote or suffer the consequences", I think we are much nearer dictatorship than aristocracy.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I oppose the second reading of the Bill. I am surprised that the Hon. Mr. Springett suggested that we should change our way of life because one in five of the population is a migrant or the offspring of migrants and because he may be voting under a different system here. I remind the honourable member that one person in five came to this country because he wanted to live here and

wanted to adopt Australia as his country. The honourable member also said that compulsory voting should not be necessary but, probably, one in three of those same people also drove on the right-hand side of the road in their own country; yet here they are compelled to drive on the left of the road. How undemocratic it must be for them to have to change their driving habits! Should we change our laws to benefit those people?

It is no surprise to me that the Hon. Sir Norman Jude has introduced this Bill. The people of South Australia, now that we have a fair redistribution of electoral districts, can get the Government they want, and that is the reason why the Opposition does not want to change the method of voting for the Legislative Council. The people should decide for themselves what kind of Government and what type of Council member they want. The Bill is a Bill of fear as far as the Hon. Sir Norman Jude is concerned. Of the honourable members who said that voluntary voting is the best system there is, not one of them has shown where compulsory voting has fallen down in any other State or in the Commonwealth. Perhaps we get the wrong Government because of compulsion: we have six Liberal and Country League Governments out of seven because of compulsory voting. I could probably agree that in the circumstances we have the wrong Governments, but never mind, the people will wake up eventually and we will not have the wrong Governments. Why they are dissatisfied with compulsory voting when there are six L.C.L. Governments out of seven is that they know that their seats are at stake and, with a proper vote (as near as possible to one vote one value), they would go out on their necks at the next election. I oppose the second reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I am afraid that the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Banfield has brought me to my feet.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He got under your skin.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I shall draw one or two analogies between what occurs within trade unions and what the honourable member wants to apply in State elections. I accept that compulsory voting is perhaps the democratic way, as honourable members of the Labor Party have suggested. However, they have not adopted this democratic policy of voting in their own unions.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We look to you to give us a lead!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Furthermore, perhaps they could adopt the policy that we adopt in our voting, in relation to secret voting. Let the unions have secret voting and compulsory voting among their members and let them see what the industrial situation will be then. Perhaps we would have a different answer and perhaps we would have different people in control of the unions today, if that happened.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You do not know about this. Voting is compulsory and secret for the officers and it is conducted by a poll.

The Hon. L. R. HART: We must be consistent in our system of voting. Let us have the same form of voting for the election of officers within unions or large organizations. If the Hon. Mr. Banfield was consistent, he would go along with voluntary voting, because that is the system that unions adopt in relation to their own elections.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are wrong.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is the system they adopt in arriving at decisions and policies in their own unions. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude is to be commended for introducing this Bill. If we liked to take a referendum throughout the State on this matter—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: With voluntary or compulsory voting?

The Hon. L. R. HART: —it would have overwhelming support. We must be consistent. Therefore, I support the measure.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I shall be brief in my reply. I thank those honourable members who have given their attention to this Bill which, although comparatively short, has strong implications. I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Hill on the obvious amount of homework he has done on this matter, and particularly in his explanation of why the matter was more or less deferred last year. I deferred it at the request of the present Chief Secretary when he said I was entitled to my own views. I think he still thinks that, and he is entitled to his views. I remind honourable members, as previous speakers have done, that this matter of voluntary voting is coming to a head in this State and, if anyone has brought it to a head, it is the new Government. As I warned the other day in a friendly way, it is interfering with local government, and local government will bite the hand that feeds it—make no mistake about it.

If honourable members feel uncertain about it, let them go out into the country now and

find out. Let them go to the ratepapers and ascertain whether they want compulsory voting for every single person within their district council area, whether or not they pay any rates. I mentioned one other point that should have the attention of those who support their own ideology—that, if voting comes to pass in the near future for people 18 years of age, as I believe it will, compelling them, some of whom admit they are immature in political matters, to vote, it will not be sound. Give them the vote, yes, but there should be second thoughts about compelling youngsters of 18 to vote. That, too, will whip up ever-increasing support for voluntary voting.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield said, “Give us some examples of where this compulsory system has gone wrong.” I cannot dig up Mussolini and ask the honourable member to look at the countries behind the Iron Curtain with their “voluntary” voting. In some of them, occasionally people have the option of voting for a candidate, but not for another Party. It is compulsory voting, yet the honourable member believes that all kinds of compulsory voting are sound. If one believes in a dictatorship, it means compulsory voting: the honourable member cannot have it both ways. A dictatorship is a dictatorship and voting is compulsory—and what is more, under a penalty not merely of some dollars but possibly of a rope around one’s neck.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What about Victoria and Western Australia when they introduced new voting laws for the Upper Houses of those two States?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The honourable member could have spoken about other States had he wished to. I am not worried by what he says, nor am I trembling with fear at the Hon. Mr. Banfield’s remarks. I introduced a similar measure before the last election.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But you did not come up for election.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I brought in the Bill before the election in which your Party was returned to Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And the Bill was not acceptable.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I do not wish to debate with the honourable member across the floor, but he himself suggested there was much to be said for voluntary voting if his Party could get into office under that method of voting. In conclusion, I repeat what I said a short time ago—that the only person who gains by compulsory voting is the politician himself—and that is not good enough

for the people of this State. However, it is a truism: "the only person who wants compulsory voting is the politician, for his own sake and for the sake of his Party."

The Council divided on the second reading:

Ayes (12)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude (teller), H. K. Kemp, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story.

Noes (4)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

CAPITAL TAXATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon.

H. K. Kemp:

(For wording of motion, see page 640.)

(Continued from August 12. Page 642.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): The Government opposes this motion for several reasons. Land tax and succession duties have been for many years a traditional source of revenues of State Governments in Australia, as well as of Governments in most other parts of the world.

In recent years these taxes have made up a quarter to a third of our State taxation. Moreover, now that the Commonwealth has made it abundantly clear that the States will not be allowed to participate again in income taxation and the High Court has ruled out a variety of stamp duties as excises and therefore outside the constitutional reach of the States, there are few alternative sources of tax revenues available to the State.

As everyone knows, land tax is not a tax on income because it must be paid whether or not the landholder makes a current income out of the land or not. That is not to say it is not paid out of income. In many cases it is of course paid out of income, and in most cases it even ranks as a deduction from income for the purposes of paying income taxation. Land tax is calculated upon the unimproved value of land, and land can only get a value because people in the open market are prepared to pay for it. People are prepared to pay market value for land either because they believe it is worth that through the income it will help to produce or because they expect, in due course, to be able to sell it at that value or better.

Apart from the general necessity for Governments to secure taxation revenues so as to provide the services required by the public, a land tax is reasonable in that the actions of the Government itself and of the populace generally have contributed materially to land values. In the country areas increased land values have arisen from the provision of water supply, irrigation development and drainage, all of which are normally carried out at a loss. Values have been increased as a consequence of transport development, ordinarily also at a loss. In urban areas added values accrue through Government development programmes in water, sewers, housing, public transport, public parks and other development. Increased city values accrue from the provision of a variety of services including fire and police as well as the normal water, sewers, and transport.

Land tax rates are ordinarily quite low and on many properties are only 2c for each \$10, that is, a property with an unimproved value of \$5,000 only pays \$10 a year tax. The Government has recognized that recent difficulties in rural areas have reduced values of land and impaired the capacity to pay land tax. It has already taken action to ensure a revision of valuations that will be effective for land tax payments in the forthcoming financial year. It is further examining the position with land tax generally, and on rural lands in particular, and an amending Bill will be introduced to Parliament during the present session. An election undertaking has already been given that rural land tax will not be increased.

With succession duties the South Australian levies are effectively the lowest in Australia, substantially because they are succession and not estate duties. Our duties are much lower than in many other parts of the world. An election undertaking has been given that an amending Bill will be introduced to Parliament, and that Bill will, among other things, provide for a reduced impact of succession duties where rural property is passed on to a member of the immediate family. As with land tax it should be recognized that values accruing to rural and other properties have, in at least some measure, accrued by reason of actions of the Government and its developmental expenditures.

The third form of so-called "capital taxation" mentioned by the honourable member is council rates. These are levied upon the improved or unimproved value of property and are the traditional source of revenue of local authorities. They are recognized as the fairest, as

well as the traditional, revenue of those authorities whose services are important to all property owners. No satisfactory alternative revenue is available to Australian local authorities, which, of course, cannot use either income taxation or turnover taxes. I oppose the motion.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): In supporting the motion I congratulate the mover, the Hon. Mr. Kemp, on bringing this matter to the notice of Parliament and the Government. I cannot understand why the Government opposes this measure, because if a fact-finding committee were appointed it would give the Government the opportunity to call witnesses and have a thorough inquiry made into the effect of capital taxation on privately owned business, manufacturing, and primary industry in this State.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: All this information is available at the State Taxes Department and through councils.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Whilst I have the highest respect for the Public Service of South Australia, it has not cornered all the brains in the State. The State is entitled to have the benefit of the knowledge of people who compute income tax and run large businesses. Computers may store information but they cannot supply the milk of human kindness that a Government ought to mete out to industries that are in deep distress today.

