LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 4 July 1996

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

GALLANTRY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement made today by the Minister for Emergency Services on the subject of the M.V. *Gallantry*.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

SCHOOL FEES

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about school fees regulations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: On 26 January the Minister announced that he would regulate for compulsory school fees. On 18 June the Minister indicated a different position when he told the Estimates Committee that:

> The Government, as the honourable member would know, has implemented a policy of materials and service charges up to a certain level, and payment from those who can afford to pay can be enforced.

My question to the Minister is: does the Minister still intend to regulate for compulsory school fees, yes or no?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Government's position has remained consistent all along. That is, right from January or February, or whenever it was early this year when I made the announcement, the compulsory payment of school fees up to certain levels would be able to be enforced either through debt collection agencies or court action. I am not sure what is concerning the Leader of the Opposition, but if she would like to further explain her question by way of a supplementary, or otherwise, I would be pleased to try to understand the question. However, the Government's position, certainly from the Government's viewpoint, has not changed at all. It was publicly announced and has been reinforced on a number of occasions, including the statement made in June.

AIR QUALITY

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources a question about air quality.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I have had a number of requests from people in the southern metropolitan area to inquire into air quality in that area. We have had a number of quite unseasonably still, warm days, and my understanding is that an inversion layer prevents the accumulated pollutants in the air from being cleared from particular regions within the metropolitan area. I also understand that the Government is improving its air testing quality procedures to gain better information on the quality of air in that region. That still does not satisfy the residents who suffer particularly from chest problems and bronchial problems, and it does not prevent their being affected by the air quality in that area at certain times of the year. Will the Government improve the liaison between the departments and the community in relation to its plans; and will the Government give a guarantee to the local community that air quality will be improved within a certain time frame?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government a question about ministerial statements.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yesterday during Question Time the Minister for Transport made a ministerial statement on AN. The Minister did not provide a written statement to the Council or to the shadow Minister, in accordance with what I have been advised is the established custom and practice of this Council. I understand that Standing Orders are silent on this issue. Since arriving in this place I have observed that both the Leader of the Government and the Attorney-General have always provided written statements when making a ministerial statement to this Council. I commend both of them on upholding the necessary custom and practice of supplying written ministerial statements. It is not only efficient practice and a sign of good government but it is also a courtesy that shadow Ministers appreciate. I cannot take shorthand, and without a written statement we are at a decided disadvantage in dealing with media inquiries which may arise that afternoon. I appreciate that a copy of *Hansard* can be read that afternoon, but not for an hour or more. Will the Leader of the Government in this Council ensure that future ministerial statements are accompanied by a written explanation at all times?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The short answer to that is that, whenever Ministers can prepare written documents for ministerial statements, they always do so. That has been the practice in the past and also under this Government. But I can certainly recall occasions in the past under the previous Government when, because of the urgency of the situation or the immediacy of the information that had been provided, Ministers sought leave to make a statement on an issue that was not made by way of a ministerial statement.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I cannot recall whether they did or did not, but the issue is simply that, whenever it is possible, Ministers provide a written statement, not because Standing Orders require it but because it has become a generally accepted principle, if it is at all possible. The Hon. Mr Cameron is not quite correct, because I can recall an instance when I gave a ministerial statement in exactly the same circumstances as my colleague the Minister for Transport—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Since I have been here?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No—where because of the immediacy of the situation—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: I said, 'Since I have been here?'

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not sure when it was, but because of the immediacy of the situation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order on my right!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —and because Ministers—in that case myself and yesterday the Minister for Transport—felt that it was better to share the information with all members for the benefit of all members than delay it by 24 hours; that is, give the ministerial statement today to allow people the time to type up the ministerial statement and make it available. They are judgments that Ministers make.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The issue is not whether a Minister predicates their ministerial statement, written or otherwise, with a phrase of, 'I apologise' or whatever. The issue the Hon. Mr Cameron—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, the Hon. Mr Cameron is not seeking that; he wants a written statement. What I am saying on behalf of Ministers of the Government is—as with the previous Ministers of the previous Government—whenever it is possible we will do that, but I will not guarantee to ask my colleagues to insist upon that on all occasions, because there will be occasions when it is not possible and it is better to share the information with members in the Chamber as quickly as possible.

