

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, November 4, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

WELLINGTON ROAD

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, an answer to my recent question about Wellington Road?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: There is no economic justification at present for the construction of a direct road from Cooke Plains to Wellington or from Wellington to Hartley. Many urgently needed projects are being delayed by the shortage of funds available to the Highways Department.

FLINDERS WAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On October 21, I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, whether he could provide me with an interim report on the progress being made on the establishment of a long walking and riding trail to be known as Flinders Way. Has he been able to obtain a report?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The State Planning Authority has been advised that a report is to be furnished shortly by the Long Distance Trail Committee, a subcommittee of the authority. In the report to the authority, it is understood that the committee is making recommendations for the establishment of a trail, suggesting a possible route, the name for the trail and details relating to securing and maintaining the trail. Further details should be available by the end of November. If the honourable member would care to follow up his question at that time, I would be pleased to get further details for him.

TOURISM

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the development of tourism in this State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In the promotion of its policy for the development of tourism throughout the State, the Government will ensure that local government bodies and other organizations interested in the development of tourism will be consulted in matters affecting their particular districts.

WEIGHBRIDGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question of October 21 about the weighing of vehicles at the weighbridge at Cavan?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague informs me that the Highways Department is very conscious of the potentially dangerous situations which can occur when Cavan weighbridge operates normally during periods of peak traffic. Although several attempts have been made from time to time to provide safe conditions to allow drivers to turn across oncoming traffic to and from the weighbridge, these have been only partially successful, and instructions were recently issued that south-bound traffic was not to be weighed during peak hours. Traffic inspectors will use their discretion in determining the extent of the peak hours, and at all other times will ensure reasonable conditions of safety apply. Suitable warning signs have been erected in appropriate positions on the approaches to the weighbridge, and it is expected the Cavan weighbridge can continue to operate on this basis until replaced by new weighbridges to be located in the duplication of the Port Wakefield Road to the north.

DROUGHT BONDS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week about the application of drought bonds in South Australia?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Drought bonds have been designed by the Commonwealth Government to encourage certain classes of primary producer to accumulate financial reserves in good seasons which can be drawn upon in the event of drought, fire or flood. Redemptions on account of drought will be allowed where the area in which the bondholder's property is situated has been declared a "drought area" by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry. No criteria are laid down for the declaration of a "drought area", but in the case of the Far North-East of South Australia, which was gazetted as such in the *Commonwealth Gazette* of January 15, 1970, this was declared a "drought area" by the Minister for Primary Industry in close co-operation with the Minister of Lands in South Australia.

Application for redemption may be made during the period the declaration is in force and for 12 months after its removal has been

notified in the *Commonwealth Gazette*. Redemption for fire or flood will be allowed on the basis of a claim submitted by a taxpayer, and accepted by the Commissioner of Taxation, that he has suffered substantial damage to or loss of pastures or livestock as a result of fire or flood. The taxpayer may apply to redeem all or part of his holding at any time up to 12 months after the occurrence of the fire or flood.

Where the Commissioner of Taxation is satisfied that a request on the grounds of drought, fire or flood should be granted, he will declare that the bonds have become redeemable and inform the Registry where the bonds are inscribed. The Registrar will then redeem the bonds. Other grounds for redemption are: ceasing to carry on a grazing business, death, bankruptcy, or serious financial hardship.

Applications for redemption are made on the prescribed form obtainable from the Deputy Director, Commonwealth Loans Organization, 41 Currie Street, Adelaide, 5000, and when completed are sent to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation for the State in which the applicant's income tax returns are lodged. In South Australia the address is Advertiser Building, King William Street, Adelaide, 5000.

SUCCESSION DUTIES OFFICE

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: About six months ago I addressed a question to the Chief Secretary in the previous Government concerning the very cramped conditions under which the staff of the Stamp and Succession Duties Office worked and the unsatisfactory conditions experienced by members of the public who visited that office. The then Chief Secretary replied that the question of transferring the office to the old Engineering and Water Supply Department building was being considered, as it was recognized that a change was urgently needed. However, such a change has not yet occurred. Can the Chief Secretary tell me the present position?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know the present position, although I have heard the matter being discussed. I will take up the honourable member's question with the appropriate Minister and bring down a reply.

KANGAROO ISLAND FARMER

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: During the much publicized farmers' march members of the Chief Secretary's Party marched with the farmers to encourage them. As a result of a controversy between a soldier settler on Kangaroo Island and the Australian Workers Union, the soldier settler could easily be deprived of his whole livelihood. Can the Chief Secretary tell me whether any of the people I have referred to, who supported the farmers during the march, would be prepared to act as mediators with the Australian Workers Union, since I know they have much closer contact with that union than do members on this side of the Council?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know the exact circumstances of this matter but, if what I read in this morning's newspaper is correct, the gentleman referred to could easily solve his problem. With great respect to certain gentlemen, we know that sometimes newspaper reports are not correct. However, I will discuss the matter with some of my colleagues and see whether anything can be done along the lines suggested.

FISHING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yesterday the Minister replied to a question about bag limits for fish in certain areas. I think he will recall that bag limits existed prior to 1968, when it was decided, in consultation with the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, that to take too many young fish, particularly whiting, was not desirable. Therefore, the bag limit as such was discontinued. In a letter that was sent to the District Council of Pirie, the Director said that he would be quite happy to permit a bag limit of 36 provided they were full-size fish. I understand that as the law stands at present any amateur fishing with a rod or line with three hooks thereon from a jetty may take as many fish as he likes, irrespective of size, that if he moves to the rocks or into a boat he may take only the legal size fish (in the case of whiting, 11in.), and that there is no restriction on the amount of fish that he can take from the jetty, from a boat or from the rocks. I

should like the Minister to check on those facts, as the reply given yesterday seemed to indicate that what has been suggested would be a restriction rather than any generosity, because at present there is no limitation on anyone who is fishing with single tackle as an amateur without a licence, provided he does not sell the fish he catches.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think there is any intention to limit the amateur fishermen at all. However, I shall bring back a detailed report for the honourable member.

MEAT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question concerning meat inspection?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Under the provisions of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act, all meat derived from stock as defined in the Act (with the exception of poultry) which enters or is processed within the metropolitan abattoirs area for sale for human consumption must be inspected by a competent authority. However, any meat or carcass brought into the metropolitan abattoirs area by a person for consumption by him and/or the members of his family is specifically exempted from this requirement. With regard to poultry, I am advised that in general there is no inspection of poultry meat in this State other than at premises registered by the Department of Primary Industry where an inspection is carried out of poultry and offals destined for export. Under the Food and Drugs Act, kangaroos are regarded as "game", and kangaroo meat does not therefore come within the jurisdiction of inspectors of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board unless it creates an insanitary condition in butchering premises. I am not aware of any special provisions in the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act governing the inspection of venison.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Minister for his reply. However, obviously, certain meats being consumed in the metropolitan area are not subject to any inspection. Can the Minister now state what is the Government's policy regarding meats that are not inspected prior to consumption in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I take it that the Leader is referring to meats for human consumption?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think that all the matters regarding meat for human consumption are covered in the reply I have just given. Kangaroo meat is defined in the Act as game; therefore, it is not readily inspected before coming into the metropolitan area. I am unable to say whether or not humans consume kangaroo meat; I do not know of any cases where kangaroo meat or game meat is used for human consumption. However, if the Leader can give me specific cases of this being done, I am prepared to take up this question on those grounds?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: What about poultry?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Poultry processed in South Australia for export is inspected by the Department of Primary Industry.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: What about for human consumption here?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am not sure of that situation. However, I am prepared to take up this matter to see what is the actual situation.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it is Government policy that the Director of Agriculture cannot publish proper estimates other than in the form of statements by the Minister? As estimate figures are vital to the efficient handling, merchandising and disposal of most crops, it is urgent that such figures be put into immediate circulation. Will the Minister allow responsible officers to publish such figures without delay?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think that the Government has any strict policy regarding this matter. I think it is departmental policy that any statement that concerns South Australia generally, particularly its agriculture, should be perused by the Minister before sanction to publish it is given. I do not think that anything would be gained or any time lost by this procedure, because these matters come into the Minister's office every day. No unnecessary delay is incurred. I think that any Government would be within its rights in ensuring that such statements come from the right quarters. If this were not the case, a statement could be published that might not set out the position correctly.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In either today's or yesterday's press I read a statement by Mr. Whitlam that dealt with a recommended change in the control of the waters of the Murray River and the Darling River. He suggested a policy that the Commonwealth Government should be responsible for the control and development of the usage of these waters. Can the Chief Secretary say whether his Government supports Mr. Whitlam's view in this matter?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As this question has not been discussed by the Government, I am unable to give a reply.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CEREAL ESTIMATES

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave of the Council to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is customary at about this time of the year for estimates of the cereal crop to be prepared by officers of the Agriculture Department. Figures for the 1970-71 harvest have now been extracted and, with the indulgence of the Council, I propose to give a brief summary of the expected grain harvest situation, which I hope will be of interest to honourable members.

Record sowings of barley this year are expected to produce the largest barley harvest in South Australia for the past 10 years. This season 1,800,000 acres was sown to barley compared with 1,400,000 acres in the 1969-70 season and 1,400,000 acres in the 1968-69 season. There has been a dramatic decline

in the acreage sown to wheat over the past three years. This has undoubtedly been due to the effects of wheat quotas. Wheat acreage has dropped from 3,700,000 acres in the 1968-69 season and 3,200,000 acres in the 1969-70 season, to an estimated 2,100,000 acres this season.

