

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 22, 1972

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

PETITION: TRADING HOURS

The Hon. L. R. HART presented a petition signed by 13,041 persons alleging that there was no real demand for any extension of trading hours by introducing Friday night shopping in the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide and praying that the Legislative Council would not allow any extension to be made to the present trading hours.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

TREE PULL SCHEME

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: There is still considerable confusion in some people's minds regarding the policy to be implemented in relation to the proposed tree pull scheme. Although the Minister has answered questions in this Council about the scheme, misunderstandings nevertheless still prevail. As this is a policy agreed in co-operation with the Commonwealth, will the Minister give a considered statement (not today, but at some later time) regarding the whole impact of the scheme and what it entails so that *Hansard* may contain a clear statement of the policy to be followed by the Government?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be pleased to satisfy the honourable member by supplying a prepared statement. Circulars have gone out to all districts where horticulture is practised, and application forms are available from horticultural advisers in those districts. They are also freely available from the Lands Department. This has been put in train already, and people have been asked to fill in the application forms and send them to the department. Apparently there are other matters the Leader would like cleared up, so I will obtain a prepared statement along the lines suggested.

STOCK BRANDS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In June last, representatives of the Stockowners Association from Eyre Peninsula presented to the Director of Agriculture a resolution dealing with the revision of registered brands for stock in South Australia. The resolution suggested that all cattle brands and earmarks in South Australia be reviewed every 10 years and that owners be required to register them on lines similar to those which apply in Queensland, where registered cattle brands are cancelled every 10 years and the owners must apply to have the brands reallocated. In South Australia the position is quite chaotic. Brands are held by defunct estates and in some cases in the names of people long since deceased. Apparently a large sum of money is required to upgrade the registration of our brands. Will the Minister say whether consideration has been given to this by the department; secondly, what moneys have been set aside for this purpose?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will get the information for the honourable member as soon as possible. When I visited the department some time ago I was told by the Director that the brands section needed a great deal of work to bring it up to the standard required. I asked him to look closely at the matter to see what could be done. I will get this information and let the honourable member have it.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: All honourable members are aware of the commendable interest the Chief Secretary is taking in the provision of the new premises being erected at Netley for the Government Printer. There is no doubt we are all very anxious to see this facility provided. Can the Chief Secretary state a more precise date of completion or say what progress has been made in the construction of this building?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Despite the fact that there has been some slight problem with the new Government Printing Office, my impression is that it is on schedule. I am unable to state the exact finishing date but shall be happy to make some inquiries and let the honourable member have a further report as soon as practicable.

ORANGE JUICE

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Education whether the Government will consider the benefit of making available to children orange juice at a subsidized rate in school tuck shops? Orange juice is available now but not at a subsidized rate. Such a scheme would have several advantages. First, it would make a useful drink cheaper and, therefore, of benefit to parents. Secondly, it would provide a competitive alternative to some popular soft drinks, which are of no great value; and, thirdly, it would help the citrus industry.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply when it is available.

MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether, following the establishment of a branch of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles Department in Whyalla, the Government has any plans for establishing similar branches elsewhere in country areas of the State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

LINEAR ACCELERATOR

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: A few days ago the Chief Secretary referred to a new 13 500 000 V linear accelerator at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for treating patients for cancer that would be functioning by October of this year, the whole scheme to cost \$200,000. Can the Chief Secretary say what will happen to the old machine that is being replaced, which was provided some years ago by the Anti-Cancer Foundation coupled with a Government grant? Is it to be renewed and reserviced? If it is, where and when will it be used?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I cannot at the moment give the information but I will have inquiries made and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

EYRE HIGHWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL (on notice):

1. What is the Government's estimate of the costs to complete construction and sealing of the Eyre Highway between Ceduna and Eucla?

2. What is the Government's estimate of the proportion of South Australian registered

vehicles which use this highway and cross the border, compared with the total road usage, and upon what information is such estimate based?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1 and 2. The estimated cost of the remaining work to complete the construction and sealing of the Eyre Highway between Ceduna and the Western Australian border is \$7,500,000. The proportion of vehicles using the Eyre Highway and crossing the Western Australian border which are registered in South Australia is presently about 13 per cent. This figure has been dropping in recent years as the proportion of vehicles registered outside South Australia has increased from 78 per cent in 1965 to 87 per cent at present. These figures are estimated from information obtained from a check of vehicles passing the fruit fly inspection station at Ceduna.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 862.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In some measure this Bill exemplifies the continuing expansion going on in Australia, particularly South Australia. The Chief Secretary's second reading explanation illustrates the expansion in Loan works that is being carried out in this State. At the meeting of the Loan Council held last June the Commonwealth Government agreed to support a total programme of \$982,000,000 for State works and services, including housing—an increase of 10 per cent over the programme agreed to last year. South Australia's share is nearly \$135,000,000, compared with \$122,000,000 last year. The Chief Secretary's second reading explanation says that, in addition to the new funds amounting to \$134,628,000, the Government expects to receive additional repayments and recoveries of about \$24,600,000. So, this year the total amount expected to be available is about \$160,000,000—certainly a considerable increase. I believe there has not been sufficient publicity given to what I consider to be the more generous and realistic treatment of the State's needs by the Commonwealth Government over the last couple of years. The fact that almost 25 per cent of the capital funds available to the State will be by way of direct grant, without the problem of repayment, is an important aspect of the Commonwealth's attitude to the needs of the

States. I believe that due credit should be given to the Commonwealth Government for that attitude. I should like to stress the appreciation that some of us, at least, have of the Commonwealth Government's action in this regard, which action makes possible a desirable expansion in Loan works in this State and other States.

Some of the matters dealt with in the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation affect the Midland District, while others, which affect the State as a whole, have brought adverse criticism from outside South Australia and are now to be rectified. It is pleasing to see that the sealing of the Eyre Highway is to be completed. Although I have not travelled over the whole of the unsealed portion of that highway, I have travelled over a considerable distance of it, and I therefore realize the necessity for the sealing to be completed. I also realize the great cost involved and that, of the vehicles which use the highway, only 16 per cent are South Australian. The State and Commonwealth Governments are to be commended for providing the money from various sources to complete the sealing of the highway in a reasonable time. However, I wonder about the so-called loan from the Electricity Trust; certainly, the loan will have to be repaid and, no doubt, it will be repaid. However, I question whether that is the best way of providing the money. I am pleased to see that the Commonwealth Government will provide \$2,500,000 over the next four years (or up to one-quarter of that sum in any one year), being one-third of the total estimated cost of about \$7,500,000. As I have some knowledge of that highway and am therefore aware of its dangerous nature, I am pleased to see that the work on sealing it will be completed and that, in the future, it will be a safe road on which to travel.

I notice that about \$5,500,000 is provided for harbours accommodation; this is a matter which, although it does not come within my district, for the most part affects the whole of the State, and certainly some of my constituents. I refer, in particular, to the \$1,300,000 provided so that work can continue on the navigation channel between the inner and outer harbours at Port Adelaide; this is a very necessary provision, because people from all over the central part of the State, at least, go to the Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited terminal at Port Adelaide. It is essential that sufficient depth of water be provided there and that the river be widened from the terminal out to Outer Harbour. I

believe that the continuing work there should be noted with appreciation. I am glad that the work is continuing, as it is important that it be continued and completed.

