

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, November 15, 1977

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS** presented a petition from 67 residents of South Australia alleging that the regulations requiring a 5 cent deposit on all cans containing soft drinks place an unfair burden upon people employed in a closed environment and praying that the Council would request the Minister to make new regulations, exempting canteen services where the can does not leave the premises, or introduce legislation to provide for such exemption.

Petition received and read.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JAM FACTORY

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: A number of questions has recently been raised in this Chamber, and elsewhere, in relation to the operations of the Jam Factory, and the oversea investigations carried out by Dr. Earle Hackett and Mrs. Karin Lemercier. The Premier is today making a statement in another place and tabling a number of related papers. I seek leave to read the Premier's statement and to table those papers in this House.

I would add that, while some comments in the Premier's statement are directed to specific members in another place, the same criticisms can equally be applied to honourable members opposite, who have not only sought to stir up a scandal but also have called into question the integrity of two persons, not by presenting facts as evidence, but by a deplorable process of insinuation and innuendo. The Premier's statement is as follows:

A number of questions has been raised in this House and elsewhere about the conduct of the oversea investigation of craft industry questions undertaken last year by Dr. Earle Hackett (then Chairman of the South Australian Craft Authority) and Mrs. Karin Lemercier (Deputy Chairman). Associated questions have been raised about the operations of the Jam Factory Workshops at St. Peters. In providing information in response to such questions, I wish to foreshadow my intention at the end of this statement to seek leave to table a series of related papers, prominent among them being the 95-page report which has emanated from the investigation. At the request of the Deputy Premier, the information incorporates the material he undertook on October 25 to provide in response to a question from the member for Kavel.

The oversea travel by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier began on Friday, September 10, 1976, and ended on Sunday, November 14, 1976, a total of 65 days. A list of people and places visited by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier is included as an appendix to the report on the investigation. Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have stated that this is their full itinerary and that no side trips or other divergences were

made. In addition to the oversea travel, Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier visited other parts of Australia to gather more information. Information on these visits is contained in Appendix 1 of their report.

The total expenditure associated with the investigation was \$34 795.51. This total was established after adjustments required for foreign exchange and after reimbursement of the Jam Factory Workshops Inc. for certain private expenses charged to it (as the South Australian Craft Authority) in the course of the trip. The total includes some amounts incurred in the course of travel within Australia for the purposes of the investigation. The total has been checked by auditors.

Funds for the investigation were made available through the South Australian Craft Authority, although for the most part arrangements for the trip were made outside of the authority. To meet the expenditure, additional funds were provided to the authority, which has had accounting responsibility for expenditure. At its August meeting last year, the board of the authority noted the arrangements made for examination of craft matters overseas, and gave its approval for Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier to seek information regarding crafts and their future development in Australia.

As the Auditor-General said in a letter dated August 1, 1977, all the \$34 800 expended on the investigation has been accounted for. Copies of this letter and the accompanying statement of the Auditor-General were tabled on November 1, with the Jam Factory Workshops Inc's. annual report for 1976-77. The expenditure statement checked by the auditor and referred to in the Auditor-General's letter is included with papers to be tabled today. As Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier did not provide vouchers for all items of expenditure, they were required to make statutory declarations to cover payments made by cash and travellers cheques. These declarations are included with the papers. The statement breaks down expenditure by category, e.g. fares, accommodation, food, entertainment, but does not deal with all matters item by item.

A number of extravagant and ill-founded allegations have been made about the costs incurred by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier during the investigation. It has even been alleged in another place—

that is, in this Council—

that \$34 800 was paid to two members of the craft authority. This is grossly misleading. It should be noted as a matter of perspective that the direct costs of travel, accommodation and food were considerably less than the overall cost of the study. The sum of \$14 300 was paid to Mrs. Lemercier's firm, the Design Centre, to cover her absence from duties with the firm for 13 weeks. This included four weeks for planning and preparation of the trip and the nine weeks of the actual trip itself. The rate of \$1 100 per week for a period of 13 weeks was recommended by the then Chairman of the Public Service Board after negotiations conducted between the board and Mrs. Lemercier's firm.

In addition to the consultancy fees, Mrs. Lemercier received subsequently payment of the normal Craft Authority Board fees for the period of her tenure, including the weeks while she was overseas. Dr. Hackett also received fees as Chairman of the Craft Authority, and continued to draw his salary as Deputy Director-General of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science while away on special leave for the purposes of the trip. At the time the board fee was \$500 per annum.

Of the remaining \$20 500, \$1 858.55 was paid to Ms. Tarras-Wahlberg Boe, a distinguished international craft industry figure, as a consultancy for assistance in arranging meetings with top level designers, craftsmen and managers, and generally for advice on craft industry matters. A further \$1 509 was used for engaging interpreters and hiring vehicles

necessary for the proper conduct of the examination. Of the remainder, \$7 208·81 was spent on fares. (This figure will be reduced by approximately \$800 as a result of a refund due on air tickets for one leg of the journey. It includes the amounts referred to earlier for associated travel within Australia.) Entertainment expenses amounted to \$454·90.

Accommodation accounted for \$6 334·68 and food \$1 555·12. Other miscellaneous expenditure cost \$1 592·09. This latter amount included baggage insurance, excess baggage, airport taxes, the purchase of a tape recorder (now at the Jam Factory) and a gift in return for assistance rendered. It is to be expected on an investigation of the kind undertaken by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier that expenses will be greater than normal, as a result of the need to depart frequently from main direct international air routes on which concessional fares are available, and on occasions to use accommodation more expensive than would otherwise have been chosen because of changes in itinerary. Nevertheless, as I said in this House on October 19, I expressed some disquiet on being informed of the total cost of the trip. I am confident that the Auditor-General and his staff have done their work competently and that all moneys have been accounted for. Expenditures were, however, higher than would normally be incurred on a trip of this kind and I have issued instructions to prevent this happening again.

The most virulent attack on the two people in question has come in the form of insinuations that while on public business at public expense they pursued their own private commercial interests in connection with the establishment of the Chesser Print Shop. The shop is a private concern, a subsidiary of the Design Centre. Dr. Hackett has informed the Government that he is a director of the shop, which is not a limited liability company, but has no other financial or legal interest or rights in it. In March this year, before Dr. Hackett entered into this arrangement, he wrote to me as Minister responsible for the Art Gallery of South Australia offering his resignation if it was considered that involvement in the print shop might bring about a conflict of interest with his position as Chairman of the Art Gallery Board. I saw, and see, no such conflict of interest and did not accept his resignation. Dr. Hackett also informed the Board of the Art Gallery of the situation. The board recorded its confidence in his continuing chairmanship. The texts of Dr. Hackett's letter to me, my response, and an extract from the minutes of the Art Gallery Board are included with the papers for tabling. Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have declared that the idea of setting up the print shop was not raised until this year, several months after the end of their trip for the Government.

In spite of these assurances and the open declaration of interest made by Dr. Hackett, however, I felt it was necessary to ensure that no doubt should be left in the public's mind about the unworthy allegations raised by members opposite. Accordingly, I wrote to Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier and asked them to make statutory declarations as to whether they had in any way pursued their private interests at public expense. They have made declarations, clearly and categorically denying any such activity whether in New York or anywhere else. Copies are included with the papers for tabling. I would hope that this would place these questions beyond doubt.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Are Opposition members going to apologise?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They made the insinuations. They made statements trying to assassinate the characters of these people, without one little bit of evidence to back up the insinuations. They are sitting back this afternoon and laughing while I try to clear the good names of the people concerned. The Premier's statement continues:

Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier made the American purchases for their shop in May this year—months after the Government trip—and Dr. Hackett took special leave without pay from May 24 to May 27, 1977 to make the purchases. All expenses on this trip were borne privately. Various attempts have been made by the Opposition to label the investigation into developments in the field of craft industry as some form of holiday.

The honourable member for Kavel has questioned the value of the trip and the consequent advice to the Government, and others have taken up his point and embroidered on it. I can only say what I said in this House before—that Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have now provided a long and informative report of considerable value to the State for consideration of the future direction of the development of craft-based activities in our community. They have recorded the views and experiences of numerous prominent people in the craft, design, production and marketing worlds, and have presented a formed view of their own of the potential for South Australia in these areas.

The proposals in the report for new activity have been considered. Conceptually they are sound, and have considerable potential. As members opposite may appreciate, however, the means of implementation must not only be developed carefully in practical detail, but their relationship to existing activities must be determined.

The Government does not share Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier's rather uncomplicated view that the approach taken at the Jam Factory is mistaken.

As I have mentioned before in this House, there has been room for improvement in the operation of the Jam Factory Workshops. The Government has not been blind to this. This year, in particular, strong action has been taken to improve management and accountability at the Workshops and to develop better working policies for training, production and marketing. The process is far from painless, but the Government has persevered.

The Government sees the road ahead not to involve abandonment of the Jam Factory Workshops, but improvement in their operations and complementary developments of the broad character advocated by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier. In order to achieve these aims a working party will concentrate on developing practical means of implementing the proposals in concert with continuing work based in the Jam Factory, the Department of Further Education, and elsewhere on advancing community appreciation of craft work of a high standard, improving the level of craft and design skills locally, and developing appropriate production and marketing arrangements.

The energy of members opposite would be better directed to constructive assistance of this process than to attempts at point scoring against individuals involved in it.

I shall return to the question of the Jam Factory statements, but I would earnestly suggest that, before any more allegations are made, the report of the trip should be read thoroughly and thoughtfully.

Some attention has been drawn to the fact that Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier are no longer directly associated with the Jam Factory. At the time they undertook the trip they were Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively of the South Australian Craft Authority, as it then was. As has been announced previously, however, the structure of the Craft Authority and its operations were changed significantly earlier this year after I had made some inquiries and visited the Workshops personally to discuss matters with the board and others involved with the Workshops.

As a consequence of these changes, the South Australian Craft Authority was succeeded by the Jam Factory Workshops Inc., whose task is to see to the running of the Workshops as a practical matter, and the South Australian

Craft Advisory Council, whose task is to advise the Government generally on craft development issues without having any operational responsibility for particular activities.

In order to achieve this, I revoked the appointments of the former board of the South Australian Craft Authority and invited all the members to become members of the South Australian Craft Advisory Council. Two of the board members were also asked to serve as board members of the Jam Factory Workshops Inc. and, as a reflection of my concern to lift the financial and general management of the Workshops and achieve high standards of accountability, I asked Mr. A. W. Richardson, Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission, to assume the responsibilities of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer for a period of re-organisation.

Mr. Richardson accepted this task and has been discharging it with determination and vigour.

The decision not to appoint Dr. Hackett or Mrs. Lemercier to the board of the Jam Factory Workshops Inc. was straightforward. The Jam Factory had gone through a period of turmoil in the latter part of 1976. Budgeting and financial control had not been satisfactory, production estimates were not being achieved, and a certain amount of personal conflict had developed.

The situation came to a head in one respect shortly before Christmas last year when the former Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Simon Blackall, had his contract of employment terminated by the board of the Craft Authority.