It is unnecessary to repeat all the points made by the Chief Secretary. The British Government has been able to manage quite well without a tax on rural lands; it taxes the improvements such as houses and leaves the land alone. This type of policy ought to be carefully considered. Meetings of the committee will provide an opportunity for various people to give evidence. Farmers and graziers organizations, winegrape growers and manufacturing interests have collected much information, but it must go to an authoritative body to be collated and brought before Parliament. Regarding the matters raised by the Chief Secretary, we are all aware that these taxes play an important part in financing the State, but we are not sure whether, if they were levied in a different manner and on different sections, some alleviation could be effected.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What do you mean by "different sections"?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It might be that the same sum could be raised more equitably, because the Minister told me only yesterday that we need to become up-to-date. It is a long while since the method of levying these taxes has been considered. Meetings of the

committee would provide an opportunity for people to give their ideas.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: When you say "more equitably", what do you mean? Do you mean that people who could afford to pay more should pay more?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The whole concept of land tax goes back a long time; it goes back to the time when people on the land were very prosperous. However, over the years the whole system has altered. Land that was valuable in certain areas has become more and more valuable, but the return from that land has not increased in the slightest.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It has decreased.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; it has decreased in many areas. This is the sort of thing that the committee should consider. So, I am happy to support the motion and I think the Government should be happy to support it, too, because it is important that we get all the information that we possibly can in order to formulate an opinion on the matter. I do not know exactly what will be in the Government's Bill on succession duties; I have heard various opinions expressed by Labor Party members. I have heard the Premier say that in some cases succession duties will be freed up to \$200,000 on certain properties; this seems a very high figure. Since the Bill on succession duties will be considered by this Council later and since the Government has promised to review the system of land tax, I think that the Council will be able to debate the Bill more effectively if it is put in full possession of the facts as a result of the work of the proposed committee. I support the motion, and I hope the Council will support it, too.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the motion and compliment the Hon. Mr. Kemp on bringing it before the Council. I am somewhat surprised to hear that the Government is opposing it, because the information obtained by such a Select Committee, with the power to examine witnesses, would be very beneficial to both the Government and the Parliament. Although I do not dispute the Chief Secretary's claim that much of the State's revenue is obtained from capital taxation, nevertheless we must consider the full impact of this type of taxation under present conditions. Only too often Governments, when requiring more revenue, are inclined to concentrate on those areas where the taxation can be levied with the least political impact, rather than investigate in

detail the impact of the tax on the people concerned.

In Parliament we often hear the question of taxation being debated on a theoretical level rather than from the viewpoint of its impact on people. I understand that a person with high qualifications is, under a Commonwealth grant and on behalf of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, investigating the effect of this type of taxation on primary production. However, the Hon. Mr. Kemp's motion goes further and covers the whole field of capital taxation. An investigation such as this will not only deal with the scale of taxation on a theoretical level but involve witnesses who can illustrate from their own experience the impact of capital taxation. Like other honourable members, I know of cases where the breadwinner has died and the rest of the family has been left in distress. Such people will now be able to come forward and give exact details of the impact of the various forms of taxation on their own lives and industries. It is only by compiling evidence from a cross-section of such people that a clear picture can be obtained.

It is easy to stand on the floor of this Chamber or anywhere else and speak emotionally about the need to raise more revenue to provide extra money for, say, education, and to use this need to justify imposing more taxation. However, I believe the time has now come to examine more closely the impact of such taxes on those who will pay them, because in many fields of endeavour within South Australia the once prosperous days have gone and it is no longer easy for Governments to levy taxation without suffering repercussions. Therefore, I believe that this motion should be welcomed by the Government as a guide line to its taxation programme.

I hope that the taxation measures foreshadowed in the Government's policy speech and again in His Excellency's Speech will not be introduced into Parliament until such time as the reports from the proposed Select Committee and from this other more independent investigation through the C.S.I.R.O. are made available to members of Parliament. I consider that this move proposed by the Hon. Mr. Kemp in this Council is the first positive move that we have seen in this Parliament to solve some of the difficulties that the primary and secondary industries, particularly the primary industries, are facing.

I believe that before real relief can be given, the Government must first of all understand the full impact of taxation and what it will do to the detriment of this State, particularly as we now have a Government which has very little representation on it from rural areas and also very few members directly connected with commerce and secondary industry. I believe this makes a committee such as is proposed all the more vital in the provision of information to the Government and to Parliament. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): The Chief Secretary said that basically the taxation of the State that is raised from land tax and succession duties has been instrumental in assisting in the development of the State in the forms of water, roads, electricity and many other essential services, and that is quite correct. In fact, the development that has gone on in South Australia in the last two decades has been remarkable. However, we have reached the point of quite a decided crossroads in the economic future of much of our agricultural area. This applies not only in the primary field but also amongst those people who are tied up with the primary producer in some form or another, namely, those people who make up country towns and have stores and shops or, as the Hon. Mr. Kemp described it, the manufacturing and privately owned business sections of the community that are themselves integrated with the rural community.

It was in 1954 that money was given to three scientists in the United States of America to look into the possibilities of increasing the production of corn, rice and wheat. Now in 1970 we have in this world a surplus of one or other of these commodities in Pakistan, India, Burma and Japan, to name just a few places. There is now a surplus of grain food, brought about by the growing of these new hybrid varieties of wheat, rice or corn. This must have an effect on the traditional markets of Australia's primary industries. New South Wales hopes to have before the end of 1971 a hybrid wheat that will average better than 100 bushels an acre. If it becomes a proposition to grow this wheat in Australia, there will be another economic impact. As I said earlier, much industry and much of our rural areas are at the crossroads. Where will we go in the next decade? We have a standard of taxation which, I admit, has done much to advance the State. Do we want these industries as outlined in the motion to still be here in 10 years' time, or do we want them to be

absorbed into great big industries, whether they be primary or secondary? The history of South Australia can be noted by the small towns which, since my day of travelling around the State, have died.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: And you are yet only a young fellow.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes. Initially, the State was opened up by large landholders. Because they had the ability, the foresight, and the capital to open the country up, the country became known to the white man. Then the Government of the day, wisely enough, made it essential that those big estates be cut up. Enough base knowledge was established to know the pattern of rainfall and the pattern of agricultural content to make it possible for the small landholder to come in and to populate the State. This has gone on for about 90 to 100 years, and it will be regrettable if before 1980 we are back with large land holdings. If that happens, the small towns that at present are still struggling on will be gone completely, and we will be back to the exact opposite of what we have at the moment.

This would not be the fault of taxation entirely. However, taxes would be a contributing factor towards it. As the Council is only too well aware, the problem of marketing Australia's primary produce is becoming more difficult every year. Today's newspaper shows the price of wool down still further, and it shows that the price of Australia's wheat is up; it gives us many conflicting opinions on how we are going economically, and this makes it difficult to assess the true value of land today. In fact, I do not think people have ever really been able to assess the true value of land, although many have tried. The formula of the willing buyer and the willing seller has been established as a basis for valuation. Whether this can be altered for the better or for the worse is not the point of this argument. However, it is the point of taxation, because this is the only way that the Government, through the years, has been able to find an equitable basis for it.

However, what is the value of land when we have a falling market for our produce and a depressed economy? Also, until today possibly we have had extremely difficult climatic conditions, making the prospects of harvest yields for 1970-71 extremely doubtful. In fact, the Minister of Agriculture, in a statement last weekend, pointed out the difficulties that may occur. All of these things make land valuation difficult and land taxation equally

difficult. The appointment of a Select Committee could do no harm. Many a deputation has gone to a succession of Premiers and Treasurers to ask that land tax and succession duties be reduced. Many of these deputations have gone along with a strong case, and the Premier or Treasurer of the day has always been able to counter the case by saying, "All right, if we reduce the taxation on your industry, where does the State go for the provision of railways and hospitals?" The deputations were left speechless because they were unable to answer. The Government of the day or the Premier of the day may have been sincere in his thinking that industry should overcome its own problems, but it is equally a matter—

The Hon. C. R. Story: I don't think the Government is interested.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Talk sense, and you'll get somewhere.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Hon. Mr. Story mentioned the concessions that have been made in the United Kingdom.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's a good gimmick. What is the use of moving motions that we cannot do anything with?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In Great Britain a 45 per cent reduction in succession duties for agricultural land has applied since 1925. In 1954, it was extended to industrial premises, and to plant and machinery used for the purpose of trade carried on by the deceased as a family business. In other words, the United Kingdom Government made a concession along much the same lines as the words the Hon. Mr. Kemp used when he asked for an investigation into the private business manufacturing side of industry. By interjection I have been challenged to answer what can be done about this. Does the Chief Secretary want to be accused of being like an ostrich with its head in the sand and not learning any more? Is there anything wrong in going ahead and looking into these problems so that for the next decade Governments and people can plan properly if they want to assist those industries that are going through a depression type of economy?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the worker! He's getting a bad deal.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: All sections of Australian industry can be said to be in difficulty. One has only to think of the objections that have been raised to the Commonwealth Government's Budget by certain sections of the community who say they are not getting a fair go.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think that the Budget was all right?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Many able members of the trade union movement are trying to improve the lot of the worker. It was once said that Socialism was the only "ism" that could help the worker, but it has been proved since Mr. Chifley ceased to be Prime Minister that even a Liberal Government can assist in the social needs and welfare of the worker.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It's not doing too good a job at the moment.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: But the Chief Secretary must admit that an attempt is being made. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said, "What about the workers?" If it could be proved that the workers were not getting the assistance that the Hon. Mr. Banfield thinks is necessary, he should move for a Select Committee to investigate his problems.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But we haven't the numbers.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are not short of pocket money.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Now we have the answer!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We're talking about a Select Committee.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Chief Secretary said what he said, and I noted his words.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Norman Jude): Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I take a point—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can't pin that one on me. You can't get me two days straight.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: A section of industry needs help and asks that a Select Committee be appointed to investigate its problems. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I commend the Hon. Mr. Kemp for introducing this private member's motion into this Chamber. It indicates the intimate concern he has for the interests that he supports here—the primary industries of this State, which are so prominent in the Southern District, for which he is a member. However, I notice he does not concern himself only with the effect of capital taxation on primary industry: he has added to that his concern about its effect

on both the business and the manufacturing industries of the State. Those two latter areas involve the electorate I have the honour to serve.