Wheat is expected to yield 32,700,000 bushels from the 2,100,000 acres sown. Barley is expected to yield 37,500,000 bushels from 1,800,000 acres sown and oats 10,800,000 bushels from 700,000 acres. Reasons advanced for the better performance of barley this year are that a greater percentage of the crop was grown in that part of the State which received close to average winter rainfall and the higher yielding ability of the variety "Clipper", which is now grown over a wide area of the State.

Of the other crops grown, rye is expected to yield 180,000 bushels from 44,000 acres; peas 480,000 bushels from 32,000 acres; and oil seed rape, 1,000 tons from crops grown for the first time in South Australia. The season has been a difficult one in some respects. Winter rainfall was extremely low in many districts, but good rains in August and September have improved prospects. The rainfall for October has been below average and weather conditions could still have an important effect on yields and grain samples.

A severe frost on October 15 substantially reduced the expected yields of barley and wheat in the Murray Mallee and South-Eastern districts. I have some production statistics for wheat, barley, and oats, and I seek the permission of the Council to have the tables incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

PRODUCTION
1970-71 Cereal Estimates

District	Wheat			Barley			Oats		
	Area harvested (acres)	Yield per acre (bush.)	Bushels	Area harvested (acres)	Yield per acre (bush.)	Bushels	Area harvested (acres)	Yield per acre (bush.)	Bushels
Central	268,000	21	5,628,000	488,000	26	12,688,000	104,000	20	2,080,000
Lower North	471,000	23	10,833,000	361,000	26	9,386,000	105,000	20	2,100,000
Upper North	143,000	15	2,145,000	26,000	19	494,000	20,000	17	340,000
South-Eastern	58,000	23	1,334,000	56,000	21	1,176,000	100,000	28	2,800,000
Western	877,000	12	10,524,000	574,000	19	10,906,000	273,000	10	2,730,000
Murray Mallee	287,000	8	2,296,000	315,000	9	2,835,000	85,000	9	765,000
State	2,104,000	15.5	32,760,000	1,820,000	20.5	37,485,000	687,000	16	10,815,000

PRODUCTION STATISTICS SEASONS 1968-69 TO 1970-71 (ESTIMATED)

Season	Wheat			Barley			Oats		
	Acreage	Yield per acre (bush.)	Bushels	Acreage	Yield per acre (bush.)	Bushels	Acreage	Yield per acre (bush.)	Bushels
1968-69	3.7M	22.19	83.1M	1.4M	20.92	29.5M	0.5M	16.5	11.9M
1969-70	3.2M	19.27	62.6M	1.4M	22.98	32.4M	0.36M	20.10	7.2M
1970-71 (estimated)	2.1M	15.5	32.7M	1.8M	20.5	37.4M	0.6M	16.0	10.8M

M = million.

PUBLIC RELIEF

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. F. J. Potter:

(For wording of motion, see page 1715.)

(Continued from October 28. Page 2107.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into certain areas of the care of the ageing in our community. I indicate now that I shall be moving an amendment to the terms of reference moved by the Hon. Mr. Potter, whose speech I read with great interest. In dealing with the appointment of a Select Committee, he said that the first reference was:

To inquire into and report upon the distress of old age pensioners with no income other than pension payments, the circumstances under which it arises and the means by which it can be ameliorated.

The honourable member then said:

I say, first of all, that I do not think it would be the proper function of this committee to make any inquiry into the question of the adequacy of the old age pension. After all, this Parliament does not fix that pension and circumstances are such that we cannot fix it. However, it has been brought to our attention recently, particularly by a statement of the Rev. Mr. Vogt of the Adelaide Central Methodist Mission, that there is an area of great need in this community involving age pensioners who receive no income but the pension and that there is also a problem of the sick aged in our community.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Hon. Mr. Potter that there is an area of great need in the community, particularly in respect of the provision of accommodation, nursing home facilities, and supporting services for aged people; but the problem is not confined to the old age pensioner or any other pensioner in our community: it is just as acute for those people who are not in receipt of any pension payment as it is for the old age pensioner or any other pensioner in the community.

We hear much these days, and there is considerable use, of the word "crisis"—a crisis in education, a crisis in this and a crisis in that. I believe that, if we want to use the word "crisis", the developing crisis in our community relates to these three areas to which I have just referred—accommodation for the ageing people, supporting services for them, and the necessary nursing home facilities for them. I spent two years, as most honourable members know, as Minister of Health in South Australia. I fully recognized that there was a problem then and I know there is a problem now. Certain actions were taken to ameliorate this situation. I think every honourable member

here recognizes the fact that provision for the ageing in our community is an ever-expanding problem. Whilst we have a difficulty now, in 10 years' time it will be much more intense.

I think we are making some contribution towards solving this problem, in that the previous Government and this Government have recognized that there are several areas that need improving. Many studies have been made of this problem and plans have been laid in many areas to tackle it. The structure of domiciliary care units in our hospitals and in local government is a decision that will have some impact upon this problem. However, I do not believe that the structure of domiciliary care units alone will fully cope with the problem. The provision of nursing home accommodation and beds, in association with our community and subsidized hospitals, is also a matter that needs close examination. We must change quickly our approach to subsidies available to community and subsidized hospitals and for nursing home accommodation for the ageing in our community.

I do not want to speak at length on this problem because I have been closely associated with it for some time, but I speak on this motion purely because I do not believe that the terms of reference as moved by the Hon. Mr. Potter will allow a full-scale inquiry into the areas of very great need in our community. As I have mentioned, there is the problem of supporting services, nursing home facilities, and accommodation for ageing persons. Therefore, I move to add the following term of reference:

111. To inquire into and report upon the needs of the ageing for accommodation, supporting services, and nursing home facilities.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK (Midland): I second the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and support the overall motion. In 1901 there were 80,000 aged people in Australia, representing one elderly person in every 25 of the population. By 1966 the figure had grown to 1,200,000, and the proportion had grown to one elderly person in every 12 of the population. This change in the balance of the population has created a situation that cannot be ignored. Here we have an aged section of the people, being part of the population, somewhat dependent on the rest of the population but not divorced from it. They have many needs—accommodation, finance, companionship, domiciliary assistance, nursing assistance, and so forth, but more particularly they have a need for understanding,

and understanding can be achieved only with knowledge. May I suggest that such a body as this Select Committee will be able to collate the knowledge that is necessary.

I should like now to read portion of an editorial from the *Senior Citizens' News* of the month of October, 1970. It is as follows:

How long will it be before we face a crisis in the care of our frail and chronically sick aged? An acute shortage of infirmity beds is apparent both in Government hospitals and in private nursing homes, and, for pensioners depending entirely upon the pension, the charges made by nursing homes are mostly beyond their reach. Take the instance of this authentic case quoted from a letter:

I have my mother hospitalized at a private hospital (name and address given). We have recently been advised that the cost of keeping my mother in hospital has been increased by \$6.30 weekly. Until last week mother's pension and the intensive care payment made by the Government was sufficient to meet the fortnightly hospital account. My two sisters, who are both widows and receive pensions, and myself, are responsible for my mother, so we are now faced with the finding of this extra money.

The letter goes on to say that the mother, who is 85 and unable to walk, was cared for by the younger daughter until January of this year, when she was placed in a nursing home on the doctor's advice. The patient was apparently well cared for in the nursing home, but in view of the increase in fees an appeal was made to a social agency to find another private nursing home of a similar standard but with lower fees. Unfortunately, from inquiries made it is apparent that no longer will private nursing homes be able to accommodate aged people for the amount of the pension plus the intensive care grant of \$5 a day. Naturally, the position is more serious for those who do not qualify for the intensive care grant, because the grant is only \$2 a day.

The 1966 census figures show the total South Australian population as 1,091,875, of which 112,436 are of pensionable age, or 13 per cent, and it is estimated some 65,000 are in receipt of the pension. It is reasonable to assume therefore that the case quoted would not be an isolated one by any stretch of imagination. Well, one might ask how much longer the community has to wait for leadership from Commonwealth and State Governments in facing up to the problems of the ever-growing aged population. From 1961 to 1966 the number of pensionable aged persons increased by 9,530.

I suggest that the proposed Select Committee is an answer to this challenge regarding leadership. I hope that country areas will be included in the sphere of the Select Committee's inquiry, because I consider that in the country there are other aspects and further difficulties than there are in the metropolitan area. A large percentage of the widows and

widowers in country towns live in houses on their own, and I believe that this situation has occurred because of circumstances that apply in country towns. When members of families reach an age at which they have to leave home for education or employment, the parents remain and follow their normal occupation until they find they are living in a fairly large house on their own. One dies and the other is left. Because of the lack of money, the house falls into disrepair, and this situation presents great difficulty to the local council. I have been directly involved in one such situation where a man relying wholly on his pension is now living in a house that is literally falling down around him. It has been condemned by the council, and this man would normally have to be put into the street so that the house could be demolished. When asked to enter a nursing home, he emphatically refused. I suggest that, in many cases, the correction is left far later than it should have been. The Housing Trust saw this necessity in country areas in 1958. Perhaps I should say that the Government of the day acknowledged and accepted the responsibility and in that year introduced the Country Housing Act, which provided housing in country areas for people who were unable to afford normal rents. As rents of the houses built under this Act are fixed according to the tenant's ability to pay, these people can remain in their family locality, because the rent payable is determined by the family income, the minimum being \$2 a week.