I assume that this is where the Hon. Mr. Hill has been getting his information.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is not so. Keep to your script. You are assuming incorrectly.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said "I assume". I did not say it was. The honourable member's allegations are the greatest lot of baloney I have heard. The Premier's statement continues:

The board had on its own account previously undertaken to give Mr. Blackall six months notice of termination. In view of the deteriorating relations between the Chief Executive Officer and the board, and particularly the executive committee of the board with specific responsibility for practical management of the Workshops, the board resolved to pay Mr. Blackall out in lieu of notice. In response to questions asked about the compensation paid to Mr. Blackall on dismissal, a breakdown of payments made is included in the papers for tabling.

Following a period of consolidation during which Mr. Richardson acted as Chief Executive Officer, Mr. M. Wallis-Smith was appointed to that position in July. In addition to the changes in management personnel and arrangements which were required, it was apparent that changes were also needed in the character and balance of the board to move out of a period of some conflict into greater harmony. Without in any way reflecting on the individuals involved, their capacities or their willingness to render public service in this way, it was decided to retain only two of the former board, one of them having been a member of the board from the inception of the authority, the other being drawn from among the crafts people working in the factory. In the case of Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier, there was a further reason, which will become apparent from a reading of the report on their oversea trip. As both of them had come to the personal conclusion that the Jam Factory did not offer the scope for craft development the Government desired and therefore should in some way be abandoned or phased out, it did not appear appropriate to ask them to continue in significant roles at the Jam Factory.

These changes took place in March this year. Since then Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier have developed their report from earlier outline reports submitted. This has taken

considerably longer than expected and while this activity has been continuing no action has been taken to call the Craft Advisory Council together. A further delay has been caused in this respect by a request by Dr. Hackett that he should not carry the office of Chairman of the Advisory Council. He gave as his reason the fact that he had given four years service on craft matters. His resignation has been accepted.

It is abundantly clear that members opposite have attempted to blow the significance of questions relating to the oversea investigation into craft industry developments out of all proportion. They have sought to impugn the character of the two persons, not by presenting evidence to support reasoned arguments but by insinuation and innuendo. They, and others outside the Parliament, have done their best to work up a scandal where no scandal exists. Apart from demonstrating a strained eagerness to throw mud indiscriminately in the hope that some might stick, they have shown in this nothing more than their own poor appreciation of the many complexities of this area of endeavour. They have made no positive proposals, no contribution which might further the interests of this State in diversifying the sources of employment in our economy. Well before the Auditor-General's report, the Government initiated strong and specific action to improve the operations of the Jam Factory. Under Mr. Richardson's chairmanship, and more recently with the assistance of Mr. Wallis-Smith, much effort has been put into improved budgeting, financial controls and other management matters. A resume of progress made is included with the papers for tabling. I make no pretence that everything is perfect, but I do say that budgeting and general accountability are improving steadily. Difficult decisions remain, and can be expected to arise from time to time. The Government will face those questions as they arise and take the requisite action. It would serve the State far better if the Opposition supported these efforts with constructive criticism and positive proposals instead of attempting to bluster its way through with ill-informed and misguided personal attacks.

In addition to that, the Hon. Mr. Hill asked a question on November 2, and other questions have been asked in this Chamber, about matters dealt with in the Ministerial statement. The answer to the Hon. Mr. Hill is that it is not true to say that any of the master craftsmen at the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated have resigned. One of the master craftsmen, Mr. Sam Herman, has resigned from the board of the Jam Factory Workshops but still retains his professional status as Workshop Director and employee of the Jam Factory Workshops Incorporated. It is understood that Mr. Herman resigned in order to be freed of board administrative responsibilities as he wished to concentrate on his own craft work. An election is to be held shortly to select a representative of the staff at the workshops on the board and to fill the vacancy left by Mr. Herman.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: That's a nice brief explanation to digest!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It was a Ministerial statement. No-one suggested it would be brief. Because of the insinuations made by members opposite, it was necessary for such a lengthy statement to be made.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! All comments are out of order.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: A few weeks ago I answered a number of questions from honourable members in relation to drought relief. On receiving the *Hansard* reports, I found that those separate statements, when placed together, could be confusing. Therefore, I believe I should place on record some of the background to the arrangements to clarify the position.

First, it should be understood that drought assistance funding with the Commonwealth is made under an arrangement which consists of an exchange of letters between the Prime Minister and Premiers and which relates to natural disasters generally. When a natural disaster occurs, the relief measures contemplated by the State are communicated to the Commonwealth, which either accepts or rejects individual measures. Relief measures approved by the Commonwealth are eligible for inclusion in the base figure expenditure which the State must meet before calling on Commonwealth assistance.

Honourable members will appreciate that drought has somewhat different characteristics from most other natural disasters because it extends over a lengthy period. A cyclone or earthquake is over within a few minutes or hours. However, drought usually extends over a number of seasons, and this necessarily covers one or more financial years. Therefore, the State and the Commonwealth must agree that the drought has extended over a certain period and to relate the approval of relief measures to this period. In the case of the present drought, the Commonwealth has agreed that the period has extended from October 1, 1976, and will continue to December 31, 1977, when the situation will again be reviewed. Thus, the relief measures approved last year remain eligible for Commonwealth assistance this year.

There is one exception to this. On May 30, 1977, the Commonwealth advised that in its opinion no expenditure should be incurred on the stock slaughter subsidy scheme in South Australia after June 30, 1977. At this time, the seriousness of the situation in the North-West pastoral area was not apparent, and the Government did not oppose the suggestion. We have now asked that this scheme be reintroduced as an approved relief measure in view of the situation in the North-West pastoral areas. This request has been accepted by the Commonwealth.

The financial arrangements in relation to these physical measures follow financial years rather than disaster periods. The State must disburse its base figure (South Australia's is \$1 500 000) in each financial year on measures approved by the Commonwealth before it receives any Commonwealth assistance. However, money committed in one year but not disbursed in that year provides part of the State base for the following financial year if it is disbursed then, provided, of course, that the drought period is still regarded by the Commonwealth as being in existence.

These arrangements are further complicated in that local government rehabilitation measures are both physically and financially related to disaster periods. I assure honourable members that this avenue of funding is also being followed up by the State Government, and, in fact, one district council on the West Coast has been advised to apply to the State for funds under this part of the scheme to deal with the extreme sand drift problem on roads within the council area. At present, Commonwealth assistance is only paid to councils for cyclones, storms, floods and bush fires, but the South Australian Government will take up this matter on behalf of the council concerned.

As honourable members can see, the arrangements for the funding of natural disasters (and drought, in particular) are complex and unwieldy. Negotiations have

been taking place for some time in an attempt to simplify and improve them. At the Premiers' Conference on October 21, these issues were discussed by all the Premiers with the Prime Minister. Although South Australia was willing to negotiate with the Commonwealth on these issues, several States were not prepared to do so.

As a consequence, the conference decided that the present financial arrangements for natural disaster assistance would continue, including no change in the base figure for each State. Since drought relief assistance is part of the natural disaster assistance arrangements between the Commonwealth and the State, the Premiers' Conference decision means there will be no change in the conditions under which drought relief is financed.

In making this statement, I emphasise that the whole matter of Commonwealth funding for drought assistance is a difficult one even for the most experienced public servant or politician to sort out, and, given the fluidity of the negotiations and the obscurity surrounding what arrangements exist, I believe that the South Australian Government has taken the only responsible action open to it, that is, to respond to the needs of farmers in this State who are suffering from drought losses.

I again make the point (and I make it strongly) that no farmer in South Australia has gone without aid in this current drought because of delays or problems that the South Australian Government has had in interpreting the bundle of confusing arrangements that exist on the availability or not of Commonwealth funds for this type of aid.

We have maintained a steady flow of funds for a stock slaughter scheme (when we were convinced that it was needed) for freight subsidies, for agistment of stock and for fodder. We have provided funds for the carriage of water to central points, and we are maintaining a flow of carry-on loan funds to farmers who are eligible for such loans. We have not wasted our time haggling over details, but have made funds available out of our own State funds. Our new drought loan application form and the new procedures for the assessment and administration of drought carry-on loans are being praised throughout Australia. I quote from "Primary Industry Newsletter" of October 19, 1977, as follows:

The hand of the practical man has surfaced in changes made this month to Government drought carry-on loans in South Australia. Bureaucratic cobwebs and Treasury safeguards have been superseded by commonsense.

South Australian producer organisations have echoed this praise. For instance, the United Farmers and Graziers' monthly paper *Farmer and Grazier* of October stated:

The Agriculture Department, with its new responsibilities, is trying hard to administer the drought aid programme well.

It went on to say:

The revised payment system enabling producers to pay their own bills from quarterly cheques instead of sending in accounts to the department will restore some dignity to the whole process.

I have received a letter from the Stockowners' Association praising the new drought aid programme, and the Stockowners' representative on the Consultative Committee (Hon. Arthur Whyte) said in this very Council that he "congratulated the Minister of Agriculture for the part he has played in effecting what everyone hopes will be a practical scheme". I have also received a letter from the National Country Party of Australia (S.A.) informing me of a resolution from their last Council meeting, which reads:

The State Council of the National Country Party commend the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for their attempting to remove the stigma of drought relief by

presenting it to farmers in their local areas as a management tool and not as a last resort.

When it comes to picking up the tab for drought relief, I have little doubt that the State Government will have to carry the major part of the load. However, even if this is to be the case in this instance, farmers in drought areas need not fear that they will be left out on a limb. We will continue to make sure that they do not suffer more than can be helped. We will provide funds to ensure that they can carry on their enterprises until normal conditions return (and we will do this by honouring our agreement with them) and we will continue to fight to negotiate Commonwealth funds without going back on our own commitments.

Let me remind honourable members that in 1976 we attempted to have drought unemployment relief approved by the Commonwealth as a drought measure, but we were refused this approval. Because we believed that such schemes conducted through local councils were of benefit to drought-stricken communities, we established a special drought unemployment relief component in our State unemployment relief scheme and this is providing some measure of employment to numbers of farmers in drought areas. Earlier I referred to the over-stocking problem in the North-West pastoral area of the State, which has been exacerbated by drought. I asked the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Ian Sinclair) to extend the recently-announced beef aid scheme to allow a bounty on the culling of old cows in an attempt to help these pastoralists to cope with their current problem. The proposal was rejected, although I do admit that Mr. Sinclair seems not to have got the point. He rejected my proposal on the grounds that the spaying of old cows would not help the matter. I intend to ask him again to consider extending the scheme to the culling of old cows, by slaughter.

At about the time this proposal was made, the Prime Minister wrote to the Premier saying that a stock slaughter scheme under the natural disasters agreement would be appropriately considered. The information I have is that a stock slaughter subsidy has been approved under the natural disasters agreement. This was approved for fire and flood only. Yesterday, I read in the press that the Commonwealth had extended this to drought and have received official advice today that this is so.

I am sure that this sort of example will enable honourable members on both sides of the Council to understand why the South Australian Government feels that, if it spends too much time trying to get clarification on the arrangements covering drought assistance before it makes funds available to farming communities, the drought is likely to be over before such clarity is reached, and many farmers and their families will have been ruined, simply owing to a lack of carry-on funds at the critical time. The South Australian Government is not prepared to sacrifice our rural community in this way, and I offer no apology for either the amount of funds committed to date, or the way they have been (and will continue to be) expended on drought assistance.