I cannot stress too strongly how the business and manufacturing areas are greatly concerned about both rising costs and Government taxation. Perhaps I should call them the commercial and manufacturing interests both within metropolitan Adelaide and elsewhere rather than the business and manufacturing interests. There is no need for me to stress the need for us in South Australia to keep down costs. For many years this principle has been pursued by those who have been in Government, those who have steered this State along the path to prosperity and those who have laid the foundations for commerce and industry upon which South Australia has built its reputation in the whole national scene.

May I now compliment particularly Sir Thomas Playford and all members of his Government for the way in which they religiously pursued their endeavours to keep down costs in South Australia, for that is where the very secret of the State's success lies: as long as we can keep down costs South Australia can compete with the other States. It has always been well-known in South Australia that, if industry generally here ever released its grip on this problem, the State would be in a serious position compared with other States, because we have to compete in our commercial and secondary areas with the manufacturers and commerce of the other States. Unless we keep down costs here, since we must add transport costs to the price of our goods that must be taken to Melbourne, Sydney and other places where the demand for them lies, we cannot compete successfully.

Included in this sector of costs are the various items of capital taxation about which the Hon. Mr. Kemp is concerned. So we have now reached a stage (because there has been over the past few years considerable pressures towards increasing costs) where commerce and manufacturing industries in this State are finding great difficulty in the area of national competition.

It is realistic for the Hon. Mr. Kemp to ask, "Is it not time some particular group looked at this whole matter of capital taxation to see whether or not it is adding too much to costs in these particular fields?" The honourable member has reasoned that a most competent group to investigate this matter would be a Select Committee of this Council.

At this point, I must express my bitter disappointment that the Government seems to have turned its back on this investigation. The whole success of the Government may well lie in the ability of commerce and industry in this State in battling through in the next few years to a world of new prosperity. The Government seems not to be interested in investigating this matter, so it deserves strong criticism.

In fact, it has turned its back on this proposed investigation to such an extent that I hear rumours in the corridors that the Government is not interested even in coming on to the Select Committee. If that is so, it is something for which the Government must be roundly condemned, because investigation would include an inquiry not only into the costs of the commercial and industrial sectors of the State but into the costs of its primary industries. For example, to take two areas at random—the Upper Murray and the South-East of the State—the people engaged in primary industry there will be most concerned that the Government has turned its back on this suggestion that capital taxation as it affects those people should be examined, and that they will not be given an opportunity through their representatives to examine this serious problem. We cannot stress this too strongly.

Unless we can sell our produce (our goods, our appliances and our motor cars) on the Eastern seaboard, South Australia will be in serious trouble. We know that transportation costs can be reduced to only a certain level, because our goods must travel fairly long distances, so this differential compared with that of the manufacturers of similar items in the Eastern States is something we cannot avoid. Therefore, unless we can keep our costs low, South Australia as a manufacturing State is doomed in the national sphere. We may be able to export some of these products but, in the Australian market, the great bulk of the buying public is in Melbourne and Sydney and in the provincial cities of the Eastern States. So, any help that Parliament can give to commerce and industry must be given.

If the Hon. Mr. Kemp's motion is carried, research will be possible into the whole question. However, judging by the Chief Secretary's reply today, the Government is not interested in it; it seems to be happily basking in the sunshine of its recent political victory.

The long-term future of South Australia hangs in the balance as costs rise. So, I con-

demn the Government for not supporting the Hon. Mr. Kemp's proposal for some form of investigation to see whether assistance can be given to promote the long-term interests of commerce and industry so that South Australia can not only remain alive but build on the foundations laid in the past.

The forms of capital taxation include land tax, Engineering and Water Supply Department rates, succession duties, and local government rates, which concerned me greatly when I was Minister of Local Government. The time has come when an inquiry should be held into the question whether local government rates in South Australia are too high; I am talking from the viewpoint of the individual ratepayer.

The committee should carefully consider the question of local government rating. There is much disquiet at present about the way council rates have increased throughout the metropolitan area in the current financial year. My personal council rates (though I do not want to bring my own position into it) will probably increase by about 40 per cent this year.

One cannot help wondering whether local government is efficiently using its capital investments in equipment, plant and labour. When I was Minister of Local Government the question of amalgamation of neighbouring councils arose. I always took the view that the question of amalgamation was one that the local people, through their local government, should first discuss and initiate if any action was to be taken; that is the democratic way to approach the problem.

I have resisted and will resist any move by a State Government to try to initiate amalgamations. The proposed committee could well probe the possibility of some kind of regional planning between councils. Possibly plant and equipment could be used by several councils in the one area, officers in the one area could serve several councils, and there could be joint ownership of plant and equipment and joint outlay towards the cost of skilled labour.

If more efficient methods could be introduced, councils' costs would be reduced. As a result of regional planning and co-ordination, council rates, instead of rising as they are doing now, might in fact be held steady or even decrease. If this goal could be achieved, it would mean that commerce and secondary industry in the metropolitan area and primary industry might benefit considerably. A deep investigation into local government

rating has not yet been carried out, and this is the kind of work that I envisage the proposed committee could do, yet the Government has apparently rejected the proposal. If the Government would only pause and consider the question carefully, it would see that there is a possibility of improving efficiency.

I have in mind a section of South Australia's manufacturing industry that urgently needs assisting and ought to be investigated at Parliamentary level; it concerns not only manufacturers but also primary industry. Consequently, it marries up the sectors that the Hon. Mr. Kemp has included in his motion. The example I have in mind is that of the manufacturer of farm machinery who, we know from newspaper reports, is in dire trouble at present.

It was brought to the previous Government's attention that the farm machinery industry at Mannum was in very serious financial trouble. From reading the newspapers it is apparent that the larger farm machinery manufacturers are in a serious plight, too, because they have announced this in their annual reports.

It might well be that one reason why this industry is in trouble at present is that capital taxation in this State affecting these particular areas is too high. When I say "these particular areas" I do not confine this to the manufacturing industry itself, for of course the problem passes from the manufacturer to the client. If the man in rural industry is hard hit to such an extent through capital taxation that he cannot place his order for his farm machinery, then the manufacturer is in trouble.

That is the situation at the present time, and there may well be a need, in the interests of South Australia, for these manufacturers to receive special consideration. The primary producer plays an extremely large and effective part in the South Australian economy, so this is an area which should be very closely investigated.

It is an area that I know the Hon. Mr. Kemp has in mind when he advocates the appointment of a Select Committee of this Council for the purpose of undertaking a deep investigation into capital taxation. I point to that one particular industry as being only one that should be probed by a committee of this kind.

The Government, in effect, says that it is not interested in such a committee. What is the Government interested in as regards this whole problem area facing this State? One indication as an answer to that question was given today by the Hon. Mr. Banfield when he emphasized that he was interested in the

workers. I give the honourable member full marks for being genuinely interested in and supporting the cause of the workers in this State. However, he should look more deeply into the question than that; if he wants to help the workers he must also help the employers, for if the employers get into trouble and are forced by their financial position to put workers off their payroll, the workers suffer.

Therefore, it is a matter which is deserving of much deeper investigation than the straight-out claim "We worry about and support the workers." The honourable member must support both employers and employees, because they sink or swim together. In this whole question of looking at capital taxation as it affects business and the manufacturing and primary industries of this State, it is extremely regrettable that the Government, purporting to support the workers, says in effect, "We are not interested in this Select Committee."

Another area of capital taxation that is very worrying to commerce and industry is land tax. The time will come when, in South Australia, business interests simply will not be able to afford the increasing rates on land tax that are being charged. We know that the present system of aggregating unimproved value held under one ownership is reaching a proportion where it is becoming an extremely serious outgoing to some businesses.

This is tax on a scale basis and it increases with the total aggregation of unimproved value held in the one ownership. I am speaking now not as an extreme opponent of the Government's cause but in an endeavour to help it if I possibly can.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Thanks for your help!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government would be well advised to treat this matter with some sensitivity and to appreciate fully and understand the problem of business, commerce and manufacturing interests in this State, because it is the last straw that breaks the camel's back. The time could well come when very serious impositions on our whole business structure could result if capital taxation increases beyond a reasonable level.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The time has come in agriculture now.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not want to pursue that point to any great length because all around me I have honourable members who represent agricultural interests and who are much more highly skilled in this area than I am. I have had the privilege in the last couple of years of travelling into country

areas in this State, and on those travels I have heard of many of the problems facing people in agriculture and in rural interests generally, and I quite agree with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that that point has either been reached now or will be reached soon.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It has been reached now in many cases.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Extremely serious results will flow to South Australia if something is not done about the question of capital taxation. Of course, the Hon. Mr. Kemp is not demanding that it be done: he is just taking the first logical and proper step into the whole problem. All the honourable member is saying is, "Let us have a very deep investigation into it." He is stressing the seriousness of the position, but all he is asking for is an inquiry.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: A high level one.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: He wants a Select Committee appointed comprising members of this Council. He knows that members of this place would set about carrying out an inquiry as it should be carried out. I am sure that such a committee would call experts from the various sectors of the economic and all other communities of this State. The honourable member knows that experts and representatives of those who are being adversely affected by capital taxation would be called.