The rents received by the trust from these houses, less any necessary outgoings, are placed in a special fund to provide for the erection of additional houses under the scheme. Government grants totalling \$936,038 have been received which, together with the income derived from the rents, has enabled the trust to build 193 houses of this type to September 30, 1970. I have seen these houses and I consider that they serve a useful purpose in country areas.

Another situation in the country that concerns the matter we are discussing is that many smaller country towns, because of modern communication and transportation, are giving way to regional centres. Although the younger members of the family leave the area for employment and education, the older people remain in the house. In the not distant future I see this situation being aggravated. Another factor is a lack of doctors and medical care in many country areas. The second part of the motion states:

To inquire into and report upon the effectiveness of the assistance available to deserted wives, widows and widowers with dependent children, and the means by which the cause of present distress can be relieved.

Some authorities and organizations have done their best to relieve this situation, and I know of a country town in which several Housing Trust units were built but, because they were originally built to house people to be employed in an industry that did not eventuate, they were not used. Widows with children, deserted wives with families, widowers with children, and invalid pensioners with families were sent to this locality. This environment was not satisfactory for these people, as they were grouped in one area, although I know that it was intended that these people were to be housed at a reasonable rent in an area in which the cost of living was as low as possible, and this intention was good. The ministers of the area found it necessary to form a benevolent society, and I know that weekly, and sometimes more often, meetings were held in order to alleviate the position caused by the straitened circumstances in which these people found themselves. So, I believe there is a need for investigation in this field.

I turn now to the amendment, which I support, concerning services not only to the pensioner but to aged people generally. I have recently been in contact with a wellknown social worker in this State who considers that many elderly people die not because of physical failure but because of malnutrition and loneliness. There has even been some evidence that, after Meals on Wheels has come in and played a very worthwhile part for some old people, the people who had been visiting them stopped doing so because of the help given by Meals on Wheels. Loneliness in old age is a very real thing. A service club that I know about is arranging for teams to visit aged people and thereby greatly assist them. Senior citizens clubs are meeting a great need in this field, too. Dr. De Souza, the Adviser in Geriatrics to the Commonwealth Government, speaks of activity as a means of overcoming the problems of retired people. In addition to many other activities, he speaks of day care centres as follows:

I would like to spend a few minutes now discussing another type of day centre. This I refer to as a day care centre. This is essentially a place which takes in disorientated and frequently incontinent though often highly mobile old people for day care. Most of these old people are suffering from organic brain disease in the form of senile dementia or cerebral arteriosclerotic dementia. A number

of such persons are cared for at home by devoted relatives, often under great emotional and domestic stress. A day care centre can give enormous respite to relatives by relieving them of the care of the patient during the day and can usually delay the inevitable permanent admission to nursing home or mental hospital. This type of centre could be most easily developed as an annexe to a psychiatric day hospital or a nursing home.

This suggestion could reduce the need for aged persons to take up beds full time in nursing homes. I believe the proposed Select Committee could collate much information, bring forward many suggestions and facts concerning facilities in various areas, and bring them under one plan. If we are to attack the root cause of the problem we must reach people prior to their retirement so that they can be educated for that stage in their lives. I should like to quote from a statement by the Professor of Psychology at the University of Melbourne, Professor Alastair Heron, to the Victorian Council on the Ageing. The professor, who has had much experience in the United Kingdom, said:

What evidence do we have of need? There are two kinds—one is statistical and the other is evidence obtained from people. They happen to be complementary. In 1901 6 per cent of the population of the United Kingdom was of pensionable age. This year 15 per cent is of pensionable age and the projections show that by 1976 it will have risen again to 18 per cent.

Although this statement applies to the United Kingdom, the same percentage increase would apply to this country. Professor Heron continued:

I addressed meetings in at least 20 different areas all over the United Kingdom in a space of two or three years, concurrently with running my research unit on ageing in Liverpool.

The professor then made the following statement on the programme for educating people for retirement:

They spent the mornings of this week on talks and discussions and then arranged to do different things in the afternoons. For example, in the mornings they talked about retirement and money, retirement and mental health, retirement and physical health, retirement and social living, retirement and further education facilities; it ended up on the last morning talking about the opportunities of age. In the afternoons of the same week they worked on crafts and hobbies, the appreciation of literature and drama, an afternoon on gardening, visits to crafts and hobbies centres.

So, an important facet of the problem is to educate people before they reach retirement so that they will be ready for it and engage in activities that will prevent boredom. Mr. John B. Martin, a United States Commissioner

on the Ageing, in speaking on homes for the aged, said:

If properly planned and administered, a home for the aged could become a senior service centre helping to meet the needs of non-institutionalized older citizens throughout its community. It could provide such services as group meals within the home setting for older people from the neighbourhood; home delivered meals to persons temporarily or permanently immobilized in their own homes; day care for older people who have family to care for them at night but are alone during the day; and general information and referral on all community service for older people.

Our generation has a responsibility to those who have gone before us. There are many ways in which we can assist in overcoming the apparent crisis that is threatening us now. One very direct way in which this Council can help to solve the problem is by forming the proposed Select Committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support both the motion and the amendment. I am sorry, however, that, whilst the amendment widens the terms of reference, the investigation that is envisaged does not cover the whole realm of poverty in South Australia. It does not affect only the aged, as previous speakers have said; the second part of the motion refers to the plight of widows with dependent children. Of course, these people are not necessarily aged persons.

That there is poverty in South Australia should be understood as far as it is possible for it to be understood by a Government and Parliament. The only way in which this understanding can be achieved is by an investigation such as that suggested in the motion. Experts tell us that poverty is one of the root causes of the sick society that exists in the United States of America. If at all possible we should seek to avoid the ailments from which that nation suffers. I think this whole question of poverty as it exists here in South Australia should be investigated in greater depth than it has ever been in the past.

An inquiry at the level of a Select Committee of this Council would be admirably suitable, I would think, for this task. Select Committees from this Chamber have, over the years, investigated their terms of reference in great depth and in a very calm atmosphere and have given very full consideration to the questions before them. Whilst I know that such Select Committees should not breach their terms of reference, this committee might vary its investigation slightly to cover all the realms of poverty that exist in South Australia and, in doing that, I think even more could be achieved

than would be the case if the exact terms of reference as stated were adhered to. I support the motion.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): In replying briefly to the speakers who have taken part in this debate, I wish to thank them very much for the attention they have given to the matter. I sense from what has been said by those speakers and also from what has been said outside the Chamber by other members that there is a real feeling in this Council regarding the need to set up this committee. Indeed, I think that it is beginning to be felt that it might be one of the most important committees we have ever formed.

I, too, agree that we do not wish to so limit the field of inquiry by this committee that the very important matter mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition cannot be locked into by the committee. I welcome his amendment. Indeed, I think that some further look at the whole question of poverty, as mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Hill, may be possible anyway under the first paragraph of the motion. I do not know whether at this late stage the Hon. Mr. Hill wishes to do anything about this.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I think it is covered, really.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, I think it is perhaps covered in the first paragraph. Certainly I do not think the committee will in any way exclude looking at the problems of all persons who are receiving a pension payment of one kind or another. I thank honourable members very much for showing such interest in this matter. I know that this committee will be a hard-working one. It may be that it will not be able to report to this Council for some considerable time and that extensions from time to time may be required in the time allowed to present the report. I am sure that when the report comes forward it will be recognized as a real contribution towards the solution of some of these very difficult problems.

Amendment carried.

Motion as amended carried and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. J. Potter, E. K. Russack, A. J. Shard, and V. G. Springett; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on December 1.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. H. K. Kemp:

That the regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1969, made on June 18, 1970, and laid on the table of this Council on July 14, 1970, be disallowed.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2110.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the motion, not because I want to provide nothing in the way of controlling pollution but because I wish to raise my protest against the manner in which these regulations have been brought forward. Several expert witnesses gave evidence before the Subordinate Legislation Committee and were questioned on whether certain powers that are being given to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief under these regulations should not be given under the Waterworks Act, 1932-1969.

I think everyone in this day and age realizes that pollution is a tremendous problem, whether it be pollution of the air, the ground, or the water. I think we have made much progress in the last couple of years in being alerted to the problem of pollution, particularly when one looks at the record of other countries, notably the United States of America, and when one sees what has been accomplished in the United Kingdom with regard to air pollution. At one time London and cities such as Bradford and Manchester were absolutely grey and black all through the winter with pollution. However, since the Government has taken a very firm stand in prohibiting the burning of solid fuels, this position has improved out of sight. Also, the position has improved somewhat in the U.S.A., where some positive action has been taken in respect of many of the streams.

I suppose it is only natural that people become very panicky when they see what is happening in some other countries, because they fear that the same thing could happen here. I agree with those people who have alerted the Government and also their fellow citizens about this most important matter. However, a subject as serious as pollution requires much planning in depth: it is not something on which one can pass one or two little regulations and laws and expect to solve the problem. In my opinion, regulation No. 8, particularly, is just a stop-gap and something more must be provided.