QUESTIONS

BLUE TONGUE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture relative to the disease blue tongue.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe that all honourable members (most certainly those with direct

connections with agriculture) will have heard with considerable concern and even dismay the news that a strain of the disease blue tongue apparently has been identified in Australia, in the Northern Territory, and I understand that this discovery has been confirmed. I ask the Minister whether he has discussed this serious development with his counterparts in the other States and with his senior officers and whether he has formulated plans to minimise to the greatest possible degree the chance of this disease spreading into this State. Can the Minister give this Council details of such a plan? If not, will he indicate to the Council what stage discussions have reached, and will he, as soon as possible, tell the Parliament and the public what action is being taken?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: There have been considerable discussions on this problem. Although at this stage they have not been at Ministerial level, I have been kept well informed by officers of my department on discussions that have been taking place between the Chief Veterinary Officers in each State. At least two meetings of the responsible veterinary officers have been held: there may have been more. If the honourable member saw the *Government Gazette* last week, he would have seen that we put a special proclamation through at a special Executive Council meeting on Friday to proclaim several diseases, including blue tongue. That would give us power to prohibit the movement of stock from areas where this disease has been identified. We are implementing the proclamation made on November 11 prohibiting cattle from the Northern Territory, the Kimberley region of Western Australia, and Queensland, as a precautionary measure against any introduction of blue tongue in this State. We also have been sampling from cattle, and from one particular sheep station outside the dog-proof fence. These are blood samples and they have been forwarded to Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation to be identified for possible blue tongue in these animals.

Regarding the country inside the dog-proof fence, we are surveying those properties on a wide basis of sampling but, unfortunately, we are not able to take any further action, because of the number of blood samples that are at C.S.I.R.O. awaiting testing. However, we have taken steps to overcome the problem and we hope that in November the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science laboratories in Adelaide will be able to test the samples taken in recent weeks in that area.

In addition, a seminar will be held on Wednesday with representatives of primary industry in South Australia to inform them of the measures that have been taken and the measures that may be necessary in future if the disease is confirmed over a large area and if it is confirmed to be a virulent strain. There is confusion about the strain of blue tongue that has been identified. It does not seem to have been identified anywhere else in the world. At this stage, although it does not appear to be a virulent strain, we are taking every precaution because, obviously, it would be a disaster for the sheep industry throughout Australia if blue tongue became established.

STOCK SLAUGHTER

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Agriculture regarding a stock slaughter subsidy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: As a result of a concerted campaign by pastoralists in the North-West of

the State and long negotiations on their behalf by the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier, I saw in this morning's paper that the Commonwealth has agreed to support a stock slaughter subsidy for the disposal of helpless and unsaleable cattle, together with compensation to producers for the slaughter of these cattle. The manner in which financial arrangements are determined between State and Commonwealth for natural disasters is a subject of continuing fascination to all concerned and, to set the record clear on this one, I ask the Minister of Agriculture to tell the Council just what is involved in this stock slaughter component, who will benefit, by how much, and who will pay.

I recall that the South Australian Government supported a scheme last season for the slaughter of stock and provided funds to local councils to dispose of such stock. Will this new scheme be the same, or will the scheme extend outside local government boundaries?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The press release issued by the Prime Minister on this question did seem to imply a reintroduction of the scheme which previously applied and which was confined to local government areas, but that is not how we see the stock slaughter scheme operating. In fact, we think its necessity is greater in the North-West and other pastoral areas, but the official confirmation I have received shows that the decision taken does not restrict it in this way. Presently we are making administrative arrangements to apply the stock slaughter scheme to all those farmers who require it, without restricting it merely to areas within local government boundaries.

WINE STORAGE

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Agriculture regarding wine storage.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: As honourable members know, there is a surplus of unsold red table wine from the 1977 and earlier harvests, and many South Australian wineries have much higher stocks of wine than usual. This limits the amount of storage space available for the forthcoming harvest, which will start in February. It may be physically impossible for South Australian wineries to accept all the grapes from the 1978 harvest, irrespective of either the wishes of wineries to take them or their ability to pay for them. Will the Minister say whether he believes that such a shortage is likely to occur? If so, will the Government consider placing orders for stainless steel or cement wine-storage tanks, which the Government could own and place in compounds in wine-making centres? As the need arises, the Government could lease them to local wineries, or it could store the wines which, in years of crisis, it might feel compelled to purchase in order to save small grapegrowers from bankruptcy.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It is extremely difficult at this stage to predict accurately the harvest for the coming year, especially in view of the dry conditions applying throughout the non-irrigated grapegrowing areas. However, in the next few weeks we hope to be able to get some predictions on the coming harvest and the tonnages available. Several Riverland co-operatives have been examining in detail this matter raised by the honourable member and have submitted proposals to the Government. Those proposals have been submitted not to me but to the Economic Development Department, which is currently studying the feasibility of extra storage facilities for Riverland co-operatives.

I believe the scheme is based on a new process of storing the must in sulphur form and desulphuring it when required, so that flexibility is retained in relation to the final product.

If it is turned into wine or spirit, the market for that commodity may not be available in subsequent years but, if it is stored in must form it can be fermented and later used in several ways.

NORTHERN TRANSPORT

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister, representing the Minister of Transport, in relation to two matters: the Crystal Brook to Adelaide rail standardisation programme and the Stuart Highway.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I refer to *Hansard* of October 27, 1977 (page 522), when the Hon. Mr. Whyte, speaking on the Appropriation Bill, stated:

What is the State Government doing about two extremely important projects for which Commonwealth finance is available? Ever since the present State Government has been in office, it has had Commonwealth money available to it for standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway, but instead of using that it has allowed the cost of that line to escalate from \$47 000 000 to about \$126 000 000.

It allows time to go on and on without making any attempt to commence the standardisation of that line. Employment would be provided for many people and money could come from the Commonwealth Government, with no strings attached. The same position applies to the Stuart Highway. A project costing millions of dollars is waiting. Environment studies and other studies are still being done. Money has been made available in the past five years to commence the standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway line, but it has been held up because Party politics have been played by the Labor Government in South Australia.

This also applies to the Stuart Highway. The route determined for the highway is well known and all the necessary studies have been made. Regardless of what route is decided on, the Government knows that the road will go at least as far as Woomera, yet it leaves people driving over one of the most dreadful stretches of road in Australia. Likewise, regarding drought relief money, the Minister of Agriculture has made several statements. I believe that he is taking an interest in the matter, but why should there be a delay in spending the money when it is available, with no strings attached?

On November 4, 1977, about a week after that statement was made, the following report, headed "Virgo: Road funds will be scarcer", appeared in the *Advertiser*:

South Australia had never faced such a shortage of funds for road construction and maintenance, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday. "And I predict the shortage will get progressively worse before it gets better", he said at the opening of the Truck Show at the Wayville Showground.

"Extensions and improvements to the State's road network have gone ahead at quite an impressive pace over the past few years, despite an uncertain and adverse economic climate", Mr. Virgo said. It was "sad" Federal Government money to continue the rate of progress was no longer being made available, he said.

The fate of the Stuart Highway (north to Alice Springs) rested with such a money shortage. The money received for national highways this financial year already was committed to upgrading other national highways in South Australia. Mr. Virgo said that as these roads carried more trucks and tourist

traffic than the Sturt Highway, he was not prepared to withdraw funds from them—

I think they mean the Stuart Highway—

“As a result, work on the Stuart Highway can and will only commence when a special allocation of funds—over and above the State’s normal road funding allocation—is provided out of Canberra”, he said. Already, the States had had to put up a big battle to get the funds at present being received, he said. Had South Australia received the amount the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads had recommended for this financial year, reconstruction of the Stuart Highway would have started.

Mr. Virgo said the motoring public, including the road transport industry, was being “bled” to fund other commitments, because road grants did not compare with fuel tax receipts. South Australia had received from the 1975-76 financial year only 5.6 per cent of fuel tax funds, despite contributing about 9 per cent.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte has deliberately confused himself, or he has deliberately misled this Parliament.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member cannot answer his own question.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I think it is only fair. The Hon. Mr. Whyte gets away with a lot in this Chamber. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris ought to watch him. Will the Minister ascertain the validity or otherwise of the statements made in *Hansard* by the Hon. Mr. Whyte?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member’s question to my colleague the Minister of Transport and bring down a suitable reply.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Minister representing the Attorney-General, on the subject of child pornography.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It has been reported to me that the Attorney-General has told deputations concerned with the question of child pornography that an opinion sought by the Government from the Solicitor-General states that the Bill introduced by the Hon. Mr. John Burdett would make it more difficult to obtain a conviction in relation to child pornography than if the Bill were not passed. That was a report made to me, and it may or may not be accurate. Has the Government sought an opinion from the Solicitor-General on the Hon. Mr. Burdett’s Bill? If so, will the Government table that opinion so that honourable members may be able to discuss the Hon. Mr. Burdett’s Bill with the advantage of that opinion?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am sure that the Leader is aware that sometimes reports received from outside bodies are not always accurate. As I do not know what is the situation in this regard, I shall refer the question to my colleague.

MEMBERS’ FINANCIAL INTEREST

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave, prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Chief Secretary, to make a statement on members of Parliament having a pecuniary interest in businesses.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No doubt honourable members will have read the front page of this morning’s *Advertiser* regarding the Federal Treasurer (temporarily

—but he must still be referred to as the Treasurer—the member for Flinders, Mr. Phillip Lynch).

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: He’s crook.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I agree—crook.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He can’t criticise another member of Parliament like that.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I never did.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You did. You said the Federal Treasurer was a crook, agreeing with the member behind you.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I said I agreed today—

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Get your facts right.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster, as I understood him, assented to the idea that the Hon. Mr. Lynch—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: He is having his gallstones out; a budding Minister of Health taking points of order. I will deal with him in a moment.

The PRESIDENT: We do not want to get involved in double meanings.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What double meanings? The man is crook. It’s on the front page of the *Advertiser*. It must be true.

The PRESIDENT: It would be more appropriate, if the Hon. Mr. Foster wants to refer to the illness of Mr. Lynch, to say that he is ill.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Mr. Lynch has a mental indisposition. He has suffered from that for many years.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I do not think one should abuse one’s health.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Question!

The PRESIDENT: “Question” has been called. The honourable member will ask his question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question relates to an article in the *Advertiser* this morning. The fellow who called “Question” has his head buried in the evening newspaper. I will deal with that on a point of order after I have asked my question. Has the Minister seen reports in the Adelaide *Advertiser* this morning referring to business interests and somewhat shady transactions—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must not comment or give opinions.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: —involving the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Lynch? Does Mr. Lynch or any member of his family, including his wife, still own and make profits from unemployment agencies operating throughout Victoria; and can the Minister say whether or not the so-called honourable gentleman, Mr. Lynch, has an interest, as expressed in the Adelaide *Advertiser* this morning, in companies in Victoria, which are the subject of an inquiry into shonky land deals in that State? Further, are any companies of a similar name or character owned by this person operating in South Australia? Finally, when can this Chamber expect responsible legislation to be introduced, as outlined by the Premier in his recent State election campaign policy speech, providing that members of Parliament should not skulk forever under a false privilege, and forcing them to disclose their direct business interests prior to nominating for public office as Parliamentarians?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I rule out of order all those parts of the question which do not deal with any matter concerning South Australia. Parts of the question were relevant to South Australia.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. Is it fair that the President should interpose with a form of false ruling in order to abort any explanation given before a

Minister can reply? As a custodian of Standing Orders in this place, your actions in this regard, Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I said I ruled out of order all parts of the question that did not relate to South Australia, on the ground that it was not within the competence of the Minister representing the Attorney-General to answer such parts of the question. He can answer that part of the question dealing only with the reference to South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I was concerned about what I read in this morning's paper. Personally, I am not aware of any situation wherein the person holding the responsible position of Treasurer in the Commonwealth Government has interests in other bodies that are the subject of an inquiry. However, in relation to interests he may or may not hold in certain companies in South Australia, I will seek a report for the honourable member.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Be careful it's not *sub judice*!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will look at the matter. I am sure that every honourable member who has read this report will support any Bill introduced in this Parliament, presumably this session, which will make it necessary for members to disclose any such interests.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That Question Time be extended to 3.30 p.m.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

To strike out "3.30 p.m." and insert "4 p.m."