PATHOLOGY SERVICES

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Health a question about pathology services in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I have been informed that there is a push—yet again, might I say—for handing over the most profitable pathology tests undertaken at the Women's and Children's Hospital to an Adelaide based private pathology company. Members of this Chamber might be interested to learn that the Women's and Children's Hospital laboratories offer pathology testing and are also engaged in teaching and research, much of it at a world-class level. I am informed that the profitable tests taken at the Women's and Children's Hospital make it possible for the federally funded research work to be done through supplying infrastructure. This research generates new tests which improve health care through improved efficiencies. I am also informed that private pathology companies are already handing over their more difficult pathology tests to the Women's and Children's Hospital. This service would have to be sought from overseas laboratories at increased costs if it was not available in Australia. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Is the Minister aware that the research undertaken at the Women's and Children's Hospital laboratories is of a world-class standard?

2. How does the Minister intend funding research infrastructure once the profitable work is handed over to a private company?

3. Is the Minister aware that private pathology companies are handing over their more difficult pathology tests to the public sector?

4. Where will private companies go for more difficult tests should the public sector become inadequately funded to undertake such work?

5. Can the Minister refute the rumour that the motivation behind the handing over of the hospital's profitable tests to a private company is to meet the needs of a private company, rather than to meet the needs of the public, and that such a decision has been linked to the personal contacts—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: No, this is the rumour to which I am referring. I said, 'Can the Minister refute the rumour?' This is part of the rumour—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: —and that such a decision has been linked to the personal contacts between a member of the Government and executives of one particular private company?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the questions and the rumours to the Minister and bring back a reply.

SKILLSHARE

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about Skillshare.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I have been contacted by some people in Skillshare, three of whom are computer science teachers. These classes in which these people have been working are fully booked out and have been for quite some time. They are booked out for the rest of this year. It is my understanding that the Federal Government has cut the funding from Skillshare. I have just been made aware of this, but five people were working at this school—two administrative officers and three computer science teachers—and they have been reduced to one administrator: they have cut out all the classes. It is a very important area in skill share because in most positions these days computer skills are very important.

Will the Minister tell us what are the numbers and the reductions in South Australia in Skillshare given the Federal Government's cutting? Has the Minister been in touch with his counterpart, the Federal Minister, to try to prevent this reduction of money?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer the question to my colleague the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

RURAL HEALTH

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Health, a question about mental disorders in rural South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: A paper published in the *Medical Journal of Australia* in August 1995 looked into the prevalence of psychiatric disorders in rural South Australia. Over a six month period in 1991 the study looked at over 1 000 adults who lived in the riverland towns of Barmera, Berri, Loxton and Renmark. The results of this study showed that 26 per cent of adults had at least one psychiatric disorder and that this prevalence was higher than in two other studies done in New Zealand and the USA. The prevalence did not differ with sex, which questions the commonly held view that mental health problems are more common in women. Further, 79 per cent of the study also reported at least one physical disorder in these people, the most common being: back problems, 53 per cent; migraine, 30 per cent; arthritis, 27 per cent; hypertension, 15 per cent;

and asthma, 15 per cent. Of the total sample, 23 per cent or almost one quarter reported being currently disabled by a physical disorder.

Psychiatric disorders were also higher in the unemployed; 85.5 per cent of those diagnosed with current psychiatric disorders had consulted their local GP and only 4.2 per cent a psychiatrist or psychologist. The findings suggest that many Riverland people with psychiatric conditions are treated by their GP or receive no treatment. There are few permanent mental health facilities in the Riverland in contrast with metropolitan Adelaide, although the prevalence of psychiatric disorders in the region are comparable with urban settings. Services in the region consist of two consultant psychiatrists who visit for two days each month and two resident community health nurses. The care of these people lies with the GPs. However, the ability of GPs to identify and diagnose these psychiatric problems would not be particularly high.