In due course, after their representations had been placed before the committee, all the submissions would be considered in detail. I believe that much good could come from such an inquiry.

It does not mean that the Government must accept the recommendations flowing from the committee. However, I think that a wise and prudent Government would at least appreciate the findings of such a committee, and it might be able to see its way clear in the general overall question of the State's finances to give a small amount of relief in some areas. It might well mean that some relief that can be given by the Government would be of great importance not only to some individuals in the State but also to the State as a whole.

Succession duties have been touched on rather extensively by some other honourable members who have spoken. This is a subject that principally concerns primary producers, because they are faced with the problem of having to pay very heavy succession duties; yet they need to retain the same amount of freehold to carry on the rural unit as an economic unit. Any help on succession duties that can be given to rural interests would

help not only the individual but might be a means of keeping people who are trained and experienced in rural industry on the land and of keeping the parcels of holdings at the optimum size that is necessary for efficient use and maximum production.

So I commend the Hon. Mr. Kemp in simply asking for this inquiry to be held. Again I express my disappointment at hearing the Government's view of the proposal. While I do not think I can influence the Government to change its mind on its first reaction to the proposal (and the reaction is that the Government is not interested in the matter), I hope the Government will give a little more thought to the question of joining in on this Committee, because throughout its history the Council has enjoyed a considerable degree of independence. I would be the first to admit that a great contribution could be made by honourable members on both sides of the Chamber, and a joint body comprised of members supported by both Parties could produce a better investigation and report than if it were formed simply of Opposition members.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I think the Government would be very wise to join in.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is simply an endeavour to help those in the State who contribute greatly to its economic welfare and progress. I do not know whether the rumours one hears in the corridors that the Government is not even interested in coming on the Select Committee are true. I hope that, if there is some semblance of truth in the rumours, the Government will reconsider its position and, at least, be prepared to nominate a member or permit a member to join on the committee, because I assure the Government that the State will benefit as a result of the committee's work.

Many individuals in country areas and in the metropolitan area would appreciate that a co-ordinated committee comprised of members of the two Parties could do a better job than a committee comprised of members of one Party only. The Government's record on Select Committees in the relatively short time that I have been a member has not been very good. The only Select Committee on which I have served was the inquiry into Scientology.

The present Government was represented on the committee by two of its members for a day or two, but then an order came through from Caucus that they should withdraw from it. They obeyed the order (which of course they

had to do) and we had to continue with members from one side only; that was not a good thing. If the Council decides to appoint a Select Committee, as a result of a majority vote, it should have a joint committee. I make a plea to the Government on this matter because of the benefits that might finally flow to individuals.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your side has refused to go on Select Committees in another place.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I cannot recall the procedures adopted by another place, because I do not interest myself greatly in what happens there. I involve myself in Council affairs and can speak only of my experience here. The co-operation I received from Labor Party members on the scientology Select Committee was not particularly good.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You were a Minister then.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. I had much other work to do, but one finds time to do these things. I have not heard the excuse mentioned that the reason why Ministers cannot join this Select Committee is that they are too busy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's not the excuse.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If that's not the reason, I wonder what the reason is. If that is the reason, there is a fourth member (not a Minister) who, I am sure, could contribute greatly to the committee's work.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He works even harder than a Minister works.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not dispute that he or Ministers work very hard, because I know the hours that Ministers in the last Government worked.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It's no 40-hour week.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, it was an 80-hour week job for me. The Hon. Mr. Kemp has brought the proposal forward in all sincerity. With the economic position in the rural and secondary industries as it is today there is a need for a very close look at the matters contained in the motion. Because there is this need, I hope that a joint Select Committee will be appointed to investigate the whole question.

Whether or not we can achieve that goal, I trust that a Select Committee will be formed to investigate this whole question at great depth and that after it has taken evidence and concluded its investigations the result will be such that the Government will have a very

worthwhile document to consider. It will then be up to the Government to consider the committee's recommendations. The target that we are aiming at is to bring forth a worthwhile document setting out the whole question of whether or not in some areas of capital taxation help and benefit can be brought to individuals in this State. I support the motion and make a plea to the Government for its co-operation.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): Governments move in peculiar ways and it seems to me that this Government is not keen to move at all until an individual or a body gets into a position from which it cannot be retrieved. I join with other honourable members in commending the Hon. Mr. Kemp for moving for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the problems associated with capital taxation upon the survival of privately owned business, manufacturing and primary industry. All honourable members recognize that the more services a Government provides, the more finance it requires to provide them. It is not capital taxation alone that is the problem today: it is the effect of capital taxation, superimposed on personal taxation, that is getting many individuals and others into a position where they are no longer a viable industry or unit.

Capital taxation falls into about four categories: land tax, succession duties, gift duty, and water rates. I will take them in that order and consider them from the primary production angle. We realize that land tax is a greater burden on some people than it is on others, depending in which area of the State the land is owned. It is said there are certain land tax concessions available to people who own land in a particular area where that land may be defined as rural land for the purposes of land tax. In that case, land so defined is granted a land tax concession to the extent that it is valued as rural land and not assessed on its market value. It remains rural land and is assessed as rural land as long as it remains so but, if it is sold, the land tax is back-dated for a period of five years on land assessed on its market value.

The present Government proposes to extend the areas in which this concession operates but, even so, this is still a heavy burden on owners of land in those defined areas. We know it is difficult to assess land on its productive capacity, but there must be some halfway mark between market value and productive capacity. One of the great problems we face

today in the assessment of land for land tax purposes is that it is far assessed above its productive capacity. This is one of the reasons why there is so much complaint today in the rural industries.

In my Address in Reply speech, I mentioned land in this category where the income from the property was very little in excess of the land tax alone, without taking into consideration water rates, council rates and other taxes that owners of land in any area must pay. When we reach the situation in this case that a farm is no longer a viable unit, this is one area in which we are justified in having a Select Committee look at the effects of this capital tax on these properties. In fact, there is justification in having a Select Committee merely to examine this area alone without considering the other areas I have mentioned.

Succession duties are also a great worry to many owners of rural and industrial properties, and even privately-owned properties within the metropolitan area. Many examples of the effect of succession duties on properties where they are being reduced in size, and probably split up and sold, to be able to pay these duties, have been related in this Council. The present tendency in rural industries is for properties to get bigger, not smaller. If a property has to be reduced in size, its productive capacity is reduced, too. Therefore, here again there is an excellent reason why we should look closely at this impost on rural properties, in the main.

Coming to water rates, I realize that the provision of water throughout the country areas is a costly service, one in which the State loses much money; but set against that is the fact that this service of providing water throughout the country areas brings into production lands that would not otherwise be productive units, and this is an area from which Governments collect other revenue. There is also another area, which may not necessarily be regarded as capital taxation—the provision of roads in country areas. Once a sealed road is provided in a country area, the assessed value of the property concerned is increased but the productive capacity of that property is possibly not improved at all. Here is an imposition of an increased capital tax on a property that is of no particular advantage to that owner unless he wants to sell it. In that case, of course, it may be of some benefit, doubtful though it may be.

The Hon. Mr. Hill referred to the plight of farm machinery manufacturers throughout the State. We have seen evidence recently of manufacturers of farm machinery in country towns going into liquidation and of others who would have gone into liquidation had they not had Government assistance. In this situation, we also have a sociological problem. There are many cases of a country town having been built around a successful industry, which in course of time, through no fault of its own, is perhaps forced into liquidation. This results in the disintegration of the country town. That industry has probably been run efficiently but the trouble is the effect of capital taxation on the farming community in that area which is no longer able to buy the machinery necessary to farm successfully. This is the reason why in many cases such an industry has folded up. So, although capital taxation has little direct effect on these industries, it is the indirect effect of capital taxation that is the problem.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp is asking for a Select Committee to probe deeply into this matter and to establish certain guide lines for the Government to work on. I cannot think why the Government is not prepared to accept the appointment of a Select Committee, because there have been cases in recent times, during my period in Parliament, where Select Committees have been appointed against the advice of the Government of the day, which has strongly opposed such appointments. I remember a case in particular where the Chief Secretary of the day said, "I was opposed to the appointment of this Select Committee but, as a result of its investigations, we have a better Bill before us."

Surely a Select Committee appointed to investigate the vital problem affecting not only the farming but also the whole community of the State would produce certain information that could be of benefit to the Government of the day. That information would assist it to solve problems with which we are now faced. Today the Minister of Agriculture (I hope I am quoting him correctly) said that this information is already available through Government departments; if it is, why does the Government not take action? We must correlate this information and spell out to the Government of the day, irrespective of its political leanings, how the problems facing secondary and primary industry can be overcome. I commend the Hon. Mr. Kemp for introducing this motion and I ask the Government to reconsider its

opposition to the appointment of the committee, because it can do nothing but good. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I have to thank many members of this Chamber for the attention they have given to this motion. It is obvious that many people who are in trouble in this State have just not been able to get through to the public as a whole or to the Government or to Parliament the true position in which they stand and the trouble that they are in. This is the really dangerous and difficult circumstance that we are up against today.