I point out that honourable members have many questions to ask, and much time was occupied earlier this afternoon by Ministerial statements.

The PRESIDENT: True, much time was taken up by Ministerial statements.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. While I was asking my question about pecuniary interests, an Opposition member, whom I am forced to refer to as the Leader of the Opposition, called "Question".

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: What is the Standing Order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You are not in the bloody Chair in this place, are you? Nos. 1 and 2 if you want to know.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am waiting patiently to hear the honourable member's point of order.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Tell him to shut up. You are in the Chair, Sir. Get Opposition members under control. I ask you, Sir, whether you ought to accept a call of "Question" from someone who mumbles while reading the newspaper. The call of "Question" sought to abort the leave given to me under Standing Orders. At least the Leader of the Opposition should have had the common courtesy to rise when he made his call.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is the prerogative of any honourable member to call "Question", whether he is reading the newspaper or standing on his head.

RICE STRAW

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

Agriculture about the possible use of imported rice straw for stock fodder.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: An article in yesterday's *Australian* states:

The joint ventures announced as possible, but not actual, goers are the manufacture of industrial footwear, the production of hardboards and, as a *piece de resistance* a \$28 500 000 plan to convert rice straw into high protein animal feed.

I realise that there is a possibility of treating straw of any nature for stock fodder. Considering the visibly depressed prices for cattle, can the Minister predict whether stock fattened with rice straw will be more saleable than stock fattened with locally produced pastures? Can he tell us the safeguards necessarily required to ensure that there is no possibility of importing exotic diseases, undesirable insects, or undesirable weeds? Was this matter fully discussed with the South Australian Agriculture Department prior to the Premier's negotiating to import 2 000 000 tonnes of rice straw?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Like many reports appearing in the *Australian*, this report has taken some licence with what the Premier actually said. The Premier was talking about a feasibility study.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He has been doing that for a long time.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: One of the projects that the Premier has been discussing has been the question of utilising rice straw available in the North Malaysian State of Kedah.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order. The Minister will continue his reply to the question.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The processing of rice straw into a high-protein concentrated feed for livestock is one of the ways of utilising the resources in that area. It would not be an economic proposition in connection with cattle, but the major utilisation in South Australia would be not for cattle but for intensive feeding; for example, the feeding of pigs and poultry, where it is difficult to get enough high-protein feed to supplement their diets of wheat and barley. The question that the feasibility study will have to resolve is whether the protein content of the rice straw can be lifted. There have been considerable discussions about this matter, and methods have been developed, particularly in America, of raising the protein content.

PRAWN FISHING

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Fisheries about prawn fishing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: There has been considerable controversy about just who is managing the prawn fishery in Investigator Strait in South Australia. I am told that, while the State controls the fishery in State waters, a recent majority High Court decision has given the Commonwealth authority over a portion of the strait waters.

This has led to a great deal of confusion in the minds of South Australian prawn fishermen over just which authority calls the tune. These fishermen have been working with the South Australian Government to establish and maintain management policies over their industry that have come to be regarded as the best in Australia. However, because of this territorial dispute

with the Commonwealth (which has very different views about the management of this fishery), this State industry seems to be under some threat.

The most recent move in this conflict came last Thursday when an announcement in the *Advertiser* by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry said that eight authorities would be issued for Investigator Strait. Prawn fishermen, alarmed at this news, are now irate after discovering that one of the new authorities will go to the operator of a 90ft. prawn boat. This length is far beyond the maximum permitted in this State and will mean a tremendous advantage for the new authority holder over our established prawn fishermen, who operate in boats varying from 35ft. to about 50ft.

This matter is a very serious one indeed, and I ask the Minister for Fisheries to tell the Council: (a) was the South Australian Government consulted about this latest move by the Minister for Primary Industry; (b) is a 90ft. prawn boat to be permitted to trawl in this fishery; (c) what are the implications for the South Australian prawn industry of this apparent unilateral action by the Commonwealth; and (d) what does the Minister intend doing about it?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: In reply to the honourable member's first question, I say clearly and categorically that the South Australian Government was not consulted by the Federal Minister on this move, in spite of what has been said to the contrary. It seems to me a funny system of consultation when the Federal Government sends us a few papers and says the South Australian Government has been consulted. Certainly, we have not had anything to do with the selection of fishermen, and particularly anyone with a 90ft. boat to be used in that strait. Most of the fishermen are operating with smaller boats, about half the size of this one, but we now see larger ones operating in this fishery. It is a serious situation when it is said that agreement has been reached at meetings with the Commonwealth when no agreement has in fact been reached; and there has been no agreement in this situation. That makes the whole management of this important resource most difficult. The situation that the South Australian Government has put forward on a number of occasions—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I thought the Federal Government was against centralism.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It is strange that the Federal Government wants to become involved in this small South Australian prawn fishery, when the sensible thing would be to delegate its powers in this State and not try to administer the scheme from Canberra. It is contradictory to have one approach in public statements on the new federalism and another approach when it comes down to the nitty-gritty of the situation.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Did you say you had some correspondence?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I was informed by telex after I had heard the announcement on A.B.C. radio. I certainly intend to take up this matter at the Australian Fishing Industry Council meeting next year and will take it up more broadly than dealing merely with the Investigator Strait fishery. It is important that this whole matter of shore-based isolated fisheries in Australia be resolved once and for all; we cannot have uncertainty surrounding each fishery in each State. I am aware that every other State is also having its problems and wants to resolve the whole matter of State-Federal administrative arrangements once and for all, and establish a clear pattern to be used for future fisheries.

BLUE TONGUE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture about blue tongue.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I listened with interest to the answer the Minister gave to a question by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins earlier this afternoon on the vexing problem of the possibility of blue tongue disease spreading into South Australia. I notice that in today's *Advertiser* there is an article about a gaggle of magpie geese being brought to Adelaide from the Northern Territory, apparently because of an over-population of them there, with the idea of sending them to Bool Lagoon in the South-East. When I read that article, it made me wonder whether there is any possibility of the spread of blue tongue infection by that migration. I should appreciate the Minister's comments on that point. People returning to Australia from visiting overseas, and particularly South-East Asian countries, know it has always been the prerogative of Australian quarantine authorities to quarantine footwear. Is it the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to quarantine passengers coming south from the Northern Territory, possibly to help overcome this blue tongue problem?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will check the honourable member's question, but it is my understanding that blue tongue would not be transmitted by birds. However, I will check on that. Insects are certainly a problem, as they seem to be the major carrier of the virus between the animals concerned. Of course, the virus affects sheep, but it can be carried by other animals, too. One of the major problems yet to be solved is what animals, if any, could be passive carriers of the virus.

The other question concerns the carriage of the virus by soil. Again, I think it would be unlikely that this would be happening, but some viruses are carried in this way. An inspection of footwear is made in order to detect other exotic animal diseases. I draw attention to what happens in Britain, where a number of foot and mouth disease outbreaks occur, as well as outbreaks of other viruses. Millions of people and vehicles are crossing the Channel every year to and from Europe, but none of the foot and mouth outbreaks in Britain has been traced to this cause. Foot and mouth disease and blue tongue are viruses of a similar nature. I think it would be unlikely that blue tongue was transmitted in that way, but I will check it out.

TALENT COACHING SCHEME

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. I understand a talent coaching scheme for juniors has been conducted by the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department over the past couple of years. Could the Minister tell the Council how successful it has been so far and what are the plans for any future conduct of this scheme?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: A series of pilot coaching programmes was offered to sporting associations in 1976 and 1977. The pilot programme aimed to evaluate several aspects in talent development and finally made it possible to introduce the Junior Talent Coaching Scheme, available on application to sporting associations with an efficient selection system and suitably qualified coaches.

Courses: A total of 18 sports participated in the pilot programmes of 10-week duration in three series: (1) squash, hockey, soccer, badminton, volleyball; (2) fencing, water polo, rowing, tennis, softball, baseball; (3) archery, athletics, lacrosse, netball, cycling, gymnas-

tics, squash, fencing. The total enrolment to all programmes was 397 juniors in the under-16 age group.

Coaches: Leading coaches supervised all pilot courses and the standard of coaching left nothing to be desired. The approach was good, although in some sports the standard of participants varied.

Participants: As already mentioned, the performance level of those enrolled in some courses varied considerably. Obviously, the present system of selection is not entirely satisfactory but there is little that can be done to improve it until talent identification based on physiological and psychological tests can be introduced.

Full scheme: To further the aims of the Junior Sports Coaching Scheme. A full scheme of talent coaching, offering 40-session courses, is planned as from August 1, 1978, on the following conditions: South Australian Sporting Association members registered with the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport are eligible; the courses to be held over 20 weeks, twice a week, with each session lasting 1½ hours to 2 hours. The department will contract two qualified coaches to conduct the courses. The Sporting Association is responsible for: (a) an efficient and acceptable selection system of talented candidates under 17 years of age; (b) availability of equipment required for coaching; and (c) an acceptable follow-on programme to assure the continuation of talent development. At the moment, courses have been started for canoeing, cycling, badminton and athletics, with a total of 92 youngsters involved. Tennis is scheduled to begin in January, followed by volleyball in March.

SHOPPING HOURS ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, a reply to my recent question regarding the cost of the Royal Commission into Shopping Hours?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague reports that the costs of Royal Commissions are met by the Premier's Department. Up until October 19, 1977, the expenditure for the Royal Commission into Shopping Hours was \$43 180. This amount includes the salaries of the Royal Commissioner, the Secretary to the Commission, and clerical and typing staff when engaged on Commission work. It also includes the fee paid to the counsel assisting the Commission, as well as expenses necessarily incurred by the Commission in travelling interstate to obtain first-hand information on the situation in other States.

BANKRUPTCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, a question regarding bankruptcy of businesses and unemployment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Having looked through the library today, I found a copy of the policy speech delivered by Mr. Malcolm Fraser on November 25, 1975. On page 6 thereof, he said the following:

We will also introduce a number of new measures to expand investment, create jobs and increase revenue—measures which are essential if we are to get rid of the deficit. He later continued:

Only under a Liberal-National Country Party Government will there be a return to business confidence. Only under a

Liberal-National Country Party Government will there be jobs for all who want to work.