An amount of \$800,000 is provided for the passenger terminal at Outer Harbour. Honourable members had the opportunity some months ago of inspecting the new terminal building in the course of construction, and recently, when we were able to go on the m.v. *Troubridge* and see the work from some little distance away, it was not possible to see much progress. However, I was told by the Chief Secretary, in reply to a question earlier this session, that the work was proceeding according to schedule. I am fully in accord with this project. I returned to this Chamber eight or nine years ago after seeing the new terminal, as it then was, at Fremantle and noticing the stark contrast between that terminal and the so-called facilities at Outer Harbour.

At that time, when the Playford Government was still in office, I suggested that we should do something about our terminal. I am glad that the new terminal is nearing completion, because I do not believe that we could continue to have a port with facilities as primitive as those at Outer Harbour for people entering the country for the first time. As it is a poor front-door approach, the provision of a new terminal is most necessary, as also is the proposed expenditure for work on the roll-on-roll-off berth at Port Adelaide designed for interstate steel traffic. This, too, is necessary and is to be commended.

Nothing of any consequence is being done in Midland District under the provision of \$8,359,000 for country waterworks. This does not mean that all the facilities in that district are up to date and do not need renewal, because all honourable members can find places in their districts in which renewals are needed. However, some worthwhile projects in the adjacent districts of Southern and Northern are contemplated in this respect. I am pleased to see that provision is made for the continuation of the Kimba main and the completion of the Tailem Bend to Keith main.

I refer also to the continuing work which is being done and which is still to be done in sewerage work in the Gawler area, in which \$300,000 is to be spent. As honourable members know, the former member for Gawler in another place, who is now the member for Elizabeth and who does not subscribe to the same political philosophies

as I do, worked for many years to obtain sewerage for Gawler. After I entered this Council, I did my best to assist in the common endeavour, and I am pleased to see that this matter is now coming to fruition.

I notice with much pleasure that the allocation for hospital buildings has been increased by more than \$2,000,000. I refer also to the allocations to improve facilities at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, which is an exceedingly valuable institution in this State; the new wing at the institute is badly needed. I note also that more than \$3,500,000 is provided to commence the construction of stages IA and IB at the Flinders Medical Centre. This is most necessary, as indeed is the provision for the Glenside Hospital.

I am sure that all honourable members are pleased to be associated with the enlightened approach to the Glenside Hospital and other hospitals in the State today, even in relation to its name. All honourable members can remember the name by which Glenside Hospital was formerly known. That it is now known as Glenside Hospital is an indication of the enlightened and more helpful approach that is now being made in these matters. I am pleased to see the allocation that has been provided for work at that hospital and the Modbury Hospital.

There is another matter for which all honourable members should be thankful that money is being provided. I refer to the provision of further new school buildings, for which over \$23,000,000 (an increase of about \$4,000,000 on last year's allocation) is to be spent. If I may become a little parochial, I am pleased to see that works in progress in my own district include very necessary work at the Balaklava and Tanunda Primary Schools, in both of which there is much need for improvement.

I am also interested to see the provision for work to be commenced during 1972-73 at the Paskeville Primary School. Having had the pleasure of visiting that school some time ago with the Hon. Mr. Hart, I know perfectly well that better facilities are needed in that area. Indeed, a new school of Samcon construction would be a great improvement. I refer also to the major additions to be provided at the Gawler and Nuriootpa High Schools. Eight or nine years ago the new Gawler High School was built. Although it was then considered that it would be adequate for some time, as is the case in so many other areas, the explosion in the number of students has resulted in the construction of some pre-

fabricated classrooms. A better, more solid construction is necessary, and provision is made in the Bill for this to happen.

The situation at Nuriootpa is somewhat different, in that, although they have excellent grounds and are in an excellent situation, until recently the only solid construction building at that school (which is equally as large as that at Gawler) was the original building. In recent times, some new buildings have been placed there, and \$205,000 is provided in this Bill for further additions. The people of the Barossa Valley have been seeking a new high school for many years; it appears that they are to receive their new high school in stages and that they will, therefore, finally have a fine school in the present excellent situation.

I am pleased to see this increased allocation for the provision of school buildings, which all honourable members realize are so necessary. I have wondered on occasions whether we would do better to build more but less luxurious schools. I hesitate to use the word "luxurious", but sometimes when one examines a new school one thinks that with that amount of money two schools could have been built. However, these schools are constructed to last 40 or 50 years. In other places schools have been built for less money, in relation to which people have said within 10 years, "Why did they not spend a bit more money and do the job properly?" There must therefore be a balance between what is necessary and what will be sufficiently permanent to be worth while.

I refer also to the small allocation of \$40,000 to finalize the first stage of the scheme for major extensions at the Roseworthy Agricultural College. The work comprises a new dormitory block for 70 students, with the other necessary kitchen and dining-room facilities. I mention this aspect, the college having undergone considerable improvements recently. Even the approaches to the main buildings have been finally sealed, about which I am pleased and on which I commend the Minister of Agriculture, having asked him for it for long enough.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Have you tried another Minister?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Various other Ministers have done their best to look after that institution while they have been in office. I know the previous Minister did his best for the college. Recently I inspected the new facilities and the new dormitory block being provided, for which this relatively small sum of money is provided to complete. It is an

excellent building, something the students would be proud to work in and in which it is to be hoped they will work sufficiently well to be successful.

The Minister has said that he will be able to provide more information about the Government Printing Department. The sum of \$2,500,000 is to be provided for work on the new premises, and we hope it will not be very long before that new facility is available for the convenience of Parliament. In the Address in Reply debate I commented on the excellent work being done by the Housing Trust and the Electricity Trust. Provision is made in this Bill for that work to continue. The work of these two semi-government bodies has been excellent and of great assistance to the development of South Australia.

The sum of \$880,000 is provided for the completion of the festival theatre. I have kept off this subject lately, because I said some time ago in this Chamber that we needed a festival hall but we did not need a festival theatre. To some extent I still subscribe to that view, because I have yet to be convinced (although I have an open mind) that we can get a theatre which will be equally efficient as a concert hall, or vice versa. This morning I spoke to Mr. Anthony Steel, the General Manager of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. He told me that the new building being erected just to the north of Parliament House would be capable of being converted, in only 20 minutes, from a theatre, with stage, dressing rooms, and the necessary theatre facilities, to a concert hall. All the work necessary for conversion from stage to concert platform can be done by two men in that time. If that is so, we may yet have a building equally suitable for a theatre and a concert hall, two things quite different in themselves. However, it will be unfortunate if the theatre people and the concert people want to use the building at the same time, as may well occur, but that is something to be worked out, I imagine, by such people as Mr. Anthony Steel. It appears we will have this new building in use before very long.