In my opinion, what should be provided is a complete review of the Waterworks Act and the regulations under that Act in order to

ensure that the Director and Engineer-in-Chief had sufficient powers over the catchment areas to restrict certain activities in those areas. However, with this particular regulation we are buying an absolute pig in a poke. It merely says that under the planning and development regulations certain powers are given to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. It states:

The Director of Planning may refuse approval to a plan of subdivision or resubdivision if:

- (a) The land or any part thereof is:
 - (i) within the watershed of an existing or proposed reservoir or source of public water supply; or
 - (ii) within 300ft. of the normal edge of the River Murray including any flowing anabranch, Lakes Alexandrina and Albert, and any watercourse extending upstream therefrom proclaimed under the Control of Waters Act, 1919-1925, or any amendment thereto; and
- (b) in the opinion of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department the approval of the plan could lead to pollution of a public water supply.

The Director of Planning already has considerable powers under the Planning and Development Act. He has regulations covering practically every contingency one could think of. At present, he must submit his plans to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief before they can be approved. However, what this regulation does is to confer an additional power on him, in that he may not recommend, as was previously the case: the regulation goes further than that. The only thing that stands between the prevention of a subdivision is that the Director of Planning must agree to the requirement of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. However, any appeal must be made to the appeal board.

My argument is that these matters should be clearly defined in a set of regulations, under the Waterworks Act, that confers certain powers on the Director. If this is done, people will know what they can do and what they cannot do. At present, people can be going about their normal business with quite a number of acres that they might decide to subdivide. It could be a nightmare if people wanted to subdivide today. The problems that one must go through today to subdivide are almost incredible. A person must not only obtain the local council's approval but also the Town Planner's approval. If that person happens to be in an area where the Lands Department is involved, the approval of the

Minister of Lands must also be obtained. If a person lives in an irrigation area and wishes to subdivide, the approval of the Minister of Irrigation must be obtained. Now such a person has the additional problem of obtaining the Director and Engineer-in-Chief's approval.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: What about the Highways Department?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. If that department wants a slice of the cake, it comes in, too. In addition to the normal problems of a subdivider, that person must find money, first, to provide for the kerbing and formation of roads, all the fees in connection with the survey and subdivision, and for getting separate titles which, in itself, is a big affair. That person must also run the whole gamut with all these authorities. I do not think that people would mind nearly as much if they knew what they must do. However, a person could incur considerable expense in preparing plans and having them drawn up, and paying certain moneys to a council only to find in the last ditch stage that the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has decided that some difficulty might be caused with the watershed, in the case of a catchment area, or the Town Planner might require something additional to the 150 links back from the stream that he now gets under the Act. The Town Planner has the right to insist on a 50ft. road, so that makes the distance from the stream about 200 links. Then the subdivision starts.

So the piece of land, which might be very attractive to people who want to buy it, would be pushed back over the rise, and all that purchasers would look at would be a sandhill. Often, this would remove much of the site's attractiveness. What I am worried about is that these matters should be clearly defined in the regulation; for example, it could stipulate that piggeries or dairies cannot be set up in a catchment area. Then the public would know where it stood.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: They would be able to find out the Director's opinion in advance.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Quite. It should be defined clearly in the regulation. At present, all the regulation states is that, in the opinion of the Director, approval of the plans could lead to pollution. What are the things at which the Director could look? He could look at 101 different things. In the meantime, it is not only a matter of telephoning or of writing to the Director and saying, "This is my hypothetical case. I should like to subdivide. Will you give

approval?" It is not a matter of a couple of gentlemen discussing the matter; it is a matter of a Government department. The department will want to see everything delineated on a plan and every bit of the necessary formalities that must take place before it expresses an opinion. As a result, a person could be down the drain for considerable money, time and inconvenience.

I should like to ask the Minister representing the Minister of Works, under whose jurisdiction the Waterworks Act comes, whether or not the Government has drafted amendments to the Waterworks Act. Sections 56, 57 and 58 of that Act contain very wide provisions. No doubt, when the Minister replies, he will give me the explanations I have asked for because this matter is just as important to him as it is to me. It is also of great importance to the Minister of Agriculture because of the dairying, pig-raising and various other activities that take place in the Adelaide Hills catchment area. The Minister of Agriculture has dairying inspectors and various other officials under his jurisdiction, who also have something to do with this whole matter of planning. I should like the Minister to answer the questions I have posed.

The other matter I want to raise is whether or not the department has actually completed a set of regulations under those sections mentioned, because I understand that a letter was circulated to councils in the various areas not so long ago pointing out that they could do certain things and were prohibited from doing other things; but somewhere along the line it appears that these regulations have not been tabled, and I believe they should be. That is why I am registering my protest, because I do not believe in giving blank cheques where people are involved in things as important as those I have mentioned. I hope the Minister will give me an explanation, because I believe these are important points, and his explanation could easily affect my vote one way or the other.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEES)

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

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(MINISTRY)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 2232.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): When reading the second reading explanation of this Bill, which increases the number of Ministers in Cabinet from nine to 10, I was conscious of the excuse that the Government used for its introduction. The Chief Secretary said:

In a developing State such as South Australia, the responsibilities of administration vested in Ministers are such that each of the present Ministers has a work load in excess of what should normally be expected of any one person.

I take the Government to task for that statement, because I wonder whether the State is developing at this point of time. After all, it has had to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth Government and the Grants Commission for financial help. It has had to do that because its population has not increased to the extent that it is now healthy and vigorous enough to qualify for normal financial assistance from Canberra; so we have become again a mendicant State, which has not progressed, to my way of thinking, as it should have. Our lack of population is a thorn in the side of progress because, no matter what we do, everything is compared with the standards achieved in New South Wales and Victoria, States with much larger populations. Obviously, we are not developing as we should or as we had hoped to.

We have on our hands at the moment this ridiculous matter of planning for the conservation of water, which is being thought of in terms of 1980, not 1970. In that respect, we have not progress but complete and utter stalemate on a principle. Whether that principle is right or wrong, the important thing is the future of the State, and it may well be that in 10 years' time we shall be the losers because of this rather absurd stand in respect of our water supply, particularly when we read in the press of the idea that, when a change of Government occurs in the Eastern States, that will be the time for a change of thinking about the Chowilla dam project. So I ask again: is the development of the State progressing at the speed the Government tries to suggest in this Bill?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And a very good question, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Government was forced to go to the Grants Commission.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Excuses, excuses!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is right—on the Prime Minister's advice.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It was the formula that forced the Government to go to the Grants Commission. The formula was there, as I have said earlier. One of the problems confronting us was that the rate of increase in population through births as well as migration was seriously down.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: We are all getting older.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: We have had a series of one-day and half-day strikes over the last month. We have been told from reliable sources that at Whyalla the production of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has fallen by some 35 per cent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What has that got to do with this Bill?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It has relation to the State's progress. The Chief Secretary, in his second reading explanation, said that we are "a developing State" and he referred to "the responsibilities of administration".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not in the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It is certainly not in the Bill, but I am trying to draw attention to the fact that the reference to progress is not correct.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is wide open procedure—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: We are going through some very difficult stages.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member is not going too well!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Government wants an extra Minister. Why do we need more Ministers? The Chief Secretary has said that the work load on the Ministers is too great—that they have "a work load in excess of what should normally be expected of any one person". Has the work load been distributed and spread evenly over all the Ministerial departments? I suggest that some Ministers do not have as much responsibility as have other Ministers. One disappointing fact revealed in the second reading explanation was that no reference was made to the department that the new Minister would control. Several names and various departments have been suggested in the press, but I cannot accept those statements. These details should be outlined in the Bill, or at least in the second

reading explanation. I am not sure that we need another Minister.

The argument that this State has the lowest number of Cabinet Ministers (equal to Tasmania with nine) is a small excuse, because the Ministerial load is directly in proportion to the type of responsibility that the Government allocates to the Ministers. To be a Minister must be an extremely onerous and difficult job, and I have often wondered whether the American system could be adopted here, because it has some merit. Leaders of industry are appointed as advisers with some type of Ministerial authority. These men have proved themselves in industry and in union administration as being extremely capable, and they introduce fresh ideas and initiative to Administration. The British Labor Government did the same thing some years ago when a person from Imperial Chemical Industries was appointed to control the railways system.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We brought one from I.C.I., but you chopped his head off and threw him overboard.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: He was not appointed at Cabinet level, and there does not seem to have been an appointment by this Government to the position he held. This short Bill amends section 65 of the principal Act, and I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I oppose the Bill, because I believe that, at this early stage in the new Government's term of office, it is too soon for the Government to take stock with certainty, and to seek an increase in the number of Ministers. If this Bill had been introduced in about 12 months' time I would support it, because a settling-in period of up to two years is necessary for any Government to appreciate fully its work load and to tackle the problems of allocating that work so that all Ministers are working hard and doing the job they have to do.

It seems to me that there has been some rush in this instance, and it is because of that that I oppose the measure. Also, the question of cost must arise. It is not only the cost of the Minister, but we know that all departments are increasing considerably in size at present. That point was made clear in this year's Budget.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not all of them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Most of them are, and this is a natural tendency. However, the Government wants to add another Ministerial department. When we consider costs, we must consider the costs that will arise when the new Minister appoints the departmental head,

who then considers the staff structure that he thinks is necessary. When this process is completed the total cost, as a result of this change, will be considerable.