For eight hours on the weekend I was letter-boxing and door-knocking in the O'Sullivan Beach area, where most of the people I met were concerned about small businesses going broke and unemployment. They were the two main topics that the people in that area were talking about, although they did not need much encouragement from me. I suppose Murray Hill was at the races on the weekend, while I was working for my Party. I am not commenting on what Malcolm Fraser has to say, because all honourable members know what I think of him. However, the people in that area were concerned with unemployment, and the Social Democrats, who seem to be attracting a certain number of votes from the Liberal Party, have come out openly regarding small and big businesses going broke and about unemployment.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Do you mean the Australian Democrats?

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: That is so. Mr. Chipp was reported on television recently as saying that Fraser is a hopeless administrator and that, in fact, since he has been Prime Minister, unemployment has risen by two-thirds. He also said that the demise of small businesses has increased by thousands more than occurred under the Federal Labor Government. I am not willing to take Mr. Chipp's word for that, although certainly this has happened to hundreds of such businesses, as the South Australian public ought to know. Before the 1975 election, we saw it stated every day in the *Advertiser*, the *Australian* and the *News* that small businesses were going broke because of Labor.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is time that the honourable member asked his question.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Very well. How many businesses (and I do not say "small businesses" because I mean all businesses) have gone bankrupt since the Fraser Government came into office in 1975, and how many of those involved joined the unemployed ranks since Mr. Fraser, in his policy speech delivered on November 27, 1975, said "Only under a Liberal and National Country Party Government will there be jobs for all who want to work"?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We must all be concerned at the position obtaining today and because people took notice of what the present Prime Minister said in 1975.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They'll take notice of him again, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course they will, and they will throw him out.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not think it is appropriate for the Minister to get involved in a political issue. Surely he can say whether or not he will obtain the information.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I was about to do that. However, you, Sir, and your Party must be concerned that Mr. Fraser has not honoured his election promises and that things are now a damn sight worse than they were previously. I will seek the information for the honourable member.

URANIUM MINING

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, regarding the mining of uranium.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I refer to a report in today's *Advertiser* in which the Attorney-General made a number

of statements about uranium mining. He appeared, in the reported statements, to express opposition to uranium mining in any circumstances. He also spoke of preventing advertisements by uranium producers. Does the Government support the Attorney-General's reported statements?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government's stand on this matter is clear: it will not support uranium mining until positive safeguards are available.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Do you support the Attorney-General's statement?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Tut, tut. The honourable member asked me to refer his question to the Premier, which I will do. However, in the meantime I do not want the honourable member to lose sight of the Labor Party's policy on this matter: it will not agree to uranium mining until adequate safeguards are available.

UTAH DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question. In order to ensure that honourable members opposite do not object, I direct the question to the Minister of Health, who represents the Premier, Treasurer, Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Deputy Premier, Minister of Works, Minister for the Environment, Minister of Labour and Industry, Attorney-General, Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, and Chief Secretary, in another place.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's me!

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member addressing the question to the Minister of Health in all his capacities?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No. Previously, I mentioned the Chief Secretary. For the benefit of dumbcluck Hill, the Minister of Health does represent the Chief Secretary. Mr. President, I sought leave to make a statement. I take it that leave has been granted?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What's the subject matter?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, what is the subject matter of the honourable member's question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Are you responding to interjections, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Hill reminded me that the honourable member had not referred to the subject matter of the question. What is the subject matter?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is about a company named Utah.

The PRESIDENT: In granting leave, I hope that the honourable member will ask a question that is within the sphere of the portfolio of the Minister who must answer it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: He's the lot.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not aware that Utah has anything to do with South Australia at the moment.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: My word it has: mining leases.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Utah Development Company has a stranglehold, in part, on all mining interests in the Commonwealth. I should have thought that you, Sir, would have informed yourself adequately on that had you watched the fine Australian Broadcasting Commission programme *Four Corners* a couple of weeks ago. There was another programme last Saturday evening that will be the subject of a rescreening in this building tomorrow evening. So, honourable members should keep their eyes peeled for the advertisements regarding that.

One of the most despicable and deplorable acts that I have ever seen undertaken was confirmed on Saturday morning with a full-page advertisement that appeared in

the *Advertiser* and, I understand, in a principal paper in every capital city in Australia. It was a suggested written apology in response to a dishonest demand on the part of Utah Development Company against the A.B.C. programme that was televised on the previous Saturday evening, wherein, in my opinion, that company indulged in one of the most blatant cases—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member knows that he cannot go on expressing his opinions.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I did not necessarily say that it was my opinion. For goodness sake, let me finish. It might well be the opinion of a majority of members in this Council that this was a form of white-collar crime when this company demanded that an apology be given and a retraction made on an honest and straightforward programme. It was at the behest of one Anthony, the Deputy Prime Minister of this country. It was a most despicable act on the part of that gentleman.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: What are you talking about?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am talking about the Utah company's dishonest demand for an apology. I commend the A.B.C. for not bowing to the demand of this unscrupulous company, and I ask the Minister of Health, representing the Premier, whether he will request the Premier to comment on behalf of all the citizens of South Australia on the actions of Utah in trying to deny the people of Australia information on that company's stranglehold activities in Australia, particularly in Queensland.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I certainly will refer the matter to my colleague, and I appreciate the concern that the honourable member has shown.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: During the debate on the Appropriation Bill, I asked a question concerning the item in the Premier's Department line referring to publicity and design services. I pointed out that no money had been appropriated last year for this item, yet the Government spent \$56 843, and this year the Government was seeking approval for expenditure of \$250 000. I asked the Minister whether he could get more information about this item. I understand that he now has a reply.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The \$250 000 proposed for 1977-78 against the item "Charges for Publicity and Design Services" is to cover requirements for 12 months, while the actual expenditure of \$56 843 for 1976-77 covered a three-month period only. The 1977-78 provision is to allow for an expected increase in the cost and volume of publicity-type work to be placed with outside contractors (including the Government Printer) by Publicity and Design Services, Premier's Department, on behalf of clients, namely, Government departments and statutory authorities. All expenditure incurred in this regard will be compensated under revenue from income received from the clients who are recharged for the cost of the total work performed.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BOARD

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Minister of Health whether he has a reply to the question I asked in relation to the Classification of Publications Board.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The following figures show the total cost of the Classification of Publications Board in South Australia:

	Proposed	Actual	
	\$	\$	
1974-75	8 200	7 216	
1975-76	7 000	6 095	
1976-77	6 500	5 141	
1977-78	5 000	971	(3 months)
Total cost to date over 3¼ years		\$19 423	

This covers advertisement and listing costs plus fees.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my question about the Land and Business Agents Act?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The regulations under the Real Property Act which govern solicitors' and brokers' charges fix a fee for all searches, perusal of documents and inquiries relating to the matter. It is considered that the fee laid down is to cover the cost of the expertise and time involved on searching, perusing and inquiring and that the fees payable to any authorities to enable these searches to be conducted are disbursements made by the solicitors or brokers on behalf of their clients. Such search fees or other disbursements incurred on behalf of a client in carrying out a conveyancing service are recoverable separately from the client, quite apart from the fee laid down by the regulations referred to.

FESTIVAL CENTRE PLAZA

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I understand that the Minister of Health has a reply to the question I asked regarding the Festival Centre plaza.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Festival Centre architects have advised that (a) the purpose of the work being undertaken is to remove sections of the topping above expansion joints, where the waterproof membrane is suspected of being defective, and (b) the work is being carried out under the warranty provisions of the building contract.

PUBLIC SERVICE PROMOTIONS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my question about Public Service promotions?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The advisability of granting public servants the right to appeal against appointments from outside the service has been considered by the Government on a number of occasions. Whilst the unpopularity of some outside appointments can readily be understood, there are practical difficulties in granting the right of appeal. This question was fully discussed with the Public Service Association when the Public Service Act was being drafted. A public servant who is already employed in the Public Service and who appeals against an appointment from outside the service creates tremendous difficulty for the proposed appointee because of relationships with his present employer. The employer cannot be expected to sympathetically view an employee who is about to leave his service for greener pastures. Incidentally, they would not know for certain whether the proposed appointment would take place because of the pending appeal. It is for this reason that we have written a preference clause into the Public Service Act, and the Public Service Board has the responsibility of

ensuring that, before a person who is not in the employ of the Government of the State can be appointed, the board must be of the opinion that he or she has sufficient superiority of qualifications and aptitude for the position to be filled to justify his or her appointment in preference to any Public Service officer who is available for the position.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is an insult to public servants.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You are an insult to this Council. You have not been elected any more democratically than have the rest of us, and you are an insult as much as anyone else.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What is this remark about?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You represent a small percentage of the people, and we have received more than a 50 per cent vote.

MAGISTRATES COURTS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my question about the magistrates courts?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Public Service Board and the Government are currently considering a report which deals with, amongst other things, the staffing of the Magistracy. The report was made by a panel consisting of Mr. Justice Walters, Commissioner Stevens (now Judge Stevens), Mr. Cramond, S.M., and Mr. Manos, S.M. The panel was assisted by a working party comprising Mr. E. McLaughlin and Mr. R. Geddes (that is not our friend opposite). The recommendations, which are currently being considered, include a recommendation that the staff of the Magistracy be reduced by two. It would seem, therefore, that the current work load of magistrates is not too heavy. As soon as the findings of the report have been approved by the Public Service Board, the Premier has indicated that he is prepared to make the report a public document by tabling it in the House.

INTER-GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: During the debate on the Appropriation Bill, I asked a question about the provision in the Premier's Department line for the Advisory Council for Inter-Government Relations. Last year, \$24 500 was provided but only \$238 was spent. This year, the Government was seeking an allocation of \$24 000. Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Advisory Council for Inter-Government Relations was set up at the initiative of the present Federal Government. It consists of representatives of all levels of Government in Australia (Federal, State and local) as well as a number of citizen representatives. The Commonwealth legislation setting up the advisory council was not presented to the Federal Parliament until late September, 1976. Following the passage of this legislation the first meeting of the advisory council was not held until June, 1977. Since this was towards the end of the financial year and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet was standing in as the secretariat of the advisory council until the council set up its own secretariat, the participants were not asked to provide the agreed share of the costs until the present financial year. The amount stated in the line is to cover this State's contribution to the costs of the advisory council and the costs of the participation of the State Government's representative on the advisory council, who is currently the Chief Secretary and Minister Assisting the Premier.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport concerning the reply given a few moments ago about the charges for publicity and design services that will channel through the Premier's Department on behalf of Government departments and other statutory authorities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As I interpret the reply, it seems that the Publicity and Design Services Section of the Premier's Department will advertise and promote publicity on behalf of Government departments and statutory authorities. It is then to spend some of this \$250 000 and, as the Minister said in his reply, that branch of the department will recoup the cost afterwards from the various client departments. Therefore, it is a fact that the Premier's Department is going to handle publicity on behalf of other Government departments.

I presume that would include (and I read some time ago that that was the case) the Tourist Bureau. What does the Minister and his senior officers think about this change in publicity planning under which the Premier's Department will handle publicity, as in future publicity will not be handled by the Tourist Bureau as has been the case in the past?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member has got the bull by the tail, because the Tourist Bureau has its own staff, who design and formulate publicity. They do it in conjunction with the Premier's Department. Mr. Joseph Parks has been appointed Publicity Officer and works in close co-operation with the Tourist Bureau. I assure the honourable member that any publicity handled by the Premier's Department under the auspices of Mr. Parks is put up initially by Tourist Bureau personnel. I assure the honourable member, too, that that is not done without the knowledge of the Tourist Bureau.