The entire statement by the Chief Secretary earlier today was completely irrelevant. We know that the State must have money and that it must get its taxation from the very limited areas left to it from which funds can be raised. The whole point is that this is having a very heavy impact on the very sector of people, although it is a comparatively small sector, in which most of the progressive development of the State arises and in which the people who are looking for a chance can generally work and get on. This sector includes people who perhaps have a new idea, a really good invention, or something worth while and who start out in private business for themselves.

A man may have gone out into a Mallee block and broken that down from Mallee scrub and turned it into a farm. Such a man may have had a really good new implement and then started out to make something similar for himself. He might even have set up a small factory to make things for other people. When he reaches the stage of really developing an asset for the State he comes up against capital taxation, and this runs him into the ground.

I was disappointed in the debate today in that honourable members referred time and again to the man on the land; but he is not the only person affected. The person who is setting up a small engineering business and developing it into a going concern, or the small garage man who started out with a repair shop and built it into a flourishing business, as soon as he reaches the stage where capital tax is imposed is unfairly treated, because when this tax is imposed all of his assets are taken into consideration. This is a classic case of the goose that lays the golden egg being killed.

No doubt all honourable members know of a really good business that has grown up over a generation but, when it has been passed on

to the next generation, it has had to be sold because of capital taxation, such as estate and succession duties. Other parts of the world have experienced these difficulties. For example, in Great Britain, as we were told today, nearly 20 years ago, when taxation was imposed on capital lines on private business where most capital was involved in actual production, there was trouble.

This is the problem that so many of our people are up against today. When an estate comes up for consideration, and the great proportion of the estate is made up of the actual means of production, 30 per cent (which is about average) is exacted whenever a death or succession comes along. It would have to be a very highly profitable business to carry such an exaction.

Earlier in the debate I raised the question of what would be the value of all public company shares if every time a change in management occurred an exaction of 30 per cent of the land value, the building value and the stock in trade was imposed. This is what occurs under capital taxation, although under public company taxation it does not occur. Under public company taxation, succession is usually based on the share value, which is based on the earning capacity of the business as a whole. With a public company there is no thought, when a succession comes along, of taking the whole of its assets into consideration.

The share value is taken into consideration, and the share value is based only on the profitability of the business as it stands. If this privilege was extended to other sectors of industry in private ownership it would afford tremendous relief, and that is why I am asking for the appointment of a Select Committee.

When a business is taxed on its capital instead of on its earning ability inevitably there is distress, and the end is very close. We should have a careful look at the impact of capital taxation as it affects every type of business in the State. We do not have to worry about the small things but we should be chiefly concerned in keeping the State going and in ensuring that there will be a future for every employee and person who is able to earn a living.

The future of a large sector of our community is being endangered as a result of the capital taxation being exacted today. This taxation is just as hard on the small manufacturer and business man as it is on the person who has been mentioned so frequently today, namely, the primary producer. Many of the old-established businesses that were in

operation for a long time have gone to the wall as a result of heavy taxation.

If this situation is not checked, or if we cannot find a way to solve the problem, the same changes will occur in South Australian agriculture and business as have occurred in such a wide part of the world, and that would be tragic. I move formally that the Select Committee be appointed. I point out a slight error in the wording of the motion in the Notice Paper. It states:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the effect of capital taxation upon the survival of privately owned business, manufacturing and primary industry.

The three words "in South Australia" have been omitted at the end of the motion. If we look at the Notice Paper of two days ago, we see that these three words were included.

The PRESIDENT: They were never on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think it is purely a misprint but, if that is the form in which you wish to put it, Mr. President, I move:

That "in South Australia" be added at the end of the motion as printed on the Notice Paper.

Motion carried.

The Council divided on the motion, as amended:

Ayes (12)—The Hons. M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (3)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Pair—Aye—The Hon. Jessie Cooper.

No—The Hon. T. M. Casey.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Motion, as amended, thus carried.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

That the Select Committee consist of the Hons. R. C. DeGaris, Jessie Cooper, T. M. Casey, D. H. L. Banfield, and the mover.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): Mr. President, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Mr. Casey is not in the Chamber. I do not know whether he has seen this motion; I do not think it is right, proper or fair to nominate to a committee somebody who is not present and who would vote against it.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Chief Secretary call for a ballot?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I rise on the point that it is not right for the Council to nominate anyone who is not present, who has not been consulted and who, I know, would not accept a position on the committee. Why not nominate somebody who can speak for himself?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In view of the objection raised by the Chief Secretary, I move:

That, instead of the Hon. T. M. Casey, the Hon. A. F. Kneebone be appointed to the Select Committee.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Hon. Mr. Kemp to move his motion again in the amended form rather than ask for leave to amend the original motion. I understand the honourable member wishes to nominate the Hon. Mr. Kneebone in place of the Hon. Mr. Casey.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

That the Select Committee consist of the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, Jessie Cooper, R. C. DeGaris, and H. K. Kemp.

The PRESIDENT: Before that motion can be dealt with the honourable member must seek leave to withdraw his earlier motion.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to withdraw my earlier motion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

That the Select Committee consist of the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, Jessie Cooper, R. C. DeGaris, H. K. Kemp, and A. F. Kneebone.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You cannot railroad us into this one. You can forget it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Mr. President, I seek your guidance. I do not support the appointment of this Select Committee and I do not wish to serve on it. I was not consulted about my appointment as a member of the committee, and I would be too busy to attend the committee meetings. I ask your guidance on what I should do.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister has declined nomination.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am thankful to the Hon. Mr. Kemp for nominating me, but he knew very well when doing so that I had no intention of serving on the committee. Having a conscience, I cannot accept nomination.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Since the Minister of Lands and the Hon. Mr. Banfield have declined nomination, I have no alternative but to seek leave to withdraw my motion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

That the Select Committee consist of the Hons. Jessie Cooper, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill, H. K. Kemp, and C. R. Story.

Motion carried.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

That the Select Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 24 or earlier.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 5.49 to 7.45 p.m.]

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to give the Treasurer power to guarantee repayment of loans made to the South Australian Potato Board. Since its inception some 20 years ago, the board has employed as an agent of the board the South Australian Potato Distribution Centre Proprietary Limited to undertake its marketing functions. While it is clear that in the early stages of its growth this arrangement was feasible and practical, the board, after a detailed examination of the situation, is now of the opinion that it is time it assumed direct responsibility for these functions. Accordingly, it has resolved to assume direct control in this area from October 1, 1970. To undertake its marketing functions, the board will to a considerable extent be dependent on Loan finance, and clause 2 of this Bill provides for the Treasurer to execute appropriate guarantees to enable the board to seek funds for this purpose.

Briefly, I commend this Bill to the Council. I think the steps taken by the Potato Board in this direction are sound. All the board members and the Chairman have told me they are in complete agreement with the situation and can see that this Bill will benefit immeasurably the growers of this State in the years to come.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise with little heart to support this measure. There is nothing wrong with the fact that the Potato Board has taken over its own marketing—that does not worry me; that is a right that it has—but I am concerned that the Minister is making a tremendous rod for his own back in entering into the business of guaranteeing finance for primary production. All the marketing Acts were passed to regularize the marketing of the growers' produce, to enable

some statutory power to be given them to market their own produce. It was never assumed that the Government would take the responsibility of financing those marketing organizations.

This is precisely what is happening here. By this guarantee, which will be a Government guarantee to the State Bank for, at this stage, an undisclosed figure, the Government will assume full responsibility. We have done this with some secondary industries that the Government has guaranteed, but in those cases it is specified under an Act that they are all free to operate on the same basis as before. I do not want to sound prophetic in this matter but I shall be surprised if the Minister does not have three or four more of his Acts opened up within one or two years for a similar type of finance. Once the floodgates are opened, they cannot be closed. I know this from personal experience.

I do not object to the potato growers doing their own marketing. If honourable members care to look at the report of the last debate on this matter held in this Council, they will see my views clearly set out in *Hansard*, because I was opposed to what was happening, and am still opposed to what has been happening. As I say, I do not object to the growers doing what they are doing, but I point out to the Government that, in entering into this guarantee, it will generate a persistent sore, which will spread, because I know of marketing organizations in a very much worse financial state than this one is.

All the time I was in office I resisted the temptation to do this, and I believe that policy was right. However, the Government intends to do this. There is no doubt that the industry will be delighted about it, but the Government should realize that, from the taxpayers' point of view, this Government or some other Government will rue the day this step was taken, because I cannot quite line up the provisions of the Bill with the position that the Government will find itself in—that this measure, like all the other marketing legislation, will have a limitation upon its duration. No provision has been made for this measure to remain in force until the guarantee is discharged. That should be done. Section 25 of the Potato Marketing Act provides:

(1) In the year 1951, and in any third year thereafter, not less than 100 growers registered under this Act may present a petition to the Minister asking that a poll shall be taken to decide whether this Act shall continue in operation.