The findings of this study have implications for health services in the Riverland and possibly in rural South Australia, that is, a high prevalence of psychiatric disorders in that community, the demands placed on local GPs and the limited access to specialist services. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Is he aware of this study?

2. If so, is he putting in place suitable mental health services to address this need?

3. Can programs be put in place to upgrade the skills of the local GPs to be more efficient in identifying these psychiatric disorders?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable members's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

MIGRANTS

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, a question about the migrant intake.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: The recent announcement by the Federal Government of cuts in the immigration program has created a number of situations that need urgent attention. In particular, when it comes to South Australia, the program announced at the beginning of June, which was aimed at boosting the State's population by introducing a series of measures aimed at attracting migrants to South Australia, will most likely need to be looked at again in light of the recent announcement.

Basically, by cutting some 13 500 units out of the family reunion program, which is one of the three major components of the immigration program, together with the independent skill and humanitarian components, what we as a nation are saying to the world is that it is okay for the migrant worker to come into Australia but it is not okay for his spouse, children or parents to join him or her in this country. In addition to the citizenship requirement, it means that by a single stroke of a pen such a migrant, who has satisfied all the criteria for being accepted in this country, is now condemned to be separated for a minimum of two years from his family.

I will not dwell on the matter of the broken electoral promise or the integrity of the immigration program, which is a Federal matter. I simply direct my questions to the Minister, and ask:

1. Will he inform the Council of the impact that the Federal Government cuts to the immigration program will have on the South Australian policy aimed at boosting our population?

2. What measure will be introduced to readjust the State policy in the light of the Federal Government's recent cuts?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I recall reading in one of this morning's interstate papers that it was claimed that the new migrant intake level is the average for the past four years under the previous Government. That claim will need to be checked, but if that is the case perhaps it is not quite as stark as the comparisons with the most immediate year might be. The honourable member will know that there have been mixed responses nationally in relation to the Government's announcements. Premier Bob Carr from New South Wales has strongly endorsed the Commonwealth Government's position, as have a number of other people, whilst I understand that Premier Kennett has expressed some concerns about the reductions. I will certainly refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply, particularly in relation to what effect, if any, there might be on the policy directions announced by the Premier earlier this year.

SCHOOLS, HIV/AIDS PROGRAM

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question on AIDS funding to schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Australia's response with regard to HIV/AIDS has been admired internationally for its success and, as documented on television last night, it is both containing and reducing HIV infection. There have been two national HIV/AIDS strategies, the latest one finishing in June this year, and to date there has been no indication as to whether a third will be established. Part of the strategy was to provide money to the States for education programs in schools regarding HIV/AIDS. I understand that the second strategy allocated approximately $293 000 to South Australia for use in school programs. I understand that with this money there has been curriculum development taking place since 1988 and that a pilot program was implemented in 13 schools with no announcement as to when the program might spread to other schools. An evaluation has been done on the program conducted in the 13 schools and the result of that evaluation was, I understand, presented to the Minister two years ago, although the results have not yet been made public. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will he make public the evaluation of the HIV/AIDS school program?

2. When will the program, which was trialled in 13 schools, be implemented across all appropriate schools in the State?

3. Will he account for the total $293 000 provided by the Federal Government for this program and will he do so in this Council?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will have to take those questions on notice and bring back a reply. In relation to the question about when the program will be extended to all schools, in terms of the response it will be a question not necessarily of 'when' but 'if'. One will need to look at the success or otherwise of the program and whether there are other ways of implementing what might have been best practice or good practice from the pilot schools through other

schools. Depending on the nature of the particular program and what was learnt from it, sometimes piloting in schools is done to approve the effectiveness of the individual program and the materials are then made available to all schools.

Through that mechanism one could say that the materials will be available to all schools. I suppose that it could be interpreted differently in that the question could be 'When will the pilot program in the 13 schools be extended to all 650 schools?' There are a number of ways in which the lessons learnt from a successful pilot program might be shared with all 650 South Australian schools. One way might be by extending exactly what occurred in the 13 schools; another way might be to learn what has been best and effective practice in the 13 schools, produce the material and make it available for teachers in other schools. In relation to the detail of the member's questions, I will need to take advice and bring back a reply as soon as I can.