In fact, not all publicity will go through the Premier's Department, because we have our own publicity arrangements within the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. Honourable members know of the information given and the publicity provided through *Sports Lines*. That publication is not produced by the Premier's Department but by the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. That is a well patronised publication. Regarding the Tourist Bureau, I can assure the honourable member that all the matters dealt with by officers of the bureau and the Director of the bureau, who has come up with many good ideas, were liaised through Mr. Parks, the Publicity Officer of the Premier's Department.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That the time for asking questions be extended by a further five minutes.

Motion carried.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAYMENTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked on October 27, 1977, during the Appropriation Bill debate in relation to terminal leave payments in the Premier's Department?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The line "Terminal leave payments" under the category "Salaries and wages and related payments for the Premier's Department", is required to provide for the payment of pro rata long service leave as a lump sum to Government officers, who

are entitled to such payments on resignation or retirement. The final payment made to Mr. J. Templeton, formerly of the Premier's Department did not include any long service leave entitlements. The \$34 000 proposed on the 1977-78 estimates against the line "Terminal leave payments", Premier's Department, is based on estimated terminal leave payments for the following officers:

	\$
T. KEIG (Immigration)	5 499-30
A. GRANT (Publicity and Design Services) . . .	4 303-80
A. N. DEANE (Agent-General in England) . .	23 896-00
	33 699-10

WHYALLA CULTURAL CENTRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question concerning the Whyalla Cultural Centre?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At this time it is hoped that the Whyalla Regional Cultural Centre Trust will be proclaimed during January, 1978, followed immediately by the appointment of trustees. Under the provisions of the Regional Cultural Centres Act, 1976, the trustees will assume responsibility for the investigation of cultural needs for that community and for decisions about the content and location of a future cultural centre to be erected in Whyalla.

DRUGS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the supply of drugs from out-patient departments in hospitals?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am aware of the situation relating to the supply of medication to out-patients who are treated at Government teaching hospitals, and the Health Commission has recently surveyed current out-patient issues. While I am concerned at the statements made, I am also aware that there are many complex issues which influence current practices at the public hospitals, including the welfare and convenience of patients. However, to obtain an accurate assessment of the situation, I have directed the Hospitals Department to conduct a comprehensive review of all aspects of the issue of drugs to out-patients at the metropolitan teaching hospitals.

PORT PIRIE CULTURAL CENTRE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question in relation to the Port Pirie Cultural Centre?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At this time it is intended to proclaim a Pirie Regional Cultural Centre Trust during January, 1978, to be followed immediately by the appointment of trustees. Under the provisions of the Regional Cultural Centres Act, 1976, trustees will assume responsibility for investigating the community's cultural needs and for establishment of a possible cultural centre based in Port Pirie.

Section 13 of the Act defines the powers of the trust to borrow money on such terms and conditions as the Treasurer approves. It is hoped that the trust will be able to borrow an initial sum of \$1 000 000 during the 1977-78 financial period and that further borrowings may be

approved as needed in subsequent periods. These funds will be used towards capital costs of building programmes. Funds which are not immediately required will be invested to earn interest.

FUEL COSTS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of October 18, 1977, in relation to fuel costs?

The Hon T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Transport has informed me that he understood that the Federal Minister for Transport intended to raise this matter at a meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council which was held on October 14, 1977. However, the matter was not brought forward for discussion. The South Australian Government has not made any overtures to the Federal Government. I understand that the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce has made representations to the Federal Government.

SCHOOL RAIL PASS

The Hon R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I received a letter from Mr. Tom Billingsley of Marino asking that the Minister of Education reconsider his case concerning a school rail pass. I have written to the Education Department about it. I received a reply saying that the department could not act on this matter because of the policy of the Government. The child of the family goes to the Mawson High School because the only direct rail route is from their area to the high school. Mawson High School is not the nearest high school. The nearest one would entail a long walk over busy roads, with no direct transport to take the child to the high school. The family cannot get a free rail pass for their child because the child is not attending the nearest high school. There appears to be an anomaly here. I ask the Minister to take up this question with his colleague, the Minister of Education, as the child is going to high school by the only form of transport available.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Education and bring down a reply.

HEALTH EXPENDITURE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Recently I asked the Minister of Health if he could justify his claim that 21 per cent of the State's Budget was involved in health expenditure. Has he the details of that expenditure?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I referred to the spending as 21 per cent of the Budget. The honourable member queried that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You were quite right.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I was.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I always give credit where credit is due.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On page 4 of the Estimates of Expenditure for 1977-78 the following figures are detailed:

Voted for 1976-77
Minister of Health—\$237.6 million
Total—\$1 117 million

The figure of 21.3 per cent was obtained by applying the following simple percentage calculation:

$$\frac{237.6}{1\ 117} \times 100 = 21.3 \text{ per cent}$$

The same figure of 21.3 per cent is arrived at if the "actual payments" figures for 1976-77 are used. In 1976-77 actual health expenditure was \$252 216 579 and actual total Government expenditure was \$1 183 179 890.

SHOP TRADING HOURS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 666.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): Last Thursday I spoke briefly, immediately after the second reading speech had been delivered because I was concerned with quite inaccurate references in that speech to the history of the shopping hours debate in South Australia. I believed that those points should be immediately rebutted. I now conclude what I want to say on the Bill. The question of shopping hours has been before this Chamber on a number of occasions. I want to speak about areas of the Bill where I feel improvements can be made by amendment, and to make my position clear in relation to some of those amendments. I have never been absolutely convinced of the necessity for late night trading, because of increased costs in this State.

On the other hand, if we are to have late night trading, then it must be fair to all sections of the community. There must be no discrimination; there must be no advantage for one compared to another, and there must be little upset to the existing trading positions that have been established over the years. I think that is a fair and reasonable manner in which to look at this Bill.

The Bill considers three separate shopping areas: the metropolitan area (the electoral definition of the metropolitan area, as far as I can see); the central shopping district, which is the hundred of Adelaide; and proclaimed shopping districts in country areas. It is to the last matter that I now direct the attention of the Council. The Bill picks up the existing position in relation to proclaimed shopping districts, where a district council or local government body may, by instrument in writing under its common seal, apply to the Minister that the whole or part of the area of the council be declared to be a proclaimed shopping district.

Under that provision, over very many years there has been a large number of districts and towns that are proclaimed shopping districts, to which the Early Closing Act applies. There is, of course, one wellknown district, Whyalla, where it does not apply. It has never been a proclaimed shopping district. Trading in Whyalla is free, as far as hours are concerned. However, an application in respect of an area shall not be made unless the proposed proclaimed shopping district comprises a municipality or an area of not less than 90 square kilometres, nor shall that application be made unless council carries the resolution by not less than two-thirds of the total members of the council.

Also, the council must advise the Minister of the views of persons resident in its area and of the shopkeepers and shop assistants affected by the application, wherever they are resident. If the Minister refuses, no further application can be made for three years. In looking at these matters, I make these points to the Government. First, I do not see

any reason why the Minister, in refusing permission for a proclaimed shopping district, should deny the right of that local government area to make another application in 12 months time, if necessary. I do not see why the Minister's decision should commit a local government area to three years of putting up with that decision. Secondly, I cannot see any reason why, in a matter such as this, a two-thirds majority of the council is required. The Constitution of this State can be altered by a simple majority of the total members of the Legislative Council, with the vote of the President yet, when it comes to a change in shopping hours in areas outside the metropolitan area in proclaimed shopping districts, a two-thirds majority is required by the local council to effect that change.

As I understand it, the change can be one of several types. It can be to enlarge, to vary, or to become a proclaimed shopping district, or to move out of a proclaimed shopping district. It seems to me to be almost an overbearing provision that in this matter a council has to achieve a two-thirds majority. It appears to me difficult to justify the right of the Minister to veto an application by a council or a municipality to vary the existing conditions, if it has carried out all the requirements of the Act.

Clause 12 (3) provides that, during the period of daylight saving, shops selling motor vehicles or boats may trade until 9 p.m. each week-day. I cannot find any valid reason for allowing special trading conditions in one industry, as opposed to another. I strongly advocate that the same trading hours should apply to each section of the retail trade.

This argument also applies to the sale of red meat. No honourable member can logically argue for the exclusion of the sale of red meat from late night trading. All other foodstuffs—processed meat, chickens, ducks, pigeons, bacon, vegetables, fruit, bread, pastries, dairy produce, eggs, fish—will be available during late night trading. But red meat, no! The popular song says, "Yes, we have no bananas". That should be changed to "Yes, we have no red meat".

The Government is discriminating in one way by allowing special conditions for shops selling motor vehicles or boats while discriminating in a different way against our main primary industry, by allowing sales of most foodstuffs during late night trading while excluding the sale of fresh meat. Therefore, if there is to be an exclusion of the sale of fresh meat (and I do not agree with that exclusion), at least it should apply to all meats, whether red, white, blue or brindle! There is no justification for having one commodity, red meat, excluded from late night trading.

In surveys done in South Australia, 80 per cent of the people interviewed said that, if there was to be late night trading, they wanted late night trading in meat. That legitimate demand is being denied in this Bill, which provides for late night trading and then proceeds to place as many restrictions as the Government can invent on that basic proposition. The Government considers that, in the metropolitan area but outside the central shopping district, trading should be allowed until 9 p.m. on Thursday nights, but in the central shopping district it should be until 9 p.m. on Friday nights, while in the country it can be until 9 p.m. on either Thursday nights or Friday nights. If we are to open shops on one night a week, the shopkeeper himself should have the right to decide the night when he will open his shop.

Shopkeepers in different areas may prefer different nights for late trading. Market days vary from country town to country town. In some areas, Tuesday night trading may suit the community, while Thursday night trading may suit another community. If we are to have late

night trading there should be no direction to a particular shopkeeper. He should be able to adjust his trading to the needs of his community. In some areas it may be suitable for one supermarket to open on one night and for another supermarket to open on the next night. Even within the framework of trading on Thursday and Friday nights, why not allow discretion between those two nights for the shopkeeper? Why not allow the shopkeeper to serve his customers in the way that they choose?

I ask people to go to the convenience shops at West Beach and O'Halloran Hill on a Saturday afternoon or a Friday night and to see people using those shops. I have petitions signed by Elizabeth residents in relation to the convenience shop in that city. Unfortunately, I cannot present the petitions, but I point out that they oppose the changes in the trading conditions for convenience shops. The petitioners state that they greatly appreciate the flexibility of shopping hours offered by the shop at Elizabeth, and they state that they would like to continue to use the shop in the future.

If people in a particular area want certain types of service, the shopkeeper should be given the right to use as much discretion as possible in meeting their wishes. The Bill provides for a discretion in country areas between Thursday night and Friday night, but in the city and suburbs there is no discretion. The central market area has been traditionally a Friday night trading area for as long as I can remember. There is no question that, in the Victoria Square area, late night trading will be on Friday nights.

It appears to me that Thursday night would be chosen by most people in the State as the night for late trading, with the exception of the central market area. The reason why Thursday night would be so popular is that in most industries nowadays workers are paid on either Wednesday or Thursday. Of course, the central market area would still be used on Friday nights by many people. The arrangement at present provided in the Bill could be something of a disaster.