I am not very quick at arithmetic, but I think the next poll will be taken in 1972, if we take into account the three-year periods from 1951 onwards; so the guarantee must be discharged, for safety's sake, by 1972. In my opinion, section 25 should be amended to make sure that the Government guarantee is safe. If this is voted out of existence, I do not think the State Government or the State Bank would be in a very healthy position. It is one of the things that worried me about similar Acts, that we would have to give a very much longer period and take away the right of the growers to have a poll. I do no more than point out these matters to the Government.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I raise some objection to this Council's being asked to proceed with this Bill at such short notice.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You can move to have the debate adjourned if you like.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I understood from the Minister that he was anxious to get this Bill through both Houses of Parliament this week. If the Minister has altered his schedule of arrangements and is prepared for the Council to adjourn the debate, I ask leave to continue my remarks; but, if the Minister prefers me to proceed with the debate, I will do so.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is necessary to restore the fund constituted under the Wild Dogs Act to solvency. Following repeated submissions dating back to 1955 received from producer organizations requesting an increase in the wild dog bounty payments, the Minister of Lands directed the Pastoral Board to convene a conference to consider this particular aspect of dingo control and at the same time to inquire into dingo control measures operating in other States, which are confronted with this common problem.

Accordingly, invitations were extended to the appropriate authorities in the various States to meet in Adelaide to consider the question of increasing the bounty payments for wild dog scalps and for discussion of wild dog control measures in each State. The conference duly took place in May, 1969. It was resolved at the conference that the bounty rate of a wild dog scalp should be increased to \$6. The Pastoral Board after due con-

sideration recommended on June 17, 1969, that effect be given to the resolution passed at the conference that the then bounty payment of \$2 for the scalp of a wild dog be increased to \$6. The notice increasing the bounty payment from \$2 to \$6 as from September 1, 1969, was published in the *Gazette* on August 14, 1969.

In making this recommendation the board was influenced by the following factors:

(1) The bounty payment was last upgraded in 1948 to the figure of \$2. Since that time costs of killing wild dogs have risen steeply, and the \$2 bounty payment provided insufficient incentive to interest people in wild dog destruction. No professional dogger was operating in South Australia. It may be pointed out that over the same period the payment made to owners of the dog fence to assist them in maintaining the fence in dog-proof condition had been increased from \$12 a mile to \$35 a mile.

(2) The Stockowners Association of South Australia and the Vermin Districts Association, the two producer organizations whose members are most directly concerned with the dingo problem, strongly advocated and supported an increase in the bounty payment to \$6. Both associations fully appreciated that such an increase would also involve their ratable members in the payment of additional wild dog rates. In fact, their contributions were trebled with the rise in bounty payment from \$2 to \$6.

(3) Reports had been received by the board of unprecedented calf losses in the Far Northern cattle areas caused by dingo activity. These reports were confirmed by the pastoral inspectors and the board's investigations. It was evident that urgent measures had to be taken to curb the rising dingo activity if cattle breeding programmes were to survive, particularly in the Far North of the State. It was obvious also that the build up in the dingo population would cause a dangerous pressure on the dog fence which is now the only functional barrier between the sheep population of the State and the dingo-breeding areas outside the fence. It was considered that the most expeditious manner of attaining this object was to increase the bounty payment.

(4) The Wild Dogs Fund as at June 30, 1969, was in a healthy position having a credit balance of \$46,000, which, with rates and subsidy to be paid for the year 1969-70 totalling about \$28,000, would provide for the payment of 12,000 scalps at \$6 each. Despite reports of increased dingo activity it was not

expected that this figure would be exceeded in the light of bounty payments made over the preceding 10 years. During that period scalps were submitted at an average rate of less than 4,000 a year. In fact, however 19,490 scalps were submitted, requiring a total bounty pay-out of \$111,060, representing 1,470 scalps at \$2 each and 18,020 at \$6. After borrowing \$8,000 from the Treasury, the maximum advance permitted under the Wild Dogs Act, the Wild Dogs Fund at June 30, 1970, was \$39,200 in debt. In order to alleviate these financial problems for the year 1970-71 the bounty payment has been reduced from \$6 to \$4 for the scalp of a fully grown wild dog, and from \$6 to \$1 for the scalp of a wild dog which is not fully grown. Also, the rate a square mile has been increased from 10c to 15c, the maximum rate permitted by the Act, which will provide an additional \$8,000 in revenue. These measures, however, will be inadequate to restore the fund to solvency if, as may reasonably be expected, 12,000 scalps are submitted during the 1970-71 financial year in the ratio of 10,000 fully grown dogs at \$4 and 2,000 pups at \$1.

On the above hypothesis there will be an estimated deficit of about \$58,000. In order to overcome this deficit the Bill increases the maximum rate to 25c a square mile. The limitation upon the \$1 for \$1 subsidy payable by the Government to the fund is removed. The total amount of the loan that may be advanced to the fund is increased to \$50,000. It is hoped that these measures will restore the fund to solvency within two years.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act. This section imposes the rate upon land for the purposes of the Act. By subsection (2) of this section the maximum rate is 15c a square mile. The Bill raises this maximum rate to 25c a square mile. Clause 3 amends section 8 of the principal Act. This section provides for the Treasurer to pay to the credit of the fund a subsidy of \$1 for every \$1 collected as rates. Subsection (2) of this section provides that the subsidy shall not exceed \$8,000. This restriction upon the amount of the subsidy is removed by the Bill. Clause 4 amends section 9 of the principal Act. This section provides for the Governor to make loans to the fund of an amount not exceeding \$8,000. The Bill raises the maximum amount that may be advanced to the fund to \$50,000.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

REFERENDUM (METROPOLITAN AREA SHOP TRADING HOURS) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 25. Page 955.)

Clause 1—"Short title."

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yesterday when speaking to this Bill I made a mistake that, fortunately, did not relate to the Opposition in this place but related to the intention of the Government. As you know, Mr. Chairman, it is not my practice to mislead honourable members, and I wish to correct my statement before the debate begins today. In *Hansard* I am reported as saying (and I do not doubt that report):

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

What I had in the back of my mind was that it dealt with bread baking and the selling of meat. In connection with Friday night shopping, with which the referendum deals, the Government has no intention of extending the area further than the metropolitan planning area and the municipality of Gawler and has no intention of making it State-wide.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Chief Secretary for his explanation because that was one matter about which I required further clarification. I said yesterday that honourable members would like to consider overnight several matters that had been referred to in the debate, and this was one of them. Every member would appreciate that in some country areas Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading is necessary. In places such as Hawker it is necessary to maintain this type of trading. Yesterday the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Lands made conflicting statements, and I thank the Chief Secretary for clearing up the matter. Can the Minister say whether the Government intends to consider the problems arising in connection with bread and meat? In connection with outback areas where at present there is weekend trading, does the Government intend to provide any alleviation in respect of bread and meat?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): Overnight I considered the questions that the Leader raised, and I wish to clarify the effect of the referendum on the areas he has referred to. One honourable member said

that country people sometimes pick up meat from butcher shops outside the normal hours; we will consider that matter and see what we can do about it. The Government does not propose that the situation regarding shop trading hours outside the metropolitan area, as defined in this Bill, will be altered. In those country districts in which there are now no restrictions on trading hours, shop trading hours will remain unrestricted, except for butcher shops, in respect of which the Government intends that there should be a 5½-day week from Monday to Friday throughout the State. I repeat that we will consider the problems arising in connection with remote areas: this will apply only to butcher shops. Of course, bread can be sold in delicatessens and exempted shops 24 hours a day and seven days a week. Because the only restriction we shall impose on bread will be connected with the baking of bread, that commodity will not come into the question of shop trading hours at all.

What I said earlier will apply only to butcher shops; in no other case will there be any restrictions on the hours at which shops can trade in those areas of the country at present unrestricted. The special provision for butcher shops will be dealt with in another Bill. In all country shopping districts outside the metropolitan area, as defined in this Bill, the present hours will continue. If the decision in the referendum favours Friday night shopping the opportunity will be given for people in each country shopping district concerned to apply also to have Friday night trading permitted, should they desire to do so. I am referring to shopping districts that do not have Friday night shopping because of the provisions of the Early Closing Act. The fact that a referendum may be carried providing for Friday night shopping in the metropolitan area does not and will not affect those country areas that are operating under the restricted trading hours of the Early Closing Act. It will not mean that shops in those areas will automatically open on Friday night.

The result of the referendum will affect only the area set out in the Bill. Anything that happens outside that area will happen as a result of people coming and asking for it. If the referendum favours Friday night shopping, the opportunity will be given to people in each country shopping district concerned to apply also to have Friday night trading; in other words, the opportunity will be given for people in each area to ask for Friday night

trading, assuming the referendum is successful. This means that only the local situation will be taken into account; people in Port Lincoln will not be able to express an opinion on whether shops in Clare should open on Friday night. Since the referendum is designed to ascertain the views of people in the metropolitan area, there is no valid reason why it should not be confined to that area.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: There appears to be some conflict between the second reading explanation and the Bill itself. This conflict has led to some of the questions that have been raised. The Bill authorizes a referendum on Friday trading hours in the metropolitan area, whereas the second reading explanation deals, in addition, with the system of petitioning and counter-petitioning and the sale of meat in the country. Honourable members have been trying to make the point that, if the Government intends to tie these things together, they should be spelt out in the referendum itself. I hope the Government will not take acceptance of the Bill itself as a mandate for the other things that are not relevant to it but are in the second reading explanation. If the Government intends to introduce a Bill later on matters that are completely different from the referendum, why has it included them in the second reading explanation, and why should trading in meat be controlled throughout the State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yesterday I was given a hiding with a big stick because it was alleged that we did not introduce a Bill that contained everything we planned to do. I explained that my second reading explanation contained a summary of what we planned to do if the referendum was carried. Honourable members cannot have it both ways. I have given an explanation of what will happen, but the Government has been criticized for not introducing a Bill. The Government endeavoured to give an explanation that would cover every eventuality if the referendum was carried. Regarding meat, when I was the Minister of Labour and Industry in the previous Labor Government I had many conferences with both the employers and the union, both seeking a 5½-day week in the meat industry.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Those are butchers, not suppliers?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The retail outlets of the meat industry, as well as the employees. While my Party was in Opposition, those people made further approaches to us.