BROWNHILL CREEK

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, a question about Brownhill Creek.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: My colleague, the Hon. Sandra Kanck, received a letter in relation to Brownhill Creek which raised a number of important questions. I want to put on record the contents of the letter and ask several questions of the Minister. The letter states:

> . . . I am actively involved with the Friends of Brownhill Creek, a support group for Brownhill Creek Recreation Park.
>
> Since becoming so involved I have been appalled to discover the degree of neglect of this once very popular park. I and almost everyone I talk to seem to have visited the park a lot in the 1950s and 1960s and remember it as an attractively maintained resource at that time. However, now the park is weed and fox infested, has an appalling pot-holed access road, crumbling bridge (although of heritage significance as one of the first reinforced concrete bridges in South Australia) and badly eroding creek banks. Trees planted last century are dying and left to fall down. Native vegetation is vanishing under blackberries, Cape ivy etc. and willows and desert ash are choking up the watercourse.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Nobody said it happened in the last two years; don't be stupid. The letter continues:

> Although probably the oldest park in South Australia outside the city parklands (I understand it was designated a reserve in the original survey, which would precede Belair National Park by 40 years, and designated as a national pleasure resort in 1915), the park is now truly the cinderella of the park system, and there are a few parks that have become ugly sisters amongst the rest. I have been told that the budget for Brownhill Creek Recreation Park is only $1 500 a year and that the ranger is scheduled to visit one or two days a fortnight. However, the revenue from the caravan park licence in the reserve is supposed to be $17 000 a year.

My questions to the Minister are:

1. What is the total annual revenue obtained during the last and coming financial years from Brownhill Creek Recreation Park, in particular from the caravan park licence fee or rental and any amounts paid for the kiosk operations?

2. What is the budgeted and actual expenditure on the park for the last and coming financial years, including capital works, staffing and maintenance?

3. Do these figures reflect any unusual items that would not normally occur and, if so, what is the income and expenditure of average years?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a precised statement before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education a question about future employment in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: A recent report and survey carried out by Morgan & Banks, who are reputed to be one of Australia's leading human resource consultancies, found that in South Australia 66 per cent of technology companies intended to take on more staff and about 66 per cent of South Australian companies involved in the tourist industry also intended to take on staff. However, the survey also showed that overall hiring intentions in this State have slipped dramatically from previous figures. The situation at the time of the survey put our State ahead of only the Australian Capital Territory, where the survey showed the ACT recording a net negative growth factor.

The survey further showed that only 5 per cent of South Australian employers have indicated that they will take on staff, a fall of 8.3 per cent when compared to the previous quarter. This figure of 5 per cent unemployment prospects, to be seen in its proper light, has to be contrasted to figures taken from employers in New South Wales, and they were intending to hire more staff, of the order of 21.9 per cent. Likewise in Western Australia, the figure in respect of those companies was 20.6 per cent, and in Victoria the figure of companies surveyed was 10.3 per cent.

These figures that the survey found led to the Joint Managing Director of Morgan & Banks observing that in South Australia the level of optimism in the economy evident during the last survey—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: You've never worked in your life.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: —no longer appeared to be there. On the one hand, we have this Liberal Government claiming much success in new job creation and, on the other hand, surveys of this type putting a somewhat different light on the same subject matter. Truly a situation—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Very impressive, TC.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I find the situation I am talking about very repressive. On the other hand—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: On the other hand, surveys of this type put a somewhat different light on the same subject matter, truly a situation which, if not stopped, might lead to total puzzlement. In the interests of clarity, and in order to ensure that this Parliament understands exactly what is required to be done in the interests of new job creation, I direct the following questions to the Minister:

1. How many new full-time jobs have been created in South Australia from 10 December 1994, and in which industries have they been created?

2. How many new part-time jobs have been created in South Australia from 10 December 1994, and in which industries have they been created?

3. How many new casual jobs have been created in South Australia from 10 December 1994, and in which industries have they been created?