At present the allocation of work within the Ministry is completely lopsided. The Hon. Mr. Dunstan is Premier, Treasurer, and Minister of Development and Mines, and within these portfolios I understand that he carries out the work that was previously carried out by the Minister in charge of Immigration and Tourism. That covers a fantastic field. At the other end of the scale there is the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation and Minister of Irrigation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And doing a good job, too.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: He always does a good job, but he does not have enough work to do.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You must be joking.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not joking: I suppose it is a question of opinion, but my strong opinion is that as a Minister of the Crown he does not have enough work to do. It is not his fault, because he is one of the most conscientious Ministers to have held office during my time as a member. I followed him in the portfolio of Transport and I know that he was an efficient Minister. However, the fact that the Premier has so much work and another member of the Ministry has so much less work highlights the lopsided approach in allocating portfolios. Until that position is rectified I suggest that it is rough of the Government to ask for an additional Minister. Until this settling-in period has occurred—

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You are being tough on Mr. Banfield aren't you?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not dealing with him. I refer to another Minister, the Hon. Mr. Broomhill. I know Ministers opposite think he has a tremendous amount of work.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He has one of the most difficult jobs in Parliament.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not deny that he has a difficult portfolio and that he is under intense pressure, but what about the volume of work he has to do? I do not think he has much work to do when we consider volume of work. We have had the same experience, but we did not have every union on our back as the Hon. Mr. Broomhill has on his.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's because you didn't do anything.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Before the Government asks for another Minister there should be some balancing and rationalizing of Ministerial work. To support my view that this Bill should be opposed, I believe that an impression was given that all Ministers were over-worked because of the amount of work the previous Government had done.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They didn't do that much.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The amount of work done by a Minister generally depends on the Minister himself. He himself either generates a huge volume of work or he coasts along at what he considers to be a reasonable pace; I am not saying that such a Minister is lazy—I am saying that he makes his own pace. We all have our own ideas about the volume of work we ought to be doing. I believe the impression was given that all Ministers were overworked because of the amount of work the previous Government had done. I do not think that that impression should be taken, in itself, as evidence that there is a need for another Minister. I think that most Ministers like working hard.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is no alternative.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I just said that a Minister could make his own pace. A Minister may come back from a meeting and initiate half a dozen departmental inquiries as a result of that meeting; or, he may come back from a meeting and not initiate any such inquiries. However, if he does initiate them and the same process occurs after every meeting, it is easy to see what a volume of work will face that Minister. Similarly, it is easy to see how much work will face a Minister who does not initiate many departmental inquiries.

There is a tendency for Ministers to work harder during their settling-in period, because they must gain knowledge about their portfolios. So, Ministers who are overworked now may not be faced with the same problem after the settling-in period has ended. My fourth point is that Ministers should be giving their full time to their work. I refer particularly to the Minister of Local Government, who retains his office of President of the Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch. I do not think members opposite will deny that this is a time-consuming job.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; it is not.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It must be. I know the amount of time that the President of my

political Party must devote to his work. The amount of time that the President of the A.L.P. must devote to his work is far greater than the amount of time our President must devote to his work. Our Party is a loosely-knit organization, whereas the A.L.P. is a tightly-knit body that needs a strong man at its head. Yet the President of the A.L.P. holds Ministerial office. Whilst he gives his time to outside jobs, Cabinet says, "We must have another Minister." People have asked me, "Why are the Ministers giving time to outside jobs?"

As a result of his outside activities the Minister of Local Government has completely lost control in regard to local government. He was heckled and jeered at the annual meeting of the Local Government Association last week—the first time that has happened in the history of the association. It happened because he is completely out of touch with his portfolio and he is not giving the necessary time to his job. Whilst this situation continues, is it fair and reasonable for the Ministers to say, "We are overworked and want another Minister"? For those reasons I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill because I did not think I would ever have to work as hard as I had to work during the term of office of the previous Government. Consequently, I have some sympathy for Ministers when they speak of their workload. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Hill that perhaps the workload may not be very evenly distributed at present. The Premier, particularly, in carrying far more than I believe is proper, from the State's viewpoint. I do not know why he is carrying such a load: it must be as a result of some arrangements within his Party.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There was no arrangement within the Party.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Then he himself must have decided to take the load. To load himself with the portfolios of Immigration and Tourism as well as Development and Mines—over and above what previous Premiers had—is to take on a very big load indeed. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Hill that the workload is not evenly distributed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not think it ever can be evenly distributed within any Government.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is a debate, not a discussion.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Perhaps the work could be a little more equitably distributed.

No doubt the Government will make changes. The public may not fully understand what some of the names of the portfolios mean and what is involved in those portfolios. The work of the Minister of Education does not end with education. Similarly, the Minister of Agriculture must deal with five departments—the Agriculture Department, Chemistry Department, Agricultural College Department, Government Produce Department, and the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation. Besides those departments, he must be concerned with the Egg Board, the Citrus Organization Committee, the Potato Board, the Barley Board, the Forestry Board, the Artificial Insemination Board, the Veterinary Science Board, the Bushfire Advisory Committee, and the Bushfire Research Committee. In addition, when I was Minister of Agriculture I had to get up at 6 a.m. each day to decide whether a fire ban should be announced. It was a great ordeal for the Minister.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You just got up to listen to your name on the radio.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. There is much work involved in many portfolios. For instance, the Chief Secretary has a multiplicity of exacting duties. I believe that some departments really need a readjustment, and I also believe that had the former Government remained in office some readjustment would have been carried out. There is room for readjustment, and there is room also for a lightening of the load and a more equitable distribution of the load over the present Ministers.

I for one do not begrudge the appointment of an additional Minister. I believe that the cheapest thing that the public of South Australia can have is a Minister who is worth his weight in gold, no matter what his portfolio might be. I am not saying that all the Ministers are good. All I am saying is that there are many worse ways of spending money than by appointing an additional Minister. Therefore, I support the Bill.

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

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 2235.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): My position in regard to this Bill is that I respect the views that were expressed by constituents in my district at the referendum on shopping hours but that at the same time I

consider the question in an overall and broad manner. Indeed, it is proper to do this. Members in this Council should not only put forward the views from within their own districts but should also look at all questions as they relate either to the State as a whole or to the areas concerned within the Bill.

In speaking to this Bill, I intend to deal with this general question of Friday night shopping from the point of view of the shoppers themselves. We have heard much from other interests concerned with the question, but the only chance we have had to hear from the shoppers themselves came at the time of the referendum, which was nothing short of a fiasco. As someone said yesterday, I think, it is impossible to interpret the result of it intelligently.

I think the shoppers' point of view should be made and that much importance should be attached to it. The shoppers principally concerned are those in the fringe areas, in the new areas where shoppers have been enjoying Friday night shopping in the past. I do not use the word "enjoying" lightly, because without any doubt at all, in my view, Friday night shopping has been enjoyed very much indeed by the people living in the fringe suburbs north of Adelaide, in Elizabeth, and also in the areas of Morphett Vale and Reynella and the surrounding parts south of the old metropolitan area.

I particularly take up the case of the younger families in this group. These people mainly comprise the customers within those areas, because in the main young families have moved into those outer parts and have established their lives there. Their practice and their principle behind their practice has been a splendid one from their own point of view and, I think, from the point of view of the State. Their practice in the main has been to go along to these shopping centres on Friday nights with their pay envelope and jointly, husband and wife, to purchase their needs for the following week out of the envelope, and they do their budgeting in a very basic and simple manner.

To put it another way, those young people do not overspend. Overspending is a curse for many young people, for they find it very difficult to resist. Especially do they find it difficult to resist where the store account system applies. However, thousands of young Adelaide couples (I use the word "Adelaide" in the full new metropolitan sense) have gone along to these Friday night shopping centres, and, in quite a basic yet simple, businesslike

manner, have purchased their household needs. They have not spent beyond their means, and they have enjoyed the night out.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Is the weather always pleasant?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the modern shopping centre, it does not matter whether or not the weather is pleasant, because the centres are air-conditioned. Those people have enjoyed the outing and the environment of the large, new shopping centres. In effect, it has been a very sound way in which they can live and budget for their particular method of living. They have enjoyed it and, of course, they want it.

We all agree that those people in the outer fringe areas want this state of affairs to continue. Because those people desire it and expect it, I would think that the shopkeepers who are taking up arms for the "No" cause in a very strong manner should go back to the basic principle and remember that the customer is always right. It is a businessman's clear duty to give the service that the people expect and deserve, and if a shopkeeper is not prepared to do just that I think he should make way for someone who is prepared to do it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is the customer always right in the land and estate business?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, he is, and in my years of experience in the business (which, as the Minister knows, is now concluded) I always endeavoured to give the best of service without concerning myself with the degree of profit, because in that business, as in any other business, profit follows service. Apparently, all those principles are now thrown overboard, because we have this keen and strong demand for a change back to the hours that the central metropolitan area has had for the last 20 or 30 years.

I think all honourable members here should look at this question primarily from the point of view of the shopper, the person without whom the shopkeeper could not live. When we consider the shoppers, we should break them up into two groups: the fringe shoppers, whose opinions we know only too well, and the group that I would call the inside shoppers. The latter group was frightened by publicity that was not particularly honourable publicity. I do not blame the publicity agents for that: I blame the principals who instruct them and pay them. On the other hand, there was an indifference towards the question within the inner metropolitan Adelaide area.