The Bill provides for \$6,000,000 for non-government hospitals and institution buildings, more than \$1,000,000 in excess of the sum provided last year. It is commendable that the Government is meeting the full cost of the extensions to provide increased bed accommodation and for upgrading the facilities at the hospital which has the honour to bear your name, Mr. President, in the city of

Elizabeth. I know that it is a well-conducted hospital and an asset to the entire area of Elizabeth, Salisbury and adjacent suburbs. I believe the intended expenditure there is needed. Whether it is wise that the Government should provide the full cost may be debatable, but nevertheless the hospital has done excellent work and the extensions are necessary.

I turn now to the expansion programme to take place at the Home for Incurables. I am pleased that \$1,400,000 is provided out of a total sum estimated to be eventually \$11,000,000. This hospital does excellent work for people who are incurably ill. Similar institutions in other States bear what I consider to be better names than "Home for Incurables". I consider that the powers that be, perhaps the authorities at the institution itself, could well consider having a better name than the present one. I quote the example of the place I mentioned a few minutes ago, the Glenside Hospital, which we all knew at one stage as the Parkside Lunatic Asylum. Everyone knows it is now a hospital for the treatment of the mentally sick. The place known now as the Home for Incurables could well have a better name and we still would know that it was a place for the care and the treatment of people who are unfortunately incurable. I commend the Government on the provision of \$1,400,000 for the continuation of the second stage of this project.

The sum of \$450,000 is to be provided for the school buses of the Education Department, \$58,000 more than that provided last year. Some of this would be due to increased costs, and some of it probably because, unfortunately, more schools are being closed. This is unfortunate in some respects, because in many cases the relatively small schools in the country have been a centre of identity for the district, and many are now being closed. However, perhaps it will provide better education for young people. I noticed with some sorrow only a few days ago that the Gawler River School was to be closed. It would have celebrated its centenary next year. It is a small one-teacher school but was recently a two-teacher school, and it is not long since the Education Department was seeking six acres halfway between Gawler and Two Wells on which to provide a much larger school. This is one example of the policy of closing schools which, in some respects and in some areas, is wise, but I hope it is not carried to extremes. I understand that increased allocations are provided for the two reasons I have mentioned: first,

the increase in costs; secondly, the fact that more buses are running because of schools being closed. I commend the Commonwealth Government on its increased allocations not merely to South Australia but to the States as a whole. I am glad to see that, in the matter of Loan works, the State is making some general expansion, which is desirable. I support the Bill.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I should like to commence by saying more or less the same as the previous speaker said in congratulating the Commonwealth Government on the additions made available to previously approved Government grants. By this increase the State has been enabled to expand the rate of activity in many works and services to an extent that otherwise would not have been possible. A good many years ago, I remember being told that, when a country and its services were developing, the basic principles on which it developed were engineering science and medical science. Engineering science is required first to open up the country, and medical science is required to make people fit to open up the country. Part of engineering science, as it expands, takes in all forms of communication—roads, railways, bridges, drains, rivers, harbours, shipping, and so on. All these factors have been taken care of and have been catered for in the Loan Estimates.

The population of an area must grow if the area is to thrive and not sink into oblivion, and one thing about Australia (and South Australia in particular) is that it is growing and will continue to grow. That is why loans to enable us to push on with all these various projects are so vital. Obviously, honourable members have different interests in special sections. What I look at first are the medical and social facilities. I am glad to see that \$558,000 is to be provided for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. Not so many years ago, the pathological, biochemical and similar facilities in a hospital occupied a very small space. Today, all over the world, doctors, even those working privately in general practice, use pathology and similar sciences to a degree that their forebears could not have dreamed of. It is obvious that, as hospital services grow, so must the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science grow, too. I am glad to see that item in the Loan Estimates.

I turn now to the Flinders Medical Centre, which is a most exciting concept. It appeals to me enormously not only as a doctor but also as a member representing this Council

and Parliament on the Flinders University Council. This centre will serve a large population, but, what is more important, it will not only be a central treatment area for many people in the southern part of Adelaide but will also exert its influence far and wide because it will create more and more doctors, nurses and ancillary people who will receive their training there in the years to come. A tribute should be paid to those who have got on with the work and laid down the guide lines for this development.

It is interesting to note that, by 1974, 64 people (so I understand) will be in training there for medicine and that the numbers will increase gradually year by year as opportunity arises. At present, South Australia is graduating, through the Adelaide University Medical Centre, between 100 and 105 doctors a year. Three or four years ago the number was just under 100, so we are about holding our own. We are not getting ahead very much, although our population is growing steadily. Now that Flinders University is taking up some of the slack, after 1974 an extra 64 people will be entered for training, but we must remember that we shall have no extra persons in practice until 1980. Students taken in in 1974 will be qualifying in 1980, and then they will have a year in which to do their preliminary ward work before they go out into the community to help fill some of the gaps that are occurring in the medical profession through old age, retirement, and lack of replacement. It is a good thing to keep the Flinders Medical Centre going like this, and it is good to see this item on the Loan Estimates.

Reference has been made this afternoon to the modern concept of mental health. Nothing can be more pleasing to any doctor than to see the way in which people are treated these days with a view to enabling them to return to full participation in community life after mental illness, just as other people return to a full life after physical illness. The stigma of mental illness is now passing but, until it has gone completely, none of us should ever be satisfied.

I turn now to one other department allied to the Hospitals Department—the Public Health Department. Here, there is to be a new chest clinic. Bearing in mind the references that are so often made today to the way in which tuberculosis is under control (and it does not occur with any frequency now), it may be somewhat surprising at first glance that a new chest clinic is required. It is obvious that, if we are to maintain our fine

record, with very few new cases of tuberculosis being notified, it is important that there should be a full and thorough screening and diagnostic service, and that is the purpose of the new chest clinic, coupled with the fact that the least said about the old premises in Ruthven Buildings the better. They were not a credit to anyone and were hardly conducive to encouraging people to seek advice, even though they considered that they needed it. It must be borne in mind, too, that this new chest clinic will not be only for diagnostic and screening services for tuberculosis for now—adays there is a tendency for associated and allied conditions of the chest to be looked at and studied at the same time. Many factors serving the community can be considered in these Loan Estimates, but I shall say nothing about them this afternoon, leaving them to be raised on future occasions.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 858.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): When I say that I support the second reading of this Bill, I do not want that to be taken as meaning that I support all of its provisions. The Bill arises from a matter that was before this Parliament earlier this year; it arises from the Government's apparent desire to see that Friday night shopping is granted to people living in the metropolitan area. Of course, this Bill does not merely do that: it provides for the industrial conditions that will follow the granting of extended shopping hours. In some respects the Bill is similar to the Bill that was considered by this Council earlier this year. In the interim the matter has been reconsidered by the Government and put through a new process in the laboratory, and I am not so sure that it is not rather like a Frankenstein monster as it has now emerged from that refurbishing process. This Bill means that there will be extra costs for the shopping public of South Australia. Perhaps people will be willing to pay that penalty, but I doubt very much whether it should be the Government's function to introduce a Bill that will greatly increase the cost of goods to the ordinary housewife.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What do you mean by "greatly"? By what percentage?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Whichever way we look at it, there will be an increase in costs of 4 per cent or 5 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How would you break that up?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I will tell the honourable member more about that later. The basic provision of the Bill, new section 221b, provides:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act other than this Part, or in any award or industrial agreement under, or having effect under, this Act that relates to or affects the ordinary hours of work of shop assistants, on and from the commencement of the Industrial Code Amendment Act, 1972, the time for the cessation of the ordinary hours of work of shop assistants employed in shops situated within the metropolitan area other than exempted shops—