4. How many new school leavers were employed by those new jobs?

5. How many people under 25 years of age were employed by the new jobs created?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not sure whether that was a matter of importance that should have had a five minute rating on a Wednesday, but I do think it probably bordered on the bounds of a statement rather than a question. I call on the Minister for Education and Children's Services.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As my colleagues behind me continue to interject, the Hon. Mr Crothers is adding to his growing reputation as the shadow Treasurer, shadow economic affairs Minister or whatever for the Labor Party—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: A man of substance, at least in one respect, the Hon. Mr Crothers. I will be delighted to refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister or Ministers and bring back a reply as soon as I can.

STUDENTS, BOYS

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about the performance of boys at school.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The *Sydney Morning Herald* yesterday carried an article entitled, 'HSC gender gap widens as boys fall behind'. Part of this article states:

> High school girls are now outperforming boys in a majority of popular HSC [the New South Wales Higher School Certificate] courses, according to detailed analysis of year 12 examination results. The bleak picture of boys' success in the final years of school has prompted renewed calls by parents and educators for a fresh effort to close the gender gap. Exam statistics compiled by the Board of Studies in 84 courses show girls outperform boys on average in 76 of the subjects, in many cases beating them by a greater margin and in traditionally male-dominated subjects such as maths and science.

The article concludes:

> Board figures show a widening gap between the Tertiary Entrance Score (TES) achieved by girls and boys in recent years.

The article also contains a comment from the President of the New South Wales Federation of Parents and Citizens Association, Ms Brennan, who said that boys were being disadvantaged by a lack of communication skills and male stereotypes which did not value academic success.

The Minister in the past has publicly expressed his concerns about the widening gap in the performance of boys at secondary schools in South Australia. What action has he taken to address those concerns which he has expressed in the past and which were expressed in the *Sydney Morning Herald* article?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Government and I as Minister have acknowledged that young women and girls continue to have a number of disadvantages that need to be addressed within our schools system. At the same time, I have indicated as Minister that I believe it is time for our system to acknowledge that boys and young men in particular were confronting a significant number of educational difficulties which for too long had been ignored by the system, and the system now needed, first, to acknowledge that we had the problems and, secondly, to set about doing something about it.

In terms of what the Government response has been, I am happy to detail some of those at the moment, but I will be happy to bring back a fuller response in due course. The Government's focus, as indicated right from its first budget, has been about the early years strategy. Whilst we have had to reduce expenditure in other areas, we have actually put in significant millions of extra dollars into the early years strategy. The Government's view is that, when one looks at all the research evidence available back in the early years, compared with the sorts of figures referred to by the honourable member in terms of year 12 results, one can see the signs of that developing in terms of some of the early information that is available.

The basic skills testing information, for example, is already indicating in terms of literacy at years three and five that girls are outperforming boys even at those years. That is a further indication of the importance of the basic skills testing information to try to highlight at what stage these difficulties commence. It would seem at that age, years three and five, that girls and boys are performing much more equally in terms of numeracy performance, whereas in terms of literacy already the distinctions are being seen.

In terms of the number of students in primary school and junior primary having behaviour management problems, being treated by our specialists, whether they be special ed. teachers, guidance officers or speech pathologists, clearly again the figures are overwhelmingly young boys rather than young girls.

The Government's long-term response—because there is no quick fix to the sorts of problems that are being identified—is that we need to do much more in the early years. So, the Government's response has been in terms of putting additional resources into the early years strategy, with additional money going to schools in terms of cash grants. Next year, $3 million in cash grants will be provided to schools to help students with learning difficulties, what will now be almost an extra 12 speech pathologists and an extra six or nine guidance officers within our schools.

All those resources and many others, which I said I will document more fully in a written reply to the honourable member, are part of our early years strategy and are part of the Government's long-term response to the sorts of issues that have been identified. There is not much point trying to tackle this issue with years 10, 11 or 12 in the school system. You have to tackle these issues much earlier—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That's exactly right. The Hon. Mr Elliott says that the style of assessment has an effect. One of the issues which I raised in Opposition and which I continue to raise as Minister—not that I control the Senior Secondary Assessment Board—is that conscious decisions were taken by officers and others working within that board to change the nature of physics testing, for example, so that girls were in effect advantaged in terms of the way that assessment was conducted within the physics examination.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, they were advantaged in relation to the way in which that particular assessment was conducted. One of the points I have raised is that we need to look at the particular issues and, if it is important to address the problems in terms of assessment technique that young

women were facing, for example, in physics, then perhaps it is important at the same time, even at that level, to be looking at the problems that young men face in terms of assessment.