For that reason, I ask the Government to consider at least a discretion, in regard to late night trading, between Thursday and Friday, so that there can be one late night a week trading and the storekeeper can decide on which particular night he will open. In that area, discretion is a reasonable solution for both the customer and the shopkeeper.

In the survey done of the traders in the Mall, not quite 200 (many of them small traders) came down 80 per cent or more on the side of Thursday night as their late night trading period. There is also the matter that, in long weekends, where the hours during the week can be staggered, the Friday night creates more difficulty than does the Thursday night. Also, as there are no banking facilities on the Saturday morning, the Friday night trading in the whole of the area of Adelaide provides some difficulty with the banking services, as they cannot be utilised until the following Monday morning.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What about a night safe?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was not referring to that; I was referring to the fact that practically every retail business operates on a heavy overdraft at a high rate of interest and, from Friday night shopping, money will not be paid into the bank until the following Monday morning, with a loss of interest. The 12 months period adds considerably to retail industry costs; I will ask the honourable member to examine that question in its reality as far as costs are concerned. With convenience stores, I think we have an absolute shemozzle. When the 1975 amendment went through (the Minister can tell me whether I am wrong) the large delicatessen or the convenience store virtually could not operate. The

Minister at the time in effect gave permission for those stores to continue operating in South Australia. I am informed that the Minister said they could continue operating provided they were not sold, that they did not change ownership. The Commissioner in his report points this out clearly, if the Minister would like to read that report. Then the Minister suddenly changed his mind and said, "Certainly, you can now sell your store and the new operator can continue operating a convenience store over the size of the limit of the 1975 amendment." Indeed, I am informed that the Housing Trust even built for some of these people, erecting stores over the legal limit in the 1975 amendment.

The position here is interesting, where through Government policy and the use of public funds people are allowed to build a store and told they can operate, and then suddenly find the ground cut from underneath their feet by this Bill. I quote one letter dated July 29, 1975, to Mr. R. J. Siviour, Red Owl Foodland, Main South Road, O'Halloran Hill. It reads:

Dear Mr. Siviour, I refer to your letter of May 6, 1975, addressed to the Minister of Labour and Industry in which you advised that because of your age you proposed to relinquish your business at the above address and asked whether permission could be given to your successor to continue trading without any restriction. I have given further consideration to the position of your convenience store and others that were classified as exempted shops in 1973. I have decided to continue registering your shop as an exempted shop irrespective of any change of ownership, provided there is no extension in the size of the shop. Your successor will thus be able to continue trading without any restriction, other than the necessity to lock away at the normal closing times any non-exempt goods which are stocked in the shop. Yours faithfully, L. B. Bowes, Secretary for Labour and Industry.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The Minister at that time was the present Minister.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is right. This store was sold in good faith that these people could continue operating it. Note the words—"Your successor will thus be able to continue trading without any restriction, other than the necessity to lock away at the normal closing times any non-exempt goods which are stocked in the shop". Suddenly, this Bill comes along and these people already have had inspectors from the Labour and Industry Department call on them, measure their shop and tell them that their shop is finished, having earlier received a letter like this from a Government department saying that they will be able to trade in the future without any restriction.

For this whole area of convenience shops in South Australia this Bill has been a total shemuzzle of the Government's own making—nobody else's. After all these guarantees have been given, suddenly this Bill appears and takes away the rights those people were given by guarantee virtually from the department. What is the answer to this question? It is not easy, because some of these convenience stores that have been allowed to operate and have been licensed by the Government are up to 12 000 square feet (approximately 1 150 m²). In the Bill, the size is restricted to 186 m², so already there are existing exempted shops on an area of almost 1 200 m², which, under the Bill, will have to reduce to 186 m², after those people had been given an undertaking by the department that they would be able to continue trading without restriction if they bought the store.

I do not know what the answer to this question is. There are two or three approaches. First, we can say to these stores, "The Government has placed you in this position; you can continue trading into the future but with no more

than 186 m²"; or we can say that the size permitted will be amended in the Bill to the size of the largest one presently operating. I do not think that is a satisfactory answer. Or we can say that these people have a certain time to get out and cut their losses even though some of them have spent up to \$200 000 and families have mortgaged four homes in the family to move into one of these stores. It is not an easy problem to overcome, but this Bill cannot be said to do justice to these people.

On the other hand, I fully appreciate the point that, if we allow total freedom in the future for the development of these sorts of, shall we say, supermarket delicatessens, many small corner delicatessens will have much difficulty maintaining their position. Nevertheless, I again make the point that this problem has been one of the Government's making. The people who are presently involved in these shops have become involved in good faith as a result of the undertakings that were given to them by this Government. It is totally wrong that they should be cast to the wall and told that they will lose vast sums of money, some even their homes, because the Government has not honoured its undertakings.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What's your answer to it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have given some answers. I am saying that I will come to an answer when the Bill goes into Committee. Then, I will move amendments regarding what I think should be done. It is not my intention now to debate amendments that I intend to move in Committee. I am merely saying at this stage that the Bill does not cater for this problem or do justice to these people. The Hon. Mr. Blevins had better bend his mind, as well as everyone else's, to try to find some answer to the Government's attitude regarding these convenience stores, which involve a problem that it has created.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You're the one with all the answers. Let's hear them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, I am not, although I recognise injustice when I see it, and that is something that the Hon. Mr. Blevins cannot say.

The Hon. Anne Levy: The Royal Commissioner even said that these were an injustice themselves.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Does the honourable member then admit that the Government was guilty of an injustice in the first place? Does that follow? If she does, she is saying that the Government acted illegally and unjustly in the first place, and now it is taking unjust action to get itself out of the problem.

As a nation, we spent an enormous sum of money changing to metric measurements, yet legislation is still constrained by the previous attachment to feet and inches. For example, under the Boating Act, one must register a boat that is over 3.048 metres long. I do not know who has a ruler that would measure 3.048 m. However, for honourable members' information, 3.048 m is exactly 10ft. So, all we have said is, "Let us stick to feet and inches, but use metric measurements." What a crazy attitude, when we could stipulate that a boat measuring under 3.5 m was outside the registration length.

Convenience stores can be no larger than 186 m² in area. It is a wonder that a figure of, say, 186.2 m² was not used. Although we are still sticking to the old imperial measurements, we are at the same time expressing them in decimals of a metre. What strange people we are! I said clearly that, apart from the sort of legislative stupidity evident regarding convenience stores, it seemed to me that, because of a decision made by the Minister to allow these stores to operate without restriction, a problem had arisen with this type of store.

The three areas on which I have touched represent the areas in this legislation with which I am mainly concerned.

I hope that, as a result of the amendments to be moved in Committee (I know that other honourable members intend to move amendments), a greater degree of freedom will result, together with a curbing of the bureaucratic power to inhibit the normal demands of the consuming public from being satisfied by those retailers who wish to provide a satisfactory service to the community.

There is one other matter on which I should like to touch. I know that every honourable member is interested in this matter, which I fully support. I do not see any need for shops to close at 6 p.m. on week days and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays. I do not want to deal at length with this matter, although I know that at 11.30 a.m. on Saturday most country towns are dead. Everyone is usually on his way to his sporting fixture, and I cannot see why shop assistants should have to work until 12.30 p.m. or, with the half-hour grace period, 1 p.m., get home, get themselves fed and changed and off to their sporting fixtures. It is not justifiable that this should be inflicted on them.

The same applies to 6 p.m. closing on week nights. I cannot see any reason why we should have legislation taking them through to 6 o'clock or, with a half-hour break, until 6.30 p.m., as a result of which many people might not be leaving their shops until 6.35 p.m. Many of these people (some of whom are working mothers) must get home, and I cannot see any need for these hours. I will therefore support any reduction in them.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You're opposing the Liberal Party's hours. They're for an open go.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This Bill is restrictive. If we are to have restrictions, let us have them so that they are reasonable to the whole community.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The same argument could well be used against Friday night shopping.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It could be used against many things.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You're completely illogical.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not. I made myself perfectly clear when I made my first few remarks on this Bill and, if he cares to look, the honourable member will see what I said then. If shops must close at a certain time, I cannot see why that closing time should not be a reasonable one, thereby giving shop assistants an opportunity to attend to their normal life style. I cannot see why such an amendment should not be supported. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to the Bill which the Government introduced earlier this year and which provided for shopping hours to be set by the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

It is now history that, because of the uncompromising attitude of honourable members opposite, the Bill was laid aside.

That is completely opposite to the truth. For various reasons, which I will not canvass now, there was practically no debate after the report of the conference was made. Otherwise, I would have raised this matter then. When the Minister of Labour and Industry, as Chairman of the conference, opened proceedings, he said that as far as the Government was concerned there would be no compromise. In view of that, who was the one with the uncompromising attitude on that Bill?

I opposed that Bill then because I did not believe that it would lead to extended trading hours. It simply meant that the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission might or might not grant extended trading hours on submissions that might or might not be brought before it. In fact, the Secretary of the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees

Association (Mr. Goldsworthy) made clear that his submission, if that Bill was passed, would be to close shops on Saturday morning, and, far from having an extension of trading hours, we would have an application for a reduction of them. I opposed that concept of altering trading hours.

At least, the Bill before us goes some way towards providing reasonable trading hours in South Australia. I say that it goes only some way because I still believe that these hours should be completely unrestricted. Yesterday, the State Manager of a large Australia-wide chain of stores gave the same view, that trading hours should be unrestricted, and he said that within 10 years these hours would be unrestricted throughout Australia.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What about Saturday afternoon and Sunday?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am stating a personal view that I have made clear to the Council several times. I have never stated otherwise, and I hope that some day there will be completely unrestricted trading hours in Australia, to get us in line with oversea countries. I believe that in that way managers, shop assistants, and consumers will come to a consensus on what is best for all, and in a case like that Parliament will not have to be involved, whereas it has to be involved at present. As long as I am a member of Parliament, I will continue to press for unrestricted hours such as other countries enjoy.

The Government is dodging the issue on this matter. My Bill was defeated in the House of Assembly, and I freely admit that several members of my own Party voted against it. All I can say is that since then most of them have become more enlightened and have supported extended hours. When my Bill was before Parliament, it brought the matter before the people, who started to make their feelings felt. Parliament realised that it had to do something, and a Bill was introduced providing for the matter to be referred to the Industrial Commission, which was a simple case of passing to someone else the responsibility that should be that of Parliament.