(a) in the case of such shop assistants other than hairdressers shall be 5.30 p.m. on every week day, and for the purpose of any such award or industrial agreement the hours of work worked by such shop assistants after that time on any week day and the hours of work worked by such shop assistants on a Saturday shall not be regarded as ordinary hours of work; and

(b) in the case of such shop assistants being hairdressers shall be 6 p.m. on every week day, and for the purposes of such award or industrial agreement the hours of work worked by such shop assistants after that time on any week day and the hours of work worked by such shop assistants on a Saturday shall not be regarded as ordinary hours of work.

In effect, the basic philosophy in that provision is that the official closing time for shops should be 5.30 p.m. So, all hours worked after that time should be paid for at overtime rates. In other words, the payment made for three hours work, whether on a Friday night or a Saturday morning, will be equivalent to the payment for 4½ hours work at ordinary rates. Honourable members should contrast that with the existing position in connection with work done on Saturday mornings. That work is in ordinary hours, but it is stipulated that penalty rates of 25 per cent are to be paid for Saturday morning work and, in addition, 30c is paid for employees' fares. The casual rate is the same for Saturday morning work, except that there is no payment for fares. In other words, the basic effect of new section 221b is to close shops on Fridays at 5.30 p.m., and all work beyond that time is to be paid for at the higher rates. So, that alone, if it is implemented, must increase prices somewhat, unless the increased charges are absorbed by the employers.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Can they stand any absorption?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The employers have just announced an increase of up to 20 per cent in wage rates for shop assistants, to take effect on September 1. I have no quarrel with those wage increases; perhaps they are long overdue in an industry that has been a little depressed in respect of wage rates, in comparison with other industries. I congratulate the employers and employees on having come to that agreement.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think that it is a coincidence that it was announced at about the same time as this Bill was introduced?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: When those rates were negotiated there was no positive knowledge that the Government would introduce this Bill. It was obvious to everyone that the time was ripe for wage increases to be granted to shop assistants, and I think they well deserve them. In addition to the provisions in new section 221b, the Government is attempting to provide some alternatives, because it recognizes that the implementation of the basic philosophy of the Bill will cause some cost increases and will also be pretty well unworkable without some alternatives. So, an attempt is made in new sections 221c, 221d and 221e to give alternatives.

New section 221c, in effect, deals with the working of a roster system on the basis that the work done under that system shall be on five consecutive days between Monday and Saturday and shall not, in the aggregate, exceed 80 hours in any two consecutive weeks. It provides for penalty rates to be paid if the roster system is adopted. The system itself seems to me to require that every employer will have to apply to the Industrial Commission and satisfy it that it is necessary to have a ballot of the employees for the purpose. Through the ballot the employees will accept or reject the proposed new system; that, in itself, is a cumbersome process. If the roster system were introduced by the consent of the employees in any business, it would provide, under those terms and conditions, a 50 per cent penalty rate for work on Friday night and Saturday morning (considerably higher than the present Saturday morning penalty rates). In other words, this provision would impose increased costs on the industry. I again make the point that, once this penalty rate is fixed at 50 per cent for Friday evening, as provided for in the legislation, it will create an industrial precedent for people not covered by the Bill.

Thousands of people work in industries somewhat allied in their type of work to shop work (people employed in cafes, take-away food bars, and exempted shops of all kinds), and they do not receive anything like a 50 per cent penalty rate for work after 5.30 p.m. on Friday. They work all kinds of staggered hours, and the general penalty rate applicable to their work is about 10 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They're casuals.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Not necessarily.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They are, in the main.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No. They might be called casuals in some ways, but many of them are permanently employed in those jobs and for those hours.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What are their hours?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: They would not be required to work more than eight hours on any one day.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They may work a lot less.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, in some cases, but not necessarily. There are many exempted shops.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That's not a crime.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I didn't say anything about a crime.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I just wondered.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The point I make is that, once this is laid down in an Act of Parliament (and this was the stumbling block last time), other people will want to receive the same rate. Inevitably, if this provision is inserted in the legislation, approaches by other unions will be made to the Industrial Commission, which would be likely to say, "Parliament has awarded a 50 per cent penalty rate for Friday evenings for shop assistants. That is to be the norm, and that is what we will have to award, because it has been so decreed."

I made the point last time, and I make it again, that thousands of people work on Friday and other evenings, none of whom, as far as I am aware, receives much more than about a 15 per cent loading, which, incidentally, is the rate applicable to the metal trades. In his second reading explanation, the Chief Secretary said:

Shop assistants are one of the few groups of employees who still do not work their 40-hour week in five days . . .

I do not know whether that was a considered statement. If the Chief Secretary means to imply that shop assistants are one of the few groups of employees who do not work their 40-hour week Monday to Friday, his statement does not bear much research, because thousands of employees have to work at weekends in service industries of one kind or another.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They work a five-day week.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: How would we manage if police, Electricity Trust workers, Engineering and Water Supply Department workers, ambulance and bus drivers all wanted to finish work at 5.30 p.m. on Friday and none wanted to work weekends, except at overtime rates? What kind of industrial conditions would we be creating in the State and what kind of astronomical increase in the cost of living would result if that were the state of affairs?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What you're saying is that the flow-on from this legislation could be astronomical.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: What I am saying is that it is not correct to say that only a few groups of employees work their 40-hour week in five days, because thousands have to work at times when other people are at leisure.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Of course they do, but they're working only five days a week.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, they are working their 40 hours in five days.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But shop assistants are doing it in six days.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: But the way it was put implied that it was an anomaly that the poor old shop assistant was the only one who had to work on Saturday mornings.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is the way you're putting it. He's one of the few who work 40 hours in 5½ days.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Why don't you be straightforward?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Many people have to work five days, including weekends and nights.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We're not denying that, but they're working only five days.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: What the Bill does is lay down that the statutory knock-off time for shop assistants be 5.30 p.m. on Friday, but many people do not have that privilege. The Bill goes even further: it provides not only a statutory knock-off time (5.30 p.m. on Fridays) but also a statutory penalty rate of 50 per cent for time worked after that