As we all know, Australians have the characteristic that when they are indifferent towards a question, and when they have some doubt about it because of that indifference, instead of looking deeply into it they always tend to vote "No". It is a national characteristic, and it is highlighted by the proposed changes that Governments at the Commonwealth level have endeavoured to bring about in the Australian Constitution.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Does that apply equally to both sexes?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, I think one sex tends to say "No" more than the other sex does. Looking at the question in the broad sense, one must consider the small trader's point of view. Of all the traders, I think that he is the one who should be given every consideration. The bigger trader can look after himself in practically any circumstance. He is a man or an entity, in the case of a company, of great resource. We should concern ourselves particularly with the small trader's point of view, especially one in the fringe suburbs.

I know that some independent small shopkeepers disagree with the views of the trading hours committee, which put forward submissions supporting the "No" vote. I believe that some members of that committee disagree with the overall decision of the committee.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You believe that, but you aren't sure. Have you any facts?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I said "I believe". If the Minister does not know the meaning of the word "believe", I cannot help him any further.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It's not very explanatory.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Of these fringe traders, some of them have extremely high commitments in proportion to their capital and resources. This leads me to one of the two most important points the Council should consider: the question of the small trader in an outlying suburb who has heavy commitments because he has established a business there as a result of the attraction of Friday night shopping. He went into those areas with the knowledge that he could open his new shop on Friday nights. His commitments are such that he is in debt but is hoping to repay over a reasonable period of time the money he has borrowed.

When one thinks of the cost of establishing a shop and of buying fittings, plant and

equipment, and the cost of purchasing a lease and goodwill to move into those areas, one soon gets a large figure. To repay this sum over a period of time the payments must be stretched over, say, two or three years. The kind of man to whom I am referring is very worried. I have heard much in this Chamber about the way in which we must consider minorities. Therefore, I urge the Council to consider seriously the small trader because, if the Bill is passed as it stands, he will be in very serious trouble.

Regarding the small traders in the inside area (the old metropolitan area) who are strongly taking up arms in their cause to retain the existing hours, the position is such that the possible change to 9.30 p.m. trading is being held up as a major fear for the future. It is being held up to an extent that it appears it is the one problem that has ever confronted them and will ruin them in the future.

But the small trader's problems go far deeper than that of Friday night closing. The problems of the small trader in the inner metropolitan area started with the advent of the big shopping centres; surely all honourable members would agree with me on that. The big shopping centres as we know them are financed by big business and, in some cases, by the big retailers. This is where the real problem that faces the small trader lies.

It was obvious to anyone who had some knowledge of shopping problems and trends that this would be inevitable. I was in the United States of America in 1961 and, although I am not an expert on the subject, I was involved in some study on it. I heard appraisers and developers lecturing and giving papers on all kinds of change involved in shopping practices in the general areas of neighbourhood, community and regional shopping centres. It was obvious to me then, in 1961, that the real danger to the small trader in metropolitan Adelaide during the 1960's and 1970's would lie in the development of large new shopping centres. Some of these shopping centres have hardly been completed.

Rather than think that Friday night shopping will finish them completely, some inner metropolitan small traders might find in the future that, if Friday night shopping is introduced, this could be a means of regaining the old customers they have lost in the past few years. I know that, at first glance, some traders will not agree to that statement, but there is some truth in it.

The other point regarding shopkeepers generally is that, when one considers legislation involving them, one must always understand that more than any other business group they fear change; I do not blame them for that. It is only natural that they should fear change. However, they invariably fear change, and it has always been a very stark fact to me to observe this fear. At one time, I was involved in the Adelaide City Council and in dealings with the Rundle Street traders in the variation of hours there and with the question of one-way traffic in Rundle Street. It did not matter how logically discussions were developing, overshadowing the whole question always was the fear of change.

The same fear was paramount in discussions in which I was involved for some years concerning the Central Market area. Here I see it rising again. I make the point that it is a fear that an outsider must respect; I respect it. When we consider legislation and questions that affect those traders, that point must be borne in mind.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What will be the situation in the Central Market area if this legislation is passed?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not had the opportunity to go into that question completely but, if honourable members do not touch on it later in the debate, I may raise it in Committee. Regarding the employees' point of view, here I know that the Government will not agree to my thinking. I believe that the employees who work in the outer areas now want the work and the money that comes to them in overtime. I commend them for their enterprise and for their willingness to work.

I know of a particular case of a shopkeeper who has several shops in the inner metropolitan area and one in the outer metropolitan area. His employees from all over Adelaide vie for the opportunity to work in the outer shop on Friday nights because they want to earn the extra money. I think I know the union's attitude on the question, that these people are overworked. The fact that even shopkeepers have told me that these employees will all be terribly tired on Saturday mornings is rubbish.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Have you ever worked in one?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have worked for 60 to 80 hours a week for the last two years.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I was tired on Saturday mornings, and I was younger then than I am now.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It is a psychological matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Hon. Mr. Hill did not say he was doing that work as a Minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This leads me to the second point that I want to stress. I have dealt with the small shopkeeper who is financially distressed because he moved into the outer area in the knowledge that he could go on trading there on Friday nights. Now I come to the employee who can use this overtime money (normally amounting to \$6 or \$7 a week) as part of his or her family budget in the purchase of a motor car or some other large item such as a television set or refrigerator. That money is being planned, used and expended for those purposes.

If this legislation passes in this form, on January 1, 1971, that money will be cut off, and members of the Labor Party more than any other group will bear in mind the plight of those persons, because they are workers. That type of person should have a reasonable opportunity of continuing to receive overtime money so that the particular purchase in which he or she is involved can at least be completed. This means that we should make some assessment of what may be a reasonable time for such commitments to continue before ceasing under an existing agreement.

When I think of some cases of wives in Elizabeth working and allocating the money they earn to the purchase of the family motor car, as some of them are now doing, I believe that about a two-year period for paying off the motor car should be allowed by some arrangement or another. If this legislation passes through Parliament in its present form, it will cause hardship.

I want now to answer some of the submissions made by the Trading Hours Committee on the matter of costs. It is being held that, if Friday night shopping is introduced, costs will immediately rise and the poor shopper will then suffer. Of course, the other side of the story is that fewer goods will be bought but, if costs are to rise, I ask the simple question: why at the moment can I purchase an article in a supermarket in an outer fringe suburb on Friday night more cheaply than I can purchase a similar article in Rundle Street?

I am told (I have not verified it but I believe it to be true) that the cost of shopping to the average family person in Elizabeth on a Friday night is about the same as

the cost to a shopper in the inner metropolitan area. If this matter of cost was so vital, surely some difference would have appeared by now in the shopping crisis in one area compared with another. If costs do rise a little, that may well be the price that people are prepared to pay for the service they are getting—the service of being able to go into a shop and enjoy an evening's outing.

The committee says we should not have entertainment. That is a lot of rubbish, too, because one of the most modern promotional activities in the retail trade is to draw people into the new shopping centres and in some psychological way, if that is necessary, make them happy there, make them feel welcome and make them regard shopping as an outing and not just a chore. Of course we need some entertainment. All over the world the big shopping developers are entertaining their customers to get them into their shops and keep them there so that ultimately more business will result.

So, in this affluent society, we must recognize that people are prepared to pay more for service. We notice in every part of our daily life that people are prepared to pay for quality and the little extra that the shopkeeper is prepared to give. So I do not place great importance on costs because, whilst I respect the views put forward by the shopkeepers on this matter, I think that in the long term once such a scheme was introduced the increase in costs would be met without complaint by the shopkeeper.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Somebody has to go short. It may be the worker if he hasn't enough money.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Of course he has, because wages are going up all the time.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yes, but they are well behind the cost of living now; and, the further we go, the further behind his wages will fall.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is a matter we can discuss at some other time. I turn now to the evidence we should always be looking for to achieve social progress in this State. We hear a good deal about the 1970's. I forget the expression used—"Go ahead in the '70's with South Australia", or something like that—but by this legislation we are being over-controlled and are becoming a hidebound community. Surely in this State the emphasis should be on freedom rather than on control. These people, of course, in the outer suburbs see this restriction and this control and they

do not appreciate the freedom that will be taken from them.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They appreciate the freedom to vote.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Labor Party should pursue this point because for years it was talking about how the people wanted more freedom. The appointment of the Lotteries Commission was a point in issue, that the people should have more freedom to do this and that. We have heard it from the Labor Party for years and years, but not on this issue. If Friday night shopping is not a strong argument, where do we stop? If we pursued that argument further, we could restrict shopping hours more and force people to cram their shopping into more restricted hours.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: As they do in Tasmania.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The shopkeepers and the Government tell the people what is good for them, and that is a very bad feature of modern society. If we accept this Bill as it stands and if we introduce this restrictive control, how shall we ever break out from it? What about staggered shopping hours, which at some time every modern society has faced or will face? The question of perhaps opening shops on another night as an alternative to Friday night or as well as Friday night could be considered. I know that the Minister of Lands is aware of the effect that this would have on the State's transportation system. If we could stagger shopping hours and business hours in metropolitan Adelaide, the saving to the people in transportation costs would be enormous—but that is a very big question.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You would want more population for that sort of thing.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, but we now have 820,000 people within the metropolitan area and in 16 years' time we shall have about 1,250,000; and so it will go on. It takes time for this type of change to occur. The position will not change very quickly if we take this backward step. When I hear how progressive we are in South Australia, it worries me when I compare our capital city of Adelaide with cities in other parts of the world in this respect. If this is the best the Government can do, why is it that I can shop on Thursday evening in London and in the evenings in Amsterdam? In Germany store hours are extended to 6.30 in the evenings; in Athens, in summer, stores are open until 8 p.m. and until 7 p.m. in winter.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Are these certain types of store?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, they are downtown retail stores.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: What about Moscow?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am coming to that. In Rome, stores are open until 7.30 p.m. in winter and to 8 p.m. in summer. In Lisbon (Portugal) stores are open on week days until 7 p.m.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What about Paris?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In San Francisco I can shop of an evening, and have done so, and in other parts of the United States the story is the same. In Philadelphia shops are open until 9 p.m.; in the State of Alabama stores remain open until 9 p.m. in the capital cities; in cities in Florida stores are open until 9 p.m., and stores in the shopping fringes of Florida cities are open every evening. In Washington stores are open until 9 p.m. on Thursday, and in Atlanta, Georgia, they are open until 9 p.m. Monday to Friday.