In our policy speech we said we would agree to what they were seeking, and now that we have been returned to office on our policy we are endeavouring to carry out our promise. We have put it in here because as soon as people start talking about early closing they want to know what is going to happen with butchers. Apparently, we are now being criticized for saying what we intend to do.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am grateful to the Minister for his explanation. However, I think he will agree that when we get two statements that are completely opposite there is a great deal of confusion. I want to question the Minister further on the question of defining the metropolitan area. As I understand the position, if the referendum to be conducted in the metropolitan area and the municipality of Gawler is carried, a country area can then apply to the Government to have 9 o'clock closing on Friday night. Certain areas of the country that are now covered by the Act may well like to express an opinion on this matter, but they are clearly being denied in this referendum a means of doing so. I believe that the people in Port Lincoln have as much right to express their view on the Early Closing Act as have the people in the metropolitan area. Port Lincoln is covered by the Act because at some stage it requested this. Other areas throughout the State are in a similar situation, but they are not going to be consulted at all on whether they will be permitted to remain open until 9 o'clock. All they can do is wait and see what happens in the metropolitan area. This is one of the complaints we have raised.

I understand the difficulty in this, and at no stage in this debate have I attempted to play down the problem that faces the Government. This problem faced the previous Government and Governments before that, including the previous Labor Government. I admit that it is an intensely difficult problem and I think everyone in this Chamber appreciates that. We still have districts in the metropolitan area that are under the Early Closing Act and others that are not, and all of those districts are going to express an opinion on 9 o'clock closing. However, areas outside the metropolitan area that are under the Act will not be consulted. Once the metropolitan area has been consulted, the answer will apply not only to the metropolitan area but all over the State. I believe that a very strong case can be made out for the right of these people outside the metropolitan area

who are under the Early Closing Act to be able to express their viewpoint at this referendum.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I appreciate what the Leader is suggesting. However, I would add considerably to the confusion if we tried to widen the referendum to try to cover all shopping districts in South Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: You have done it in Gawler.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We have extended the metropolitan area. The Leader referred to Port Lincoln. However, I point out that there is nothing between Port Lincoln and perhaps Port Pirie. It would be impossible to achieve what the Leader is suggesting.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Don't forget Whyalla and Port Augusta.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I repeat that it would be most difficult to cover all shopping districts in this referendum. If the referendum is carried, 9 o'clock closing will be permitted in the metropolitan area. I cannot see any argument in favour of the people who are now unrestricted in their hours coming into a referendum. It is apparent that the Leader has come to his present point of view because he has now changed his approach and is saying that shopping districts outside the metropolitan area should have a say in the referendum. If the referendum is carried, shopping districts outside the metropolitan area are to have an opportunity to say what they think in regard to Friday night shopping.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I point out to the Minister that I have not changed my approach at all. The Minister will appreciate that until today all of us, including the Ministers in this place, were confused about exactly what the Government intended to do outside the metropolitan area. It is not true to say that we have changed our course. I think the Minister would admit that until today we were completely confused, because we had two conflicting statements yesterday. I have now had the correct explanation, and we now know for the first time that the Government does not intend to interfere with trading hours in those areas that are at present unrestricted. I think that is the situation and I accept it. However, this is the first time we have had the explanation correctly presented to us.

I still cannot accept the Minister's statement that it is not possible for shopping areas outside the metropolitan area to be involved in this referendum. The Minister has conceded the point that he thinks they should have a say in this matter. There will be the difficulty of getting out a roll, but there is no difficulty

in including the municipality of Gawler. There are people just outside that area and people between Gawler and Elizabeth who will not have a vote. This should not be a difficult matter and, as the Minister has said, there would not be many shopping districts outside the metropolitan area that would be involved. It would not be difficult to bring out the roll so that all the people in the State who are affected by the Early Closing Act would have a say in the referendum. I do not think the Minister could deny that this would be the correct way to judge the situation. Any person affected in the future by a decision made now should have a voice in that decision.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am glad that the Leader is no more confused than he was yesterday. He said he was not confused any more. Yesterday, apparently, I was the only unconfused member in the Chamber. There is no use the Leader's saying that every honourable member was confused. I put the points as clearly as I could and I thought that the Leader would listen to the second reading explanation and read *Hansard*. The Chief Secretary has already said that he thought he made a mistake in what he said; that could be so. I have done the same thing myself before. The referendum should be restricted to the metropolitan area, and I cannot see any other way of doing it. I cannot accept the Leader's arguments, and I hope that the Committee will agree with me and support the clause.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Minister has just said that he was not confused. However, I am extremely confused because I had answers yesterday which were new to me, and some of which appeared to conflict with each other. Will the Minister put the record straight for me on several points. First, assuming that the referendum is passed and Friday night trading becomes operative, will Saturday morning trading not be impaired or abolished at least during the life of this Parliament? (I think that was said yesterday.) Secondly, what will happen, again on the assumption that the referendum is passed, to Saturday afternoon trading? From the replies I was given yesterday, I understood that Saturday afternoon and Sunday trading would be abolished everywhere. Then the answer apparently emerged that this was to apply to meat and bread only. Now I understand that it will not necessarily apply everywhere.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I thought that all these points were cleared up yesterday and again a short while ago. The Premier

has given an assurance that Saturday morning trading will not be interfered with during the life of this Parliament. He could not give an assurance of what might happen beyond the life of this Parliament. The 5½-day week will apply in the metropolitan area as

defined in the Bill. There will be no

Saturday afternoon or Sunday trading and there will be no alteration outside of

that defined metropolitan area except as regards butcher shops. I assured the Leader a moment ago, when he referred to outlying areas where, say, a miner might come into a town seeking meat, that we would look at the situation to see whether something could be done for such people when the 5½-day week

in the meat industry was extended to the whole of the State. I can assure the Leader on that point.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Clause 1 deals with the question of the metropolitan area and, as I have an amendment on the file to clause 1, I have been probing the Minister on what is intended. The matter of areas that have unrestricted trading has been fully answered. I would be satisfied if the Minister could undertake that those areas that are in shopping districts and under the Early Closing Act will be given an opportunity to vote on the question of whether they want 9 p.m. closing in those shopping districts either now or in the future. I do not want the situation where the metropolitan area will vote on

shopping hours, then the Minister turn around and say to Port Lincoln shopkeepers, "You cannot stay open until 9 p.m."

Will he ensure that an opportunity will be given to those people who will not be affected by the decision made in the metropolitan area to have their say in some form of referendum on this question? I realize that my amendment covers the whole State, but today we have had the position clarified as to unrestricted areas outside the metropolitan area. To redraft my amendment to cater for those areas under the Early Closing Act would take some time. I am certain that the Minister appreciates my point. It would not be difficult to include such people now, but if it cannot be done now, or if the Government refuses to do it now, will the

Minister undertake to see that these people are given an opportunity to express themselves at some time in the future?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I assure the Leader that we will give these people the opportunity to express their desires.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Fixing of day for referendum."

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "As soon as convenient" and insert "Not less than one month".

My reasons for this amendment are that it is certainly unethical and probably morally wrong to introduce voluntary Legislative Council voting and compulsory referendum voting on the same day in the considerable area in which this referendum is to be held. Many people in the districts concerned (Elizabeth, Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully, Playford, and part of Light) are migrants who are not as conversant with our voting practices as they might be. It is not difficult to confuse the issues in those areas. These people would want time to study the cases for and against the matter to be included in the referendum. It should be properly considered and the people should have time to do that if this referendum is held.

The referendum for trading hours should be proper, adequate and widely based in its content. I refer the Committee to some comment in today's *News*, where a certain gentleman claims there was a go-slow on trading hours by the Legislative Council, which, he said, was trying to bog down the shop trading hours issue. I believe this Bill will be passed in this place tonight and the earliest it could have been passed was last night. The only reason why we are still dealing with it today is that a petition bearing nearly 11,000 signatures was brought into this place yesterday morning and it was physically impossible for it to be properly checked in time for yesterday afternoon's debate, as I informed this Council yesterday.

At the appropriate time, the Leader of the Liberal and Country Party in this Chamber asked that progress be reported. The Minister kindly, and I believe properly, moved that progress be reported so that those people should not be denied the opportunity of putting their views before this Council. That was proper procedure, and that is the only way in which it can be said that the Legislative Council was slowing down the passage of this Bill. Therefore, the claim made in this afternoon's *News* is completely without foundation.

I believe, too, that, if this Bill with this amendment passes through Parliament tonight, the referendum can be held one calendar month from today. That will be September 26 which happens to be a Saturday. If the Government so desires, there is no reason why a referendum cannot be held on that day. I

have indicated the situation as I see it. It is incorrect and wrong for compulsory voting on a referendum to be confused with voluntary voting on the replacement of an esteemed late member of this Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I oppose the amendment. Along with other honourable members, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins criticizes the Government for holding the referendum on the day of the Midland by-election. We would have received just as much criticism from many people had we not planned to have the referendum on that day. First and most importantly, we would then have been criticized for asking people to vote twice within a few weeks when we could have asked them to vote conveniently twice on the same day. Secondly, the Government is trying to save costs wherever possible. These are sound reasons why the clause should remain as it is.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. M. B. Dawkins (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (5)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill, A. F. Kneebone (teller), and A. J. Shard.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. Jessie Cooper. No—The Hon. T. M. Casey.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"Question to be submitted to electors."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

To strike out "question is" and insert "questions are".