knock-off time on Friday and Saturday. Many people do not have a statutory knock-off time, and no legislation provides a statutory penalty rate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Hear, hear!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yet, for the first time, this Bill attempts to legislate industrial conditions that could not help but have an enormous impact on other sections of industry and on our economy generally.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But it doesn't go outside of overtime rates.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: There is a difference between the penalty and overtime rates. The honourable member can see that plainly in this Bill, because under the first alternative of a roster scheme, working 80 hours in two consecutive weeks, it is provided that penalty rates shall be paid. In other words, to take the simple example of one working a 40-hour week and getting paid \$40, under the roster system (if it can ever be adopted in industry) one will, under new section 221c, receive under the penalty rate \$1.50 extra for working on Friday night and \$1.50 extra for the three hours worked on Saturday morning. Therefore, under that roster system, an employee would, assuming a normal wage of \$40 a week, receive \$43.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But they are getting a 25 per cent loading for Saturday morning work.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am comparing the two new sections—sections 221c and 221d. Under the former, a man receiving \$40 a week would be paid \$43 a week with the extension of trading hours to 9 p.m. Friday and with Saturday morning work. However, under new section 221d, where 40 hours are worked in any one week, the hours worked on a Saturday morning are to be regarded not as ordinary hours of work but as overtime hours. Therefore, taking this simple example of a person receiving a normal wage of \$40 a week, he would receive an extra \$1.50 for work performed on the Friday night, and for work done Saturday morning he would be paid as though working for 4½ hours. Therefore, under new section 221d an employee would receive \$46 for his total work. No-one can tell me that this will not result in increased prices, because it must—and that is what the Bill provides.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What is the percentage of wages to the cost of running the store?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I do not know that or to what extent this increase could be absorbed by employers. I do not possess those

figures. I am merely saying that, because of increases of up to 20 per cent in employees' wages, costs will inevitably increase.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The increase in costs will vary from industry to industry. In some industries it will be more than 4 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It may be far less.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Audible conversations are out of order.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It seems to me that, whether one takes the basic philosophy of new section 221d, whether one takes the roster with one working 80 hours a fortnight, or whether one takes the roster with the employee working 40 hours in any one week, the consumer will be worse off under every alternative that the Bill proposes. I have already dealt with the industrial implications that will follow from these statutory provisions, to say nothing of the further industrial repercussions that could arise in relation to work performed on nights of the week other than Friday. It seems to me that, if one sets a statutory rate for Friday night work, this point will be raised by people working on other nights as well.

I know that shop assistants do not want this provision, although a small section of them, I suppose, may welcome the extra pay involved. Basically, however, the information that has come to this Council (probably in the form of today's petition—although I have not read its exact terms—and also information we had earlier this year) has been that shop assistants are not anxious to have extended working hours. A small section of them (probably young men) may be anxious to receive the extra pay, particularly at the new rate, but young women and older persons will be much happier to have the extra time off. That is, I think, fairly obvious. Although I have said that I will support the second reading of this Bill, I believe—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I thought you were opposing it.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I said I would oppose some of the terms of the Bill. However, I have not departed from the attitude I took last time: I believe there is a case, particularly in this year 1972 (and that case will increase in importance as the years pass, as our population increases, as more and more shift work is being done in our factories, and as our city spreads), for extended shopping hours. Indeed, from my observations in countries on the other side of the world

it seems to me that there is no great regimentation in relation to shopping hours. Some countries have an almost open go at any hour of the day or night. I do not think I would like to see that happen here.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You wouldn't like to see them open seven days a week, would you?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I certainly would not. The Chief Secretary, from his own oversea observations, will know that shopping hours in other countries are not as regimented as they are at present in South Australia. Therefore, a good case exists for shopping hours to be extended. At the same time, however, we ought to make an attempt to keep down the cost to the public of this extra service, without in any way trying to make the shop assistants carry the burden.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They have been doing it for years.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have come to the conclusion, after having given much thought to this matter, that the amendments which I moved to an earlier Bill and which were debated in this Chamber previously are the only practical solution that will completely solve this problem from the point of view of all parties. Honourable members will recall that previously I tried to get at the crux of the whole situation by defining what was meant by "ordinary hours of work". I did that in a form of words which, as I understood it, was acceptable to all parties involved in the dispute. Indeed, that form of words is the only sensible form that can be used. Accordingly, I intend again to place those amendments before honourable members. However, in the latter stages of the previous debate attempts were made by Government members to draw some red herrings across the trail. They said that, by defining ordinary hours of work, I was in fact taking away the jurisdiction of the court to impose penalty rates. That was debated, and it was hotly denied by me at the time. However, in the heat of the debate my assurances were not accepted. I intend this time to add to my previous amendments some additional clauses which will make clear, beyond any doubt, that, notwithstanding that the hours are to be described as ordinary hours, they will carry extra rates of pay, not imposed by the Statute but to be awarded by the commission or the appropriate conciliation committee, as the case may be.

That, I think, is the only way in which this whole problem can be resolved. Accordingly, I commend these amendments to the Council. I have not had an opportunity to have them printed and distributed, but I will do so as soon as possible. I hope that, on this occasion, and with the additions I have proposed, they will receive serious consideration. It is only by adopting such a formula that we can propose in legislation something which will give to the public of South Australia late night shopping on Fridays, which will not interfere with Saturday morning work, and which will enable, by the selection of the appropriate working roster for each shop, proper rates of pay to be awarded to shop assistants for their normal hours of work.

This Bill must be looked at carefully in the Committee stage. Something should be done to bring back the hour of 12.30 p.m., proposed here on a Saturday as a closing time, to the normally accepted hour of 11.30 a.m. I have had an opportunity to look over certain submissions and correspondence that has come to me, and also to other honourable members, concerning the sale of meat. I have great sympathy with the arguments presented there and I see no reason why prepackaged meat should not be available in shops open to the closing hours of 9.30 p.m. on Fridays.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That would put up the price of meat, according to your argument.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am not talking about butchers. I am speaking only of prepackaged meat.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But that would put the price up, according to you, if it is to be sold on Friday nights when overtime rates are in force.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Aren't you supporting the Bill?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Interjections are out of order!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I doubt very much whether it would. Obviously, not very much assistance is needed to help oneself to packets of prepackaged meat, but that seems to be somewhat of a red herring (or a piece of red meat, perhaps) that the honourable member is drawing across the trail. I commend the Government for having solved one problem I pointed out in the previous debate regarding the difficulty involved in the definition in the Act of "shop assistant". The Government has seen the light and it has defined extremely clearly in section 221a what the expression means for the purposes of this

Bill. That is a very great improvement. It is a pity the Government did not carry on a little further with the provisions debated last time. I intend to support the Bill, but my final vote on the measure will depend very much on what happens in the Committee stage.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill produces a situation extremely similar to the position we reached in the lapsed Bill of last session. I commend the Hon. Mr. Potter for the manner in which he has restated the case and the various objections he has to the present Bill. There is, however, one slight variation to the position we reached at the conference between the two Houses during the passage of the Bill in the previous session. During the debate on the question of late night closing of shops, several important points were raised. I am not talking now of the various amendments moved at that time: I am speaking in relation to the general principles involved in late night closing.