In Louisville (Kentucky) stores are open until 9 p.m. every evening, and in Baltimore they are open until 9 p.m. For the Hon. Mr. Kemp's benefit I tell him that the large departmental stores in Russia open at 8 a.m. and close at 9 p.m., but on Monday they open from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. Smaller stores have different hours, some closing at 7 p.m. These examples indicate what happens in other capital cities of the world.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Do they close during the day on any week day?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They vary somewhat, but I am speaking about the specific point of evening shopping during the week. I am seeking to preserve the privileges that the Labor Government is taking away from people at Reynella, Morphett Vale, Elizabeth, and Tea Tree Gully. With this legislation, is any member willing to say that he can foresee the day when shopping hours, comparable with other progressive cities in the world, will be introduced in Adelaide? Of course he cannot.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why didn't your Government introduce these privileges into the metropolitan area?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Our Government was wrestling with the problem.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I'll say it was!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have nothing to hide. The difference between the two Governments is that we were able to take our time, because we did not have to obey any sectional interests. The Labor Government, once the whips came out from the Trades Hall, did not have any longer to consider the matter, and members opposite know that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Come on, be fair.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have duck-shoved it for about three years.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think I have allowed a reasonable amount of latitude to honourable members during this debate, but it has developed into a condition of disorder, wilful interruption, and considerable noise whilst the honourable member has been speaking. If members study and observe Standing Order 181 they may be able to improve the decorum in this Chamber. The Hon. Mr. Hill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government's position in regard to this question is what I call calamitous. Indeed, the historical Klemzig meeting referred to earlier in the debate was something that will never be forgotten by the people of this State. It highlighted the stark differences that exist between the two political Parties, for it was an example of the Labor Ministry's yielding to outside pressures from the trade union movement, and as a result of that this legislation has now been introduced.

We have to consider this question seriously, because it is involved in the debate: the Government has yielded to pressure and has introduced a measure for which it has no heart, but this Council has the opportunity to put that calamitous position right. However, when one debates the question in one's mind it is difficult to overlook the whole question of the referendum.

The referendum was a fiasco: that was admitted by everyone to whom I spoke at that time and who said that it was a matter that an intelligent person could not interpret. Although, in a sense, it was a referendum, I call it an aggregated local option poll and not a referendum of the people of the whole State.

It was a vote of people from a region of the State. However, it was a vote and the overall result of it, based on the majority verdict, was that it favoured the "Noes". This meant that those people who had overwhelmingly voted to retain their privileges were to be overruled if the majority vote was accepted. From my independent point of view I have

considered seriously the matter, and have reluctantly decided that, because of the result of the referendum, I am willing to support the second reading.

I do not intend to obstruct legislation in this Chamber at any time and, although the management and arrangement of the referendum must receive the most severe criticism, in the final decision I think the majority vote must be considered extremely seriously. I believe that two particular groups of people, to whom I have referred, should be fully considered and given absolute assistance by this Council. They are, first, the small trader who will be at a financial loss when he closes his doors on January 1, 1971 (if this measure passes as it is) and, secondly, the working man or woman who is committed to spend the overtime money that he or she has been earning until the particular hire-purchase agreement involved has been paid off.

I believe that, in assessing a reasonable period in which help should be given to these people, the legislation should not come into effect for another two years. If that occurred I think those two groups of people would be given the assistance they deserve. I do not foreshadow any amendments at this time, but I will listen with interest to what other members have to say.

I hope that there will be further consideration and debate, and a change in this legislation before it passes, in order to give some period, at least, so that shops may remain open and in which the two groups of people to whom I have referred can be assisted. I support the second reading.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): In considering this Bill I asked myself, first, what influence it would have on a family group that lives in a certain locality. Obviously, there must be work for the breadwinner and, equally obviously, that work must be reasonably appropriate. Shopping hours must be as convenient as possible, and transport is the key link between home and work and between home and shopping facilities. The areas that this Bill particularly affects (Elizabeth, Salisbury, Christies Beach and Morphett Vale) have a very high proportion of residents who have come from other countries. They have come to this State and settled in those areas because, when they lived in other countries, friends wrote to them from South Australia and told them that there was opportunity here for work, opportunity to acquire houses and opportunity to make extra money through the wife being able to work in shops that had extended hours.

There is an opportunity for both mother and father to work. As a result, between them they can earn enough to buy a house with the extra money that mother earns. Also, they can buy refrigerators and other household articles.

When this Bill is passed many such people will find themselves in what has been called Queer Street. Certainly, the community as a whole will lose one of the inducements that have led people to come from other countries to South Australia to live on the fringe of the metropolitan area. As a result of this Bill, the whole family economy will be thrown out of gear. The Government held a referendum on the basis of a straight "Yes" or "No" vote, but only one clear picture emerged: in areas that already have Friday night shopping the residents want to continue that system. Many people voted informally and many did not vote at all. Surely this demonstrates that a single question in such a referendum was not adequate and that it did not allow for a clear interpretation of the people's views. There were really several possibilities. The referendum has solved nothing: it has only underscored what happens when a measure is introduced by the Government without giving full credence to the local situation.

The Government has more than a working majority, yet it called for a referendum to discover the will of the people. That will has been expressed by a narrow overall majority for "No". Now, this Bill seeks to give effect to that referendum. I wonder what will be the effect if the Bill is passed. What will happen to all the people who did not record a vote? Will they be dealt with according to the law? Powerful voices in our community have recently urged the breaking of laws when they are considered unacceptable. Will the Government allow those who disapprove the legislation to exercise the right of their conscience and to protect their established trading hours? Personally, I do not favour breaking the law, but this Bill is related typically to Socialist dogma—what is good for one must be good for all. Therefore, irrespective of the fact that tradition has built up an accepted system, all people in the larger metropolitan area will be bound together.

The Government has said that the legislation will take effect on January 1, 1971, but the Hon. Mr. Hill has said eloquently why that should not be the date for the implementation of this measure. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris suggested that there should be a period of grace to ease the plight of those most

seriously affected. A recent article in the press dealt with the problem facing honest folk in their home life south of Adelaide. One lady was quoted as saying, "If they take Friday night shopping away from us we'll be just pack horses." Another young Morphett Vale lady with three young children said she was beginning to doubt whether it had been a wise thing to move from a farm in the Murray valley into town. She was reported as saying:

I thought it would be cheaper to live in the town and lovely to be near shops but my husband has to take the car to work and it's not much fun walking along the road in the heat or dragging a pusher, the children and the parcels on and off the buses.

Another young mother was reported as saying:

It will be very hard on people. The Government should have left the shopping hours as they were.

These people cannot continue to shop during the hours that they have been used to. The Leader of the Opposition has referred to new section 227; I shall not say much about it, except that it appears to me that it makes the Minister judge, jury and executioner in a pole-axe type of measure. In the referendum a majority voted against extended shopping hours, but people in the areas where it means loss of existing trade practices must feel bitter about the measure. For the reason enunciated by the Hon. Mr. Hill, I shall vote for the second reading and follow what happens during the Committee stage with care and interest.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): Some of the things I planned to say have been said at length by other honourable members. In contrast to some of the honourable gentlemen who have already spoken, I am not able to support this Bill as it stands. I say this after considerable thought, because I do not work on instructions—I work on my own judgment. I have come to this decision after taking due notice of the fact that the referendum was carried by about 18,000 votes. As the Hon. Mr. Springett said, many people voted informally and many did not vote at all. If the Electoral Office successfully takes action against all the people who did not vote, it may even be able to pay for itself, but prosecuting all those people would be a mammoth task.

I believe in freedom as far as possible, and I do not believe in unnecessary restriction. I am convinced that, in some parts of the metropolitan area at least, some of these suggested restrictions are both unnecessary and unwise. They take away from the people freedoms and advantages that they now enjoy. Both the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr.

Hill have said that there are many young people in the outer suburbs of the expanding city of Adelaide. They are not only customers, but in many cases, as other members have said, they are workers, and they are basing their hire-purchase payments upon this weekly extra \$6 or \$10 or \$12 that in many cases the wife is earning between, say, 5 o'clock and 9 o'clock on Friday night in a shop or in some other part-time work which has very largely come about because of the extra shopping in these particular areas.