The Government's proposal to ask a Gallup poll type of question of the electors is loading the question and not seeking people's opinion on the total question. As a matter of procedure, before any matter is referred to the people in a referendum an appropriate Bill should be introduced: this is the only proper way in which a referendum can be conducted. Since the Gallup poll type of question is to be used I believe that a wider range of questions should be included.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I oppose the amendment. Is the Leader planning to put three questions on the ballot-paper?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I have not yet moved in that direction.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: However, I believe that the amendment is the key to further amendments. The Leader does not say what method of voting the people will be asked to adopt. What will happen if there is not a majority in favour of any of the questions? Should the people vote "1", "2", and "3"?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: They will vote "Yes" or "No" on each question.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: What will happen if there is a "Yes" vote on all questions?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In that case you have got your answer.

the Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Leader has spoken about alleged confusion as a result of what Ministers have said, yet further considerable confusion will be created if his amendment is carried. Any requests that have been made for extended trading hours have been for Friday night trading. Most people are not interested in Saturday afternoon trading and Sunday trading except in exempted shops. There is provision for an extended range of emergency items to be available in exempted shops. Therefore, I ask the Committee not to carry the amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Minister said that there was no demand for extended trading hours, except for Friday night trading, yet a petition signed by 10,000 people has been presented to Parliament today. Therefore, it appears that there is a demand for extended trading hours. However, I am not saying that I agree with all aspects of demands for extended trading hours.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It depends on where the people who signed the petition come from.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I appreciate that point. The idea of trading for 24 hours a day does not appeal to me. The Minister said, too, that we were trying to create confusion. At present there is, to be one question on the ballot-paper, and my amendment adds two more questions. A person will be able to vote "Yes" or "No" to one question, and I cannot see that there will be great confusion if he has to do the same thing to, say, two extra questions. If there is to be a Gallup poll type of question, the public should be able to express their views fully and meaningfully.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Under the Leader's proposals, there may even be a vote to close the shops on Saturday mornings. If that happened, a person would be able to

sleep in on Saturday morning and go to work on Saturday afternoon. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins this afternoon referred to an article "Go-slow on hours claim". I think from the way the debate is going now that Mr. Demasius was right when he said that the Legislative Council was trying to bog down the Bill. Mr. Demasius is chairman of the Trading Hours Steering Committee, which comprises many different bodies.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: All employers.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and they are the people that are vitally concerned in this. If the employers thought there was any necessity for extending the hours, they would no doubt be pushing for that right. However, those employers point out that there has been no consistent demand for Saturday afternoon or Sunday trading. Mr. Demasius went on to say that uniform 9 o'clock Friday night closing would force prices up, especially for essential commodities, by as much as 10 per cent. Therefore, how much more would costs be forced up if stores were to remain open on Saturday afternoon?

These employers are the men who would know whether they could get an extra dollar or two by remaining open on Saturday afternoon or Sunday, and if there was any demand for it they would be the first ones to want the right to remain open at those times. It is not often that I accept the word of the employers, but I think I can on this occasion, because we know that there has been no consistent demand for Saturday afternoon trading.

Some people have said that this referendum will be overwhelmingly carried. Well, it may or may not be overwhelmingly carried. Some years ago when a petition was circulated in Elizabeth more people signed against Friday night trading than signed for it. However, for some reason not connected with the poll, the matter was not pursued.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: As I said before, we have a second reading explanation setting out the Government's intentions on a number of matters while the Bill itself provides for a referendum based on one question only. If this Parliament accepts this Bill providing for a referendum on only the one subject of Friday night trading, I consider that any subjects introduced in a subsequent Bill can be dealt with on their merits at that time, and that the matters dealt with in this Bill are not binding on this Chamber or this Parliament.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: There is an amendment in my name which I do not intend to proceed with. I consider that this is the key

clause of the Bill. I have had complaints from butchers in the outer areas that the extension of the list of exempt goods to include meat under refrigeration will affect them materially because these goods will be handled by delicatessens.

If the referendum is carried successfully and Friday night shopping comes in, Saturday morning trading will continue. The later trading, which is so important in these outer areas, will still go on. However, it will go on not through the butchers but through the delicatessens, and this will have a great effect on some businesses. Although perhaps not a very large number will be affected, they are, to the people who own them, very important businesses.

I consider that this represents a lack of consideration for the small man, and it is being done at the very time when the meat trade should not be interfered with. These are the districts where trading in meat can be expected to rise, and there should be no interference at all at this critical time.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think I have already dealt with the question of meat. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said that the passing of this Bill would not mean that a mandate was given to anything that might be introduced at a later stage.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Other than nine o'clock closing.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I would give a garden party if, as a result of this Bill's being passed and the Government's introducing another Bill as a result of the referendum, every member in this place voted unanimously on the subsequent Bill. I have always understood that this was a House of Review and that all Bills brought before it were argued on their merits.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 29) and title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later:

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendment.

In Committee.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I move:

That the Council do not insist on its amendment.

When I spoke earlier I said that much criticism would have been levelled at the Government (and quite correctly) if it had not planned

to hold the referendum and the by-election on the same day. If the polls were held on separate days extra cost would be incurred and the people would be caused inconvenience. If the referendum was held one month after the passing of this Bill, it would be held on the day of the football grand final, and I can imagine what an outcry there would be if that happened.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Do you mean that both you and Sturt may win?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes; there could be a double celebration.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Isn't there a semi-final on September 12?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, but not a grand final. People arrive, at Adelaide Oval on the day before the grand final and do not leave the oval until 6 p.m. on the Saturday. Consequently, they would not be able to vote in a referendum on that day.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Couldn't they vote at 8 a.m.?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: They could not vote at 8 a.m. if they arrived at the oval on the day prior to the grand final.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Couldn't they exercise a postal vote?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not think that the electoral office would accept attendance at the grand final as a satisfactory reason for a postal vote. I have been told by people in the street that they have had to go to the polls too often in recent years. Soon, there will be a by-election, a referendum and a Senate election. If the by-election and the referendum were held on separate days the Opposition, not the Government, would be criticized. I suggest that honourable members should have second thoughts and not insist on the amendment.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I hope the Committee will not support the motion. The argument that confusion would arise through holding a voluntary vote for a by-election and a compulsory vote for a referendum on the one day is just as valid now as it was when it was advanced earlier today. The two kinds of voting would be necessary in only 4½ of the 28½ electoral districts in which the referendum will be held. The problem would be particularly confusing to the relatively new settlers of Elizabeth, Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully. Consequently, I urge the Committee to insist on its amendment.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (3)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, A. F. Kneebone (teller), and A. J. Shard.

Noes (12)—The Hons. M. B. Dawkins (teller), R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. T. M. Casey.
No—The Hon. Jessie Cooper.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

Later:

The House of Assembly requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the Legislative Council's amendment to which it had disagreed.

The Legislative Council granted a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 3.30 p.m. on Thursday, August 27, at which it would be represented by the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, G. J. Gilfillan, and A. F. Kneebone.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.
The Bill's main object is to increase from \$200,000 to \$400,000 the present limit of the estimated cost of a public work that does not require reference to the Public Works Standing Committee. The present limit of \$200,000 was fixed in 1955. The comparable cost last year of a building which had an estimated cost of \$200,000 in 1955 was \$285,000, and this means that many projects which previously would not have required reference to the committee must now be referred to it. The small school building projects, particularly the solid construction and Samcon type primary and infants schools that presently vary in cost from \$212,000 to \$313,000 according to site conditions, now require reference to the committee. It is this class of project which is usually urgently required and which, unlike many larger projects, is often difficult to plan ahead in terms of time but which the present limit of cost seriously affects.

The process of reference to the committee involves additional planning time and administrative cost in the preparation and submission of evidence. The increase in building costs since 1955 is resulting in an additional number of projects being referred to the committee and has reached a stage where the building works programmes are being excessively restricted. Since 1955 building costs have

increased by about 3 per cent per annum and last year the rate of increase was at least 3½ per cent per annum. Further cost increases are expected as a result of substantial building labour cost rises this year. During the past four and a half years 30 public building projects costing between \$200,000 and \$300,000 have been submitted to the committee and it is expected that this rate of reference will increase. Twenty of these projects were primary or infants schools, six were other types of school projects, and four were other than school buildings.

If the proposed amendment to increase the present limit of costs from \$200,000 to \$400,000 were approved by Parliament it would make for increased efficiency in the provision of the smaller and usually more urgent works. The figure of \$400,000 is comparable with the \$200,000 of 1955, and it would reduce the burden of legislative and administrative controls which are presently militating against the most expeditious achievement of works programmes. Clauses 2 and 3 convert certain references to the old currency into decimal currency. Clause 4, which amends section 25 of the principal Act, is the Bill's main provision. It increases from \$200,000 to \$400,000 the present limit of the estimated cost of a public work that does not require reference to the committee.

New subsection (5), proposed by paragraph (d) of the clause, preserves the application of the existing provisions of the Act so far as they relate to public works that are referred to the committee before this Bill becomes law. Clause 5 is another conversion to decimal currency, and clause 6 is a drafting amendment.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

EUDUNDA AND MORGAN RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.33 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 27, at 2.15 p.m.