Many points were raised during the second reading debate. I will mention two or three of the major points detailed at that time, and in these points I believe there have been some significant changes in weight since the Bill was debated nine months ago. The first point is that there exists no mandate for the introduction in South Australia of late night shopping; indeed, if anything does exist it is an expression by the people for no alteration. That must be borne in mind by members in this Chamber when voting on the measure. Since the Bill was debated in the previous session this position has changed significantly. At the referendum the Government conducted to determine the wish of the majority of the people in the metropolitan area, a small majority favoured no alteration. I believe that majority has grown considerably in the past nine months. While this point may not be entirely valid, due to other cross-currents of opinion at the time the referendum was taken, which influenced the voters, and also the matter which was raised previously, that the question itself was rather non-specific, nevertheless it is a point that is assuming greater weight in my mind. It is at this stage reasonable to assume that fewer people favour late night closing than favoured it when the referendum was taken.

The second point I wish to make (and it was made in the earlier debate and also by the Hon. Mr. Potter today) is the increase in cost to the community following the introduction of late night trading. The Hon. Mr. Potter has dealt with this rather fully, and I do not wish to cover the same ground again

in any detail. Once again, I make the point that this question has assumed greater weight in the present situation as compared to the situation existing when the previous Bill was debated. There is now, I believe, a further increase in cost that will be placed on the public over and above the increased costs that would have been borne some nine months ago. Various estimates have been given, but on the figures I have worked with I find that the minimum increase in cost to the community will be about 4 per cent and this, if I may use the term, is what I would call a primary figure only. That is the increase in costs that will be passed on to the community purely because of the increase in wage costs to business in South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What percentage of the wages did you put on as a component part of the cost?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have the figures here, and I will deal with them—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Hon. Mr. Potter was going to, but he forgot.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not think the honourable member is quite right in saying the Hon. Mr. Potter forgot.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He did not give me any figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The increase in costs will vary from business to business, depending on the labour intensiveness of the industry concerned. For example, to give the Council one accurate figure, in hairdressing salons the 6 per cent basic wage increase increased the salons' costs by 22½ per cent. In other words, there is a chain reaction as well as merely the increased cost of wages. Whilst, as I see it, the cost of wages in most businesses will be between 3 per cent and 4 per cent of their turnover, other increases, too, will occur in them because of increased costs in the general community—for instance, in respect of workmen's compensation and in other areas; but the impact will vary from business to business. However, the smallest increase in cost will be 4 per cent. I do not see any cost increase lower than that in any business.

Whilst I say that 4 per cent will be the primary increase, the final figure of increased costs to the community will be in excess of that percentage. Of course, the effect of this cost increase will be felt most severely by one section of the community—the one-job family with young children. Since the introduction of late night shopping facilities in New South

Wales and Victoria, some information is becoming available on the effects in those States. So far, the information is somewhat limited but it appears that the smaller trader, the specialist trader, in both the city and the suburbs is adversely affected, to varying degrees, in both States. The turnover of a large supermarket operator has increased in both those States, while the smaller trader (although some large businesses, too, are involved in that category) loses business to the large supermarkets. Also, there is an alteration in the business done in various outlets in the supermarket field: those towards the centre of the city are suffering just the same as is the small trader, but at the moment this information is somewhat limited. However, this appears to be the general trend in those two States in respect of late night shopping.

For these three major reasons—first, the wishes of the majority of the people in the metropolitan area, which were expressed in that referendum; and I believe the majority in favour of "no alteration" has increased considerably since that referendum was taken—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the report of last weekend?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If we are to take a newspaper Gallup poll as the opinion of the people of the State, we are easily led. It referred to two areas of the State and did not take into account the views of the whole metropolitan area.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Then where are you getting your figures from?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: From the last referendum.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You said that things have changed. I am asking you where you are getting your figures from.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I know that many people who voted at the referendum for a change have now changed their minds. Fewer people are in favour of extended trading hours now than when the referendum was taken.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Where do you get that information from?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is my opinion. I think the Hon. Mr. Banfield must agree that, looking at it from the point of view of cold logic, one would expect that to be the position. Nevertheless, the referendum was taken and it showed a majority of people not in favour of any alteration. The second point raised was the cost to the consuming public, in respect of which, no matter how one looks at it, one can only reach a logical

decision that the one-job family man with young children represents the section of the community that will be hardest hit by this increase in cost to the consuming public.

The third matter is the effect, as one can see it in New South Wales and Victoria, on the smaller trader, the specialist trader, in the community. It will be a bad day if this group of people, which provides a service to the community, is placed in a more difficult situation than it is in at present. These three points were raised previously, but their importance has increased since this legislation was last debated. The Hon. Mr. Potter has dealt with the industrial matters in the Bill, and I do not wish to go over that ground again. I merely say that I fully and absolutely support his views on that matter. To me, the provisions of the Bill are unsatisfactory. It adopts principles that it is difficult for the Government to defend. At least, we should not embark on such policies without some clear indication of the wishes of the people of South Australia, because in this Bill we are adopting a new principle that does not appear in any other legislation in Australia. By adopting that principle, we shall create a chain reaction that Parliament will find it difficult to contain.

I agree entirely with the contention of the Hon. Mr. Potter about the adoption of this principle. Any Legislature should await at least the verdict of the voting public before it embarks on principles of this kind. I do not intend to deal with the two industrial matters contained in the Bill—the adoption of a ballot system in respect of the roster system, and the adoption of the principle of writing into legislation overtime rates and rates for other periods of work—but I now touch on another matter that has assumed greater prominence since this legislation was last debated—the prohibition of red meat sales from late night trading. There is no logic associated with this discrimination against one of the State's most important industries. The point was raised in the previous debate that the consuming public and the primary producer organizations were demanding that there be no discrimination if late night trading eventuated. The New South Wales figures show a decline of \$5,000,000 a year in red meat sales, owing to the introduction of late night trading. I want the Council to bear in mind that in New South Wales late night trading is on the Thursday night until 9 p.m. I want the Council to see the impact of a ban on red meat sales on Friday nights. If one takes the New South Wales figure of \$5,000,000 as being accurate (and I can assure the Coun-

cil that it is very close to being accurate) the comparable reduction in South Australia would be \$1,000,000 if there were late trading on Thursday nights. Of course, since late trading is proposed for Friday nights, in many of the large outlets red meat will be removed from the counters on Friday nights at 5.30 p.m. and will not be replaced for sale on Saturday mornings. So, in South Australia the impact on red meat sales will be proportionately greater than it has been in New South Wales.

No-one can convince me that there is any logic in making red meat the exception in connection with Friday night trading. I made this point very strongly in a previous debate, and I stress it again now. A petition signed by 750,000 people has been presented to the New South Wales Parliament; that petition demanded that there be no discrimination in relation to the sales of red meat in that State. No matter how the Government deals with this problem and no matter what pressure the butchering trade puts on the Government to exclude that trade from the provisions of the Bill, if Friday night trading comes to South Australia the public will demand that red meat be on sale, too. So, there is no possibility of the Government's continuing discrimination against certain goods; eventually such discrimination will be dispensed with.