I believed then (and I believe it now) that the laying down of trading hours was Parliament's responsibility, not the responsibility of someone outside. Even when my Bill was defeated, the Government still would not face up to its responsibility, and the result of that was the setting up of the Royal Commission. Today, I was pleased to receive a reply to a question I asked about two or three weeks ago about the cost of this Commission. It was my view then (and it is my view now) that the setting up of the Royal Commission was totally unnecessary. To October 19, it has cost the State \$43 180.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You are to blame for that. Why didn't you let the Government put the matter in the hands of the Industrial Commission? You forced the setting up of the Royal Commission.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: We did not. The Government could have made this decision. It could have brought in a Bill similar to the one that it has introduced now. The Government would not face up to its responsibility, and it referred the matter to someone else to make a decision so that the Government could say, "These are the findings of a Royal Commission and we are following what it recommends." The Hon. Mr. Blevins has made clear that he did not want to face up to his responsibility. He wanted someone else to make the decision for him.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I did not say that.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The honourable member says that he wanted the Industrial Commission to do it, or that we forced the Government. All that the Royal Commission has come out with is what I and other members have been saying for a long time. The people had

shown that they wanted extended trading hours, and the Royal Commissioner came down with that finding. I commend the Royal Commissioner for the way in which he investigated this whole complex matter. It was a thorough and comprehensive investigation, but I do not agree with all the recommendations. All the prevarication by the Government has only delayed the introduction of late night shopping in Adelaide or in the whole of South Australia for 12 months.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That is what you, for electoral purposes, wanted to do.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: That is not true. When I introduced my Bill, there was no election in the offing. I will not deal in detail with the report. Those interested in late night shopping can read it and I recommend that they do so, because it is a good report. I want to refer to some aspects involving the fear and misapprehension by the people that are dealt with in the report. The first relates to the increase in prices. It is obvious that extended trading hours, because of penalty payments and so on, must result in some increase in prices, but people have been concerned about the extent of the increase, because much false information or misinformation has been brought forward. The Royal Commissioner stated that it was inevitable that there must be some increase in costs. As he pointed out, any such increase can be due to wages or charges relating to wages. This is where the misunderstandings occurred. The Royal Commissioner states:

Although it is not possible for this tribunal to determine the extent of increased labour costs it recognises the inevitability of an upward movement. In New South Wales and Victoria, where late night shopping one night each week is the vogue, estimates of increased labour costs range from 4 per centum to 10 per centum. An inquiry conducted by the Queensland Industrial Commission is the most recent investigation conducted into the principle of late night shopping in Australia, and because the major portion of its investigation was centred around labour costs I find myself more influenced by their findings than the unsubstantiated estimates from New South Wales and Victoria. The Queensland Commission found that if one late shopping night was permitted there would be an increase to labour costs of between 5 and 6 per centum. Given similar circumstances I think these figures may well be reflected in South Australian awards.

The people were under the impression that the costs of goods for sale would increase by 5 per cent or 6 per cent, when they saw that costs would increase by that amount. Neither the union nor the Retail Traders Association did anything to dispel that belief, although they knew it was totally false. The labour component in costs in retail establishments varies, depending on whether the establishment is a low-labour-intensive one, such as a supermarket or a self-service type of store, or whether it is a store that gives a full service, such as Myers, David Jones, or John Martins.

The Hon. Anne Levy: There is a labour component in supermarket costs.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: They have a higher labour cost in their total costs than do supermarkets. I am saying that proportionately the percentage to labour in such a store would be higher than in a supermarket in regard to costs. Assuming that the percentage of the cost due to labour is about 10 per cent (and from my inquiries it is around that figure), a 6 per cent increase in wages can be added only to that component of the costs directly attributable to wages, that is 10 per cent. The total increase that would obtain is about 0.6 per cent: not 6 per cent as many people have thought. The Commissioner refers to such a case as I have just referred to and he goes on to say:

However, no matter how high the labour content is in the company's costing it is extremely unlikely that a 6 per centum increase in labour costs would amount, at the top end of the scale, to more than a 1½ or 2 per centum increase in the price of the product, and in the lower end of the scale it would be below 1 per centum; indeed it may not involve a cost increase at all.

The whole matter of scare tactics which was indulged in relating to costs is dealt with in the report, and the Commissioner states:

The evidence from Woolworths and Coles indicated for their type of business there would be little if any increase to the consumer. They submitted that the possibility of a labour cost increase of around 5 or 6 per centum would have a minimal affect on their current selling price policies. It has been conceded by the major companies that operate in New South Wales and Victoria that there have been price rises since the introduction of late night shopping, but they claimed that the rises were as a result of equal pay being introduced into the awards covering the shopping industry, plus substantial national wage increases from time to time. They said the late night shopping was not a factor that had any significance on commodity price rises in Sydney or Melbourne.

From this evidence and discussions I have had with a senior officer of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch in order to inform my mind, I am led to the belief that an additional late night of shopping if granted to the metropolitan area of Adelaide should not have a significant impact on current selling prices nor should it have a significant impact on the State's consumer price index.

Next, I refer to the question of the hours worked by shop assistants. This matter was a real red herring drawn across the trail by Mr. Goldsworthy of the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association, and others. When my earlier Bill was before this Council I was accused of wanting shop assistants to work extremely long hours. That was a ridiculous statement: at no time did I ever suggest that I wanted shop assistants to work longer hours. In fact, I said that with roster systems such as those operating in Melbourne and Sydney most shop assistants would enjoy three-day weekends every two or three weeks. Certainly, they would not work longer hours than they were presently working and in most cases they would work shorter hours.

My position has been vindicated completely by the report. I now refer to that section of the report dealing with points raised by the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees Association. Point 2 is headed, "An extension of shop trading hours would mean additional working hours for shop assistants". The first sentence states:

This contention lacks validity.

The statement continues:

At present the majority of shop assistants work 40 hours a week and if extended trading hours are introduced I would not envisage an extension to working hours but there would of necessity be a rearrangement.

The Commissioner refers to the roster systems in New South Wales and Victoria, which are included in the appendices of the report, and he continues:

In each case a shop assistant averages less than 40 hours per week over the full roster cycle and they receive more money than they did under their previous working hours arrangement. To my thinking the hours set forth in the rosters, particularly the New South Wales roster, are far more attractive than the hours shop assistants are working at the moment.

That lays to rest the red herring introduced by Mr. Goldsworthy, who attempted to mislead members of his own association and the public. He failed on both counts.

There will now be additional jobs available, because more casual work will be available for people. Generally, shop assistants will not work longer hours, as in many cases they will enjoy better conditions, whilst more work will be available for other people.

I now refer to two matters about which I disagree with the Commissioner. Both matters were dealt with at length by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and I shall deal with them more briefly. Regarding the first question, the sale of red meat, the report states:

The merchandising of meat differs from general merchandising and I have reached the conclusion that the retail trading of meat must be isolated from my general recommendations regarding extension to shop trading hours.

I cannot agree with that statement. If we are to open up the selling of foodstuffs surely we cannot omit from that extension the basic food item of red meat. One can buy everything else that one needs but then one would have to come out on another day merely to buy meat for the family. Such a situation is ridiculous. If shopping hours are to be extended, let them be extended across the board without one item being excluded.

The whole purpose of widening shopping hours is for the convenience of shoppers, especially people who find it difficult to shop during normal trading hours. I do not accept completely the claim of producers that meat sales will drop if butchers shops are not permitted to open at night. That may be the case, but I am not going to argue the point one way or the other. I doubt whether it has made much difference in either Victoria or New South Wales, where there are restrictions on the sale of meat after hours. I recognise the difficulty in this section of the industry.

Butchers already work long hours and the report states (and I have no reason to doubt the submission made), that butchers working in city and suburban butcher shops work about 46 hours a week and butchers working in supermarkets work about 42 hours a week. Apparently in the meat industry there is no unemployment. In other words, there are no casual butchers available to fill the gap in relation to extra shopping hours. The argument advanced by the Commissioner and the argument advanced to him by the trade is that, if butcher shops open one night a week, the extra hours would have to be worked by people who are already working in the industry and who are already working long hours.

I do not believe that that is a problem to which a solution cannot be found. In considering this matter briefly without giving it much depth of thought I can think of two solutions worthy of some consideration. First is that, on the day of extended shopping hours, the staff in a butcher shop work on a roster. The second solution is to do as supermarkets do; that is, to pre-pack meat for sale after normal shopping hours, so that butchers can work normal hours and, after that, pre-packed meat can be sold by sales staff rather than by trained butchers.

I refuse to believe that there are insurmountable problems in this matter. Parliament, if it believes that shops selling food should be allowed to open at night, should allow shops selling all types of food to be open. It is wrong to make an exception and exclude just one type of shop. I disagree with the Royal Commissioner again, on a question dealt with at length by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the so-called convenience stores. I believe that here the Royal Commissioner exceeded his terms of reference. I cannot find any reference to his being asked to inquire into this area.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: He says he was not.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: As he was not asked to investigate it, he should have made no comment on this question. Here we have a Bill before the Council which sets out to extend trading hours of shops in South Australia. In that respect it is a good Bill, but this same Bill has the effect of reducing the hours of 25 major stores in this city. They are trading with the explicit permission of the Department of Labour and Industry, which means that they are trading with the explicit permission of the Minister. Their stores were purchased or set up on that basis; their economic structure is based on working a seven-day week. They have debts to service. Many will lose substantially if they are forced to close, as required by this legislation. The Commissioner said that they had an unfair advantage over other types of supermarkets. This may be so, but they were given that advantage by the Minister.

As the manager of a large chain to whom I referred earlier said, he is unhappy about the convenience stores because he claims that they have an unfair advantage over his chain. His solution was the opposite of this Bill; there should be no restriction; he should be able to be open and compete with them on their own ground. I will support any move to allow the present 25 convenience stores in Adelaide to remain open.

Another question raised as a result of the report is that of the two-nights trading. The Commissioner recommended that in the city square mile the trading night be Friday and, in the outer metropolitan area, it be Thursday night, provided that the metropolitan area is the area the Hon. Mr. DeGaris described. The Commissioner gave as one of his reasons in the report that in Sydney and Melbourne, where only one late shopping night is used, it seems that it is not as successful in the inner city areas as it is in the suburbs. He says, "I have observed that in the inner city Sydney area a number of shops do not open at night." In other words, the Commissioner is saying that the suburbs gain more business than the inner metropolitan area. He appears to be trying to protect traders in the metropolitan area from something for which they have not sought protection, because the traders in the inner city area, particularly those in Rundle Mall, want to remain open on the same nights as do the traders in the suburbs.

Then we have the problem raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris of the Mall as opposed to Victoria Square, where they get more trade from the Central Market. On the whole I agree with the Commission, that there should be two nights, but I agree for a different reason. I believe in unrestricted hours. To me, two nights are better than one. By going to different areas, people can have two nights of late trading. The Commissioner refers, in many cases, to areas coming alive at night. It would appear that Adelaide could be that much more alive over a longer period. Unfortunately, at this stage I cannot get what I want, and that is unrestricted trading hours. That being so, I believe the best solution is to allow shops anywhere to open Thursday or Friday night, but not both.

I have just heard the Hon. Mr. DeGaris suggest that there is some merit in the fact that country areas have market days and shops should be able to open on one night. Certainly in metropolitan Adelaide they should be allowed to open Thursday or Friday, but not both at this stage. This would solve the problem of the differing opinion between the Mall traders and the Victoria Square traders, and would provide a wider choice for the consumer.

This Bill shows the effectiveness of an Opposition. It was the Liberal Party which forced the Government to take some action, and, without any undue false modesty, I

say I was very much responsible for the Liberal Party adopting its policy in this area. I have no doubt that the Government will now take credit for bringing enlightenment to trading in South Australia. I do not mind this as long as the consumer gains some benefit. I believe that he will. I hope that this is just a first step in enjoying services and conveniences which are common place in most other countries of the world. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.11 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 16, at 2.15 p.m.