It is fine to hear, as we have heard for many years, that these are particular problems that young women face and therefore we need to address them in terms of assessment technique. No-one, certainly not I as Minister, will argue about that. The argument I have always had, and will continue to have, is that it should not be simply limited to identifying the problems that young women face in terms of assessment technique. If we are serious about this, we need to look at the particular problems faced by young men in terms of assessment technique. If we are deliberately to set about a strategy of redressing disadvantage, or providing advantage, because they are mirror images of the same actions for young women, we must equally do it for young men.

That has been the Government's position on gender equity issues. At the national level a task force established by the ministerial council was specifically devoted to the educational problems confronting girls and young women. As a result of the initiatives taken by the South Australian Government and me as Minister, that has now been changed to a gender equity task force, which is now charged for the first time with addressing the problems that confront not only girls and young women but also boys and young men within our school system.

The Government is initiating a range of responses. For example, some of our schools now are establishing girls-only classes, and some schools are also experimenting with boys-only classes, particularly through those very difficult pre-adolescent and early adolescent years in upper primary and junior secondary. A number of schools are successfully using programs there. A number of programs are directed to encouraging young boys, particularly in primary school, to speak out and address their emotions and feelings in terms of controlling their anger, and to participate more fully in the educational programs in the school.

Many things are going on quietly in the Government school education system in trying to address some of the issues that are now being identified nationally. The sort of figures that the honourable member has quoted are certainly apparent here in South Australia. Young women now outperform young men at year 12 in virtually all the subject areas, including mathematics and physics, together with the more traditional subjects in which young women have outperformed young men. It is true to say that smaller numbers of young women are participating in subjects such as physics and maths II compared with young men but, equally, smaller numbers of young men than young women are participating in other year 12 subjects. I have given the honourable member a flavour of the Government's position and some of the actions that it is undertaking in this important area, and I will be happy to collect some more information and provide a written response to the honourable member.

SCHOOL SALES

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services questions about the sale of schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: As members are aware, a number of schools have been for sale and will be sold by the department—by this Government. The estimates for capital receipts show that the Education Department expects to receive $14.5 million this year from the sale of land and buildings, and this compares with $12.5 million for this year. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister provide a schedule showing all school properties currently for sale and which properties the Government expects to sell this year?
2. Which school properties were sold in 1995-96?
3. Who purchased them?
4. What was the reason for the shortfall of $2.89 million on the sales of schools in 1995-96?
5. Did this shortfall delay the commencement of any of this year's capital projects?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy to provide some of that information. Certainly, I will be able to provide information in relation to what properties and schools have been sold. I will be able to provide some information in terms of what is projected for 1996-97, but I certainly will not be able to provide all the information at this stage. In answer to the final question as to whether the shortfall has affected some redevelopment projects, as the honourable member would know, I indicated in the Estimates Committee that that is and has always been the case. A perfect example of that is a school such as Seaton High School where, until we can get agreement on the nature of the redevelopment at that high school and we are then able to sell the property, we will not be able to commence the redevelopment.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources questions about vegetation clearance at Lucindale.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yesterday in matters of importance I raised an issue related to the clearance of remnant vegetation and the problems that that creates in providing habitat and continuity of integrated ecosystems. Today I received a letter which was sent to Mr Kerin by the Conservation Council of South Australia and which indicates that it has information that the department—that is, PISA—has made an application for a conditional contract and purchase of 856 hectares in the district of Lucindale and that it has applied to the Native Vegetation Council to clear a large part of this land, for the purpose of radiata pine plantations. Over the past two or three years the Opposition has consistently raised issues about the widespread clearance of native vegetation and the single culture, broadacre planting of pines and vines, etc., and some of the problems that that raises.