I began by saying that I believed that the three major points that were made originally in connection with this matter were still valid, and I cannot see any reason for changing my attitude to the other provisions included in this Bill. When the Government found itself saddled with what it thought was a political dilemma, it very quickly forced through the Lower House a Bill providing for Friday night trading, and that Bill is now before us. The logic of the situation has been lost sight of, because some people are seeking a political solution to a problem, rather than seeking the maximum benefit to the community. There are very strong grounds for opposing the second reading of this Bill but, if the second reading is carried, I believe that the amendments foreshadowed by the Hon. Mr. Potter are essential. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage I shall move amendments in relation to the sale of red meat on Friday nights.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): We certainly have a paradoxical situation at present, where Liberal Party members are supporting members of the Shop Assistants Union, and the Labor Party (the Party that

claims that its special mission is to look after the interests of the workers) refuses to accept the view of the Shop Assistants Union that Friday night shopping is not sought by the majority of the people in the metropolitan area. In September, 1970, a very costly referendum was held, resulting in a "No" vote. At that time the Labor Government, acting on the result of the referendum, introduced legislation abolishing Friday night shopping, which at that time applied only in the outer metropolitan area. Since then people have become accustomed to the present shopping pattern and, if a referendum were held now, the "No" vote would be even more decisive than it was in 1970. Bearing that in mind, one can only conclude that this Bill has been introduced for political reasons. Because some of the vulnerable Labor seats are in areas that recorded a "Yes" vote in the referendum, the Labor Party believes that, by introducing Friday night shopping, it will gain a political advantage.

Previously, because Friday night shopping existed only in the outer metropolitan area, people from the inner metropolitan area visited the areas where Friday night shopping applied, creating a carnival atmosphere, and prices were no higher. However, if this Bill is passed, shops throughout the metropolitan area will be able to open on Friday nights, and fewer people will visit each of them; as a result, the carnival atmosphere will disappear and prices will be higher. People who are competent to judge estimate that for a family unit of four there will be an increase in costs of \$4 a week. Because some petrol stations are operating at only about half of the required turnover, it is thought that some stations with small turnovers will have to go out of business. So, it is only logical that, as a result of lower turnover, some shops that are forced to open on Friday nights will in time have to close their doors. If costs are increased by Friday night trading, there will inevitably be (and rightly so) pressures for higher wages to maintain an acceptable standard of living; that is only logical.

In the States where Friday night shopping is operating, the increase in costs in the grocery trade is estimated to be between 7 per cent and 11 per cent. If some shops do not open on Friday night because of lack of trade then, the increase in costs across the board may be lower but, if those shops remain open, the increase will undoubtedly be higher. It must be remembered that, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris pointed out, there are such things as hidden costs that have not been taken into consideration at present, such as superannuation,

sick leave and workmen's compensation. If people were given a choice between Friday night and Saturday morning shopping, I expect they might well accept Friday night. No doubt, Friday night shopping would be more acceptable to the shop assistants and the retailers. Perhaps we should be thinking along these lines now rather than trying to impose Friday night shopping on the present pattern. The roster system may appear attractive to those people who do not have to work under it. Most of the shop assistants to whom I have spoken do not like the roster system, which would present great difficulties and result in an increase in costs for the smaller retailers, particularly those who employ fewer than six employees. If he is forced to roster his employees (and it could well be the employees' decision, not the employer's decision), there must inevitably be a lowering of the standard of service to customers.

As the Leader covered the question of red meats, I shall not repeat what he said, but I think that all honourable members would agree that, if butcher shops were to open on Friday nights, a great strain would be placed on butchers. We know that much work must be done before a butcher shop opens for business in the morning and after it closes at night. It would be long after 9 o'clock before shop assistants in a butcher shop could be relieved of duty for that day. Under the Bill, butcher shops will not be allowed to trade after normal hours of trading. If butcher shops must remain closed, the overall effect on the meat industry will be as has been mentioned by other speakers; it has resulted in a loss of \$5,000,000 in New South Wales, and the loss will be proportionately greater in South Australia. Such a move would have a detrimental effect on this State's primary industry, which is facing sufficient difficulties now without having to face up to additional problems.

Experience in other States indicates that grocery chain stores, as a result of late night shopping, are finding it necessary to close some of their stores; this could well happen here not only to chain stores but also to smaller grocery stores. It seems inevitable that many of the smaller stores will be forced to close as a result of having to remain open for extra hours for a small amount of uneconomical trading. The suggestion that unemployment may result from the introduction of this legislation is no idle threat. It is no secret that considerable division exists within the Labor Party and the Trades and Labor Council on whether the legislation is

necessary and, if introduced, on the form it should take. In today's *News*, Mr. Goldsworthy is reported as saying that, if the Bill went through Parliament, his union would take a ballot of members to ascertain whether they would work on Saturday mornings if Friday night shopping were introduced. That could mean that shop assistants might well decide that, if they were required to work on Friday night, they should not be required to work on Saturday morning. Unanimity of thought does not exist within the Labor Party hierarchy regarding the industrial clauses in the Bill. This matter is also highlighted in a report in today's *News*, and it is interesting to reflect on some of Mr. Goldsworthy's comments. He is reported as saying:

If Friday night shopping were introduced we would approach the Industrial Commission with three alternative plans to cover working arrangements.

These plans have been referred to by other speakers today. Mr. Goldsworthy continued:

We have repeatedly said we do not want working conditions incorporated in the Bill. They are the words of the Secretary of the Shop Assistants Union, who has publicly stated that his union does not want industrial conditions incorporated in the Bill. Mr. Goldsworthy believes that industrial conditions should rightly be decided by the Industrial Commission. Parliament should realize that legislation in respect of a certain group of employees within an industry (in this case, the retailing industry) should not give them preferential treatment. Shop assistants are only one part of the retailing industry, and it will be the responsibility of industrial tribunals, which have operated in this field over the years, to include in the award such matters as the spread of hours, penalty rates, overtime provisions, etc. The commission makes an award only after it has heard the proposals put forward by both sides of the industry.

Another aspect of the Bill that disturbs me is the period of operation. Most awards have a stated period of operation, but it is competent for the parties affected by the award to have the period of operation varied either by agreement or by a tribunal on application by one party. This award will be an Act of Parliament, and only Parliament will be able to vary its operation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's not right. It's a minimum.

The Hon. L. R. HART: As Parliament is to decide on the operation of the award, I assume that only Parliament will be able to amend it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your assumption is wrong. This is the minimum.

The Hon. L. R. HART: As only today I presented a petition signed by more than 13,000 persons (collected in less than a week) who oppose this legislation, and as many personal representations have been made to me by people who oppose it, I find it difficult to support the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): This measure has been adequately covered by the three honourable members who preceded me today, and they put the case very well. As I see it, the Bill has three objectionable features, possibly more. The first feature is the increase in costs, to which the Hon. Mr. Potter referred. He mentioned a 4 per cent or 5 per cent increase in costs, and I am personally opposed to any increase in costs which my colleagues believe will take place and which I believe will occur if the Bill is passed in its present form. I am even more strongly opposed to what might be called the new principle, which was encompassed in the previous Bill, that we are expected to write into the legislation matters that should be considered by the Industrial Court. I wonder whether, if we go into this sort of legislation, we are seeking to dispense with the Industrial Court, in which there must be objectivity, and to bring all these matters into a political atmosphere in Parliament. That would be wrong and I could not agree to such a scheme or support this provision in any way.