I have come to the decision to oppose the Bill after looking, first of all, at the result of the referendum as a whole. As I have said, the "No" vote was carried by a very small majority and there was this large number of informal votes and this large number of non-voters. I have also taken into account the fact that the Government has a mandate for its position at least as far as butchers are concerned. I doubt whether it had a mandate for a referendum. In deciding to oppose the Bill, I have not done so lightly, because I have regard for the fact that the "No" vote was carried and the fact that the Government is in office with a workable majority. Therefore, I have looked at the position not only as far as the overall situation is concerned but also as far as the Midland District is concerned.

I want to draw the attention of honourable members to the results of the referendum in certain areas, and at the risk of wearying them briefly (I will not take as long as some other honourable members have taken) I will quote figures that were published on September 21; they may not be the final figures, but they are very close to it. The figures are these: in the Tea Tree Gully District, 9,582 people voted for shopping to continue, while 3,814 voted "No"; in Salisbury, the figure was 7,492 for "Yes" and 3,023 for "No"; in the Elizabeth area, the vote was 8,932 to 2,304; in the Playford District, the vote was 9,352 to 2,794; and in the relevant portion of the Light District (mostly the town of Gawler, which was included in this referendum), 2,527 wanted Friday night shopping to continue and 1,134 were against it. In those five areas, the overall figures were 37,885 for "Yes" and 13,069 for "No".

Therefore, there was an overwhelming majority vote for continued Friday night shopping in the Midland District: over 74 per cent voted "Yes" in that particular area. I wish to support the wish

of the people of the District of Midland who were asked to vote in this referendum. I would support amendments which may be put on file by my colleagues to this end, and I may place an amendment on file myself. Clause 46 of the Bill enacts the new part XV with regard to new shop trading hours, and proposed new section 221 (1) states:

Subject to this section, the closing time for a shop shall be 5.30 p.m. on each week day and 12.30 p.m. on a Saturday.

It goes on to make provision for hairdressers' shops and for a variation of the hours for those shops. It then provides that this section shall not apply in respect of a public holiday. If I were to seek the position which can obtain at present of shopping for 24 hours a day on seven days of the week I would move to insert a subsection (5) to the effect that this section shall not apply in respect of the districts of Elizabeth, Salisbury, Gawler, Munno Para and Tea Tree Gully. However, I do not believe that the public needs the facility of seven days a week and 24 hours a day shopping, although I do believe that people need the situation of at least one night a week in which they can shop.

I am confining my remarks this afternoon entirely to the latter portion of this Bill. I think it was the Hon. Mr. DeGaris who said that the earlier part of the Bill from clauses 1 to 45 dealt with amendments to the Industrial Code as it now exists, and I am leaving that portion of it to honourable members who are far more conversant with that Code than I am.

I am particularly interested in this question of shopping hours, and I want to refer briefly to the rationalization or the staggering of shopping hours which the Hon. Mr. Hill dealt with in some considerable detail. I believe that this obtains in many places in Great Britain, as well as in the many other areas that the Hon. Mr. Hill mentioned. I believe it could well be the case in South Australia that shops could close on one morning a week or one day a week and evening shopping could be allowed on one or two nights in the areas where it is needed.

I believe that Friday night shopping is needed in these outer areas. I do not wish to go into great detail about it. I have already mentioned the people who are getting a little extra money by working in shops on Friday night and the large number of people who find it difficult to shop at other times during the

week. This has been underlined by members who have spoken before me, and I do not wish to deal with that subject at any greater length.

I do point out that this Bill ignores the needs of the consumer in these areas, and I do not believe that it is a good thing to ignore the needs (I emphasize the word "needs") of the consumer. People in the fringe areas do not have ready access to the Central Market in the city of Adelaide. Although I am not an authority on the Central Market, I know that some parts of it at least are open at night. I have heard it said (I do not know how correct this is) that those portions of the Central Market that are open at night would correspond to a series of delicatessens being open in one particular area and, if that is so, I would say that possibly the people in the fringe areas of Tea Tree Gully, Salisbury and Elizabeth would not necessarily be any better off if they had a similar central market in those areas.

I know (and I am sure all other honourable members know) that delicatessens can be quite expensive places in which to shop. I have nothing against delicatessens as such, but I know that one can pay 20 per cent or 30 per cent more for goods there than one would pay in the larger shops, and this would mean an increase in costs to those people. If this Bill is passed in its present form, it will mean an increase in costs to the consumer in some areas.

Therefore, if the second reading is passed I will support amendments to postpone the operation of the legislation for some time. Various times have been mentioned, and I shall be interested to hear the comments of other honourable members before I make up my mind on this subject. I am sure that it is necessary to give people a chance to adjust themselves and a time in which to adjust themselves if this legislation is to become law.

I do not wish to say very much more on the matter now. The Bill is one on which many things could be said in Committee if necessary. However, I wish to comment briefly on the matter raised by the Leader, namely, new section 227 of new Part XV which provides for the constitution or abolition of shopping districts and which has regard to what a local council may or may not do to set up or to abolish shopping districts. New subsection (4) concerns me. It states:

The council must attempt to ascertain the views of shopkeepers, shop assistants and other interested persons upon the subject of the application and the application must be accompanied by a statement of those views.

I ask the Minister in charge of the Bill to explain what the Government means by "must attempt". Surely if this legislation is to be carried out, instead of "must attempt", the legislation should state, in effect, that the council must ascertain the views. New subsection (5) states:

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

To me, this means that the council will be responsible for the cost of conducting the poll and for the preparation of the rolls. I think it was the Leader who said that these council boundaries need not conform, and certainly do not conform now in many instances, to electoral boundaries, and it would be very difficult for a council to prepare the rolls for this purpose. I object to the fact that a council, with the limited revenue that should be spent in the interests of ratepayers in its area, should have to conduct a poll at the direction of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Local government is under the overall control of the Minister of Local Government, and I find it rather anomalous that, in this instance, the Minister of Labour and Industry will be directing councils on what they must do. I am opposed to that section of the Bill. Much has been said about this measure and, no doubt, more will be said in Committee. I am opposed to the taking away of legitimate privileges which people already have and which they have shown in no uncertain manner that they wish to retain. Therefore, I oppose the second reading.

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

PINNAROO RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 2246.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. I also support some of the views that have been put forward by the Hon. Mr. Hill in regard to these reserves and to the control of them when the Minister of Lands takes them over. It has been pointed out that this Act was originally passed in 1903 and that there have been problems concerning the control of the various areas that have been reserved as a result of the building of the railway line from Tailm Bend to Pinnaroo. The second reading explanation states:

As Crown lands, the control of these areas would be vested in the Minister of Lands. The areas could then be dealt with in various ways. They could, for example, be dedicated as:

1. National Parks under the control of the National Parks Commission;
2. Reserves under the control of a district council;
3. Reserves under the control of the Minister.

I hope that the Minister will seriously consider the second alternative, namely, that the reserves should be under the control of the district council involved.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I thank honourable members for the way in which they have handled the Bill. The points made by the Leader were also made by the Hon. Mr. Kemp. The Hon. Mr. Kemp thought that any action contemplated by the Bill should be delayed for some time before being carried out. I point out that the preparation of the Bill has been delayed a long time while this matter has been sorted out. Much time has been spent by departmental officers in the area examining the situation and letters have been sent backward and forward between the councils and the department.

As against this, the Hon. Mr. Hill complained that the Lands Department has a tendency to delay matters too much. Here there is one honourable member saying that the Bill should be delayed, whereas another honourable member is saying that the Lands Department delays matters too much. I do not agree with what the Hon. Mr. Hill has said. The action proposed to be carried out by the Bill has been supported strongly by those concerned because of the indecision regarding who should control these areas over the years since the Act has been in existence. I think that most honourable members agree to the general principle outlined in the Bill; it is in respect of only one point that they disagree. They all agreed to the proposed actions regarding the matter of the breakwind reserves. However, the Hon. Mr. Hill was concerned that local government authorities in the area would not receive proper consideration regarding eventual control of these areas.

I have just as high a regard for local government in this State as the Hon. Mr. Hill has and for those people in local government who give voluntarily of their time for the genuine advancement of the community generally. Every consideration will be given to the wishes of local government authorities in this area when action regarding the breakwind reserves is taken.

I now come to what I consider to be an unwarranted attack on a most efficient department by the Hon. Mr. Hill yesterday. According to my observations, the Lands Department is held in high esteem both inside and outside Parliament. In my opinion, the heads of the Lands Department who, under the Minister, have the administration of the department, could not be bettered in any State of the Commonwealth. I say that advisedly. This was evident when the Commonwealth Lands Administration Conference was held in Adelaide earlier this year. These officers have been held in high regard, which has been expressed on more than one occasion by previous Ministers of Lands.

Under the administration of these officers and those officers under their control, I consider the Lands Department a most efficient department. The Minister and the department are required to administer the laws made by this Parliament. The conscientious application of those laws naturally takes some time to carry out. If the honourable member seeks some short cut to these procedures either for his own or for somebody else's purposes or if he desires some change in the ownership of land, it is up to him to seek to change those laws in that respect and not attack a department without making charges in regard to any specific matter suggesting that a Royal Commission should investigate matters controlled by the Lands Department. That is all I have to say in reply to this debate.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.13 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, November 5, at 2.15 p.m.