It appears that the department has made an application for a further 856 hectares on top of the 500 hectares it cleared in 1995-96 in the Lucindale-Reedy Creek area. On the Tuesday after the clearance was made I went down to that property at dusk, and it was pretty disheartening to see all birds trying to return to their nesting points in the trees and finding that the trees had been heaped into windrows ready for burning. I would hate to see another 3 000 native trees knocked over in the same way. It is the Opposition's view that we can increase pine tree plantation areas by using the existing cleared agricultural land that abounds in the South-East. The department could be looking at buying a number of appropriate properties, but here we have another application for a conditional contract on another parcel of land.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yes; the honourable member raises the point that thousands of wild manna gums are growing within this clump of native bush, and the koalas on Kangaroo Island could be transferred to those trees. My questions are:

1. Has PISA a conditional contract for the purchase of 856 hectares of land in the Lucindale district?

2. Has the department made an application for clearance of this native vegetation?

3. If so, how much of the land is to be cleared, how many trees are to be removed and what impact does the department believe it will have on the environment in that area?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I direct my question to the Minister for Transport. Did the Federal Minister for Transport brief her on the news of job losses in AN which appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday; what did he advise her; and when did he advise her?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The answer to the first question is 'No,' so it is not possible to answer the other two. As I said yesterday, I will be speaking with the Minister again next week when he returns from New Zealand.

JUVENILE JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I direct my question to the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General received the report of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee; if so, what are its recommendations in relation to general deterrence; what are its recommendations in relation to community service orders; and will he make the document public and release it immediately?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Attorney-General and bring back a reply.

PUBLIC SECTOR REDUNDANCIES

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs a question about reductions in public sector numbers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: At the recent Premiers' conference held in June and the subsequent announcement regarding the reduction in funding to the States, some strong concerns have been raised in the Public Service regarding possible reduction in the number of employees over and above the programmed reductions announced some time ago. Following the recent Premiers' Conference and the reduction in funding for South Australia, can the Premier as Minister give an unequivocal assurance that reductions in public sector numbers will continue to be achieved by the use of voluntary separation packages, and that there will be no forced redundancies in South Australia's public sector in the new financial year?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

CULTURAL FACILITIES PROGRAM

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the cultural facilities program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The cultural facilities program has existed for many years and has been used by local government and other bodies all around the State to obtain grants, usually small ones, towards upgrading venues throughout South Australia. In recent years, not only venues for performing arts and visual arts but also local museums became eligible for application to the cultural facilities program grants. For many years, the program had an allocation of $250 000. From the budget papers, it is not possible to work out the allocation for the cultural facilities program because it is rolled in with the general grants for the arts line. I have been told that the previous $250 000 was reduced to $150 000 last year, which is a cut of 40 per cent. There are many concerns that the allocation will decrease even further in the current financial year. I am sure the Minister is well aware of the enormous value of this program and how it has assisted arts activities of many types and small, local museums throughout the State. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Can the Minister confirm that last financial year the cultural facilities program fund was cut from $250 000 to $150 000?

2. Can she indicate how much is being allocated to it in the current financial year?

3. Can she also tell us what administrative arrangements will apply for evaluating submissions and making grants for the program in this financial year, as I believe she has abolished the independent committee which used to receive and evaluate these submissions?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I recognise I have a short time in which to answer some important questions in relation to cultural facilities. The arts budget, along with every budget across Government, has been subjected to considerable pressure in the past few years, not because we have been keen to do so but because we have a situation where we have to seek to resolve inherited budget pressures. It has been determined not to cut out a program which I agree with the honourable member is an important one and which is particularly valued in country communities. We have cut the amount of money to $150 000, as the honourable member indicated. It is my recollection—

The Hon. Anne Levy: That is last year.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Last financial year—that the sum will remain the same, that is, $150 000, so there is no increase in real terms this year. Also this year the majority of those funds will be transferred to the South Australian Country Arts Trust to administer. The officers are around the State most of the time—

The Hon. Anne Levy: I have been told that most arts venues are not eligible any more