The other matter which was raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and to which I object is the exclusion of red meats from night trading. My colleague said that this restriction had occasioned a drop of \$5,000,000 a year in red meat sales in New South Wales and that it could be expected to cause a \$1,000,000 drop in this State. However, as the honourable gentleman said, it is possible that, once red meat was withdrawn here on Friday afternoons, it would not appear again until Monday morning, as a result of which the drop in sales in this State could be considerably more than the suggested \$1,000,000.

On September 19, 1970, this Government held a referendum on this matter, believing that the people would get it off the hook by voting "Yes". The people had the opportunity to comment on the matter and to say "Yes" or "No". All honourable members know (and no-one knows it better than the Government) that the people said "No" in a decisive manner. Now, for the second time since that

occasion and for the political reasons referred to by the Hon. Mr. Hart, the Government has tried to get itself off the hook by introducing this measure, trying again to reintroduce Friday night shopping. Does not this Government take any notice of what the people say? The Labor Government believes in referendums, and it believes in getting itself off the hook from time to time by holding a referendum.

On the occasion to which I have referred, the result of the referendum was different from what the Government expected and now, for the second time, the Government is endeavouring totally to disregard the clearly-expressed wishes of the people. I believe the Government is being irresponsible and cynical in its disregard of the people's wishes in introducing this legislation. One or two previous speakers (I think the Hon. Mr. DeGaris or the Hon. Mr. Hart) mentioned the assumption that there has been a change in attitude, even in the fringe areas, of those who voted "Yes" in the referendum. There is no doubt that there has been a considerable change of attitude in those areas. I am not suggesting for one moment that some people would not still like to have the opportunity to shop on Friday night, even if they did not use it much. However, the number of people who want Friday night shopping has greatly diminished, there having been a change of attitude over the last two years.

I believe that if a referendum were held tomorrow the majority for a "No" vote in relation to Friday night shopping would be found to have increased considerably. I have been approached by many people who do not want this legislation. Although I represent a considerable part of fringe areas of the outer city that voted "Yes" two years ago, I have not been approached by one person who has asked for this legislation to be passed. From the contacts I have made and from those that I know my colleagues have made, I am sure that there has been a considerable change in attitude and that there is no real demand of consequence at present for the reintroduction of late shopping on Friday nights.

In view of that, and as a week or two ago I went to a meeting with the Hon. Mr. Hart, following which more than 13,000 signatures were obtained (which the honourable gentleman brought to this Council today in a petition), I find it impossible to support this legislation, which, I believe, should not go on to this State's Statute Book.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

JUDGES' PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SAFETY)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 16. Page 795.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): The provisions outlined in this Bill deal mainly with the control of traffic within the metropolitan area, and although I have some comments to make I presume city members would need to pay much closer attention to this measure than I. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act and gives a more comprehensive definition of traffic control devices, signs at road crossings, and so on. This is a step forward. There is in this Bill an attempt to make uniform the various devices and signs at present used and to bring them more into line with those in use in other States; perhaps we will one day see uniformity throughout the world. Today we find an increasing intake of oversea visitors, and it must be extremely confusing to them to find that South Australian signs differ not only from those to which they are accustomed but also from those in other States. The Bill makes some attempt to rectify this.

Clause 4 deals with the definition of "Authority" and the erection of various signs. I have no quibble about this. It is a step in the right direction to know who is responsible for the design and authorization of

the various devices, and now this will be known to all. Clause 6 deals with the exhibition of signs at pedestrian crossings, and clause 7 repeals two sections of the principal Act. Clause 12 deals with driving on footpaths, and contains a recognition, long overdue, of the difficulties of handicapped people. As the Minister said in the second reading explanation, many handicapped people, through their own determination and fortitude, are able to propel themselves from one point to another, and over the years have broken the law either by travelling on the footpath or by mingling with the traffic on the road. These people are now catered for in the provisions of this Bill, and this is certainly long overdue.

Clause 13 contains some provisions that seem quite anomalous. I consider it is quite impossible to expect a driver, faced with a collision, not to apply his brakes immediately. I do not know how he can signal that he is about to stop suddenly. He must, within a few feet and within a split second, decide whether he would incur a fine of \$100 by applying his brakes without giving the appropriate signal or pile into the back of another car. There seems no good reason for this provision, especially for the \$100 fine. It is a clause with which I do not agree, and I will have more to say about that in the Committee stage.

Clause 14 deals with signs prohibiting turns. These signs are shown on the chart displayed in the Chamber at the request of the Hon. Mr. Hill. I commend the honourable member, who is always an authority on State transport, on the way in which he researched the Bill and the information he gave members concerning it. I have a comment to make on the various signs and also a suggestion to the Minister. We should have not only uniform signs but some uniformity regarding the position in which signs are placed. I know of one place where a sign, depicting a right-hand turn and four miles of winding road, is situated on the crest of a hill. On going over the hill, one realizes just how factual is the description; if one negotiates the first half mile of turns one has a fair chance of seeing out the other three miles.

I am always intrigued by the sign denoting a T junction, the 90-degree entry to a main road. To my mind, this is one of the worst pieces of highway engineering seen in our day. It is always fraught with danger, but quite

often the sign is not sufficiently far back from the intersection to provide the necessary space to negotiate the intersection. Such intersections are hard enough to negotiate in any circumstances, especially with a loaded vehicle. Often one is faced with the necessity to go out on to the road to see whether there is oncoming traffic, and to make a very speedy turn for the rest of the way if there is such traffic. It is a point that needs further consideration. If we had uniformity in this, people would realize that within a given distance they would be approaching a junction. I am referring, of course, to country roads. I remember quite well that in the Middle East we saw a series of warnings of major junctions giving decreased distances as one approached the area of danger. In South Australia signs are shown at different distances from what is quite often the point of impact, or let us say from the point of concern.

Those are the two points on which I wished to speak. I have little else to say about the Bill. It is a good Bill but it needs some tidying up. For instance, it is impossible for a person to signal that he is about to apply his brakes suddenly. That provision should be removed from the Bill. As a matter of fact, I commend the man whose reflexes are such that he can avoid an accident by applying his brakes suddenly. Another point relates to signs. One is never quite sure what signs mean. For instance, a sign concerning kangaroos states "Kangaroos for the next 40 miles". Apart from alerting drivers and passengers that they may see kangaroos, the sign does little good, because one never knows whether to drive slowly or fast. In any case, at any speed one is likely to hit a kangaroo. I remember the case of a father late at night jamming on his brakes to avoid a collision with a huge kangaroo. He said to his son sitting alongside him, "It is just as well I was driving, boy, or we'd have hit him." The son said, "If I'd been driving, Dad, we'd have been home in bed by now." I do not think much real instruction can be given about avoiding kangaroos. With these few comments, I support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August, 23, at 2.15 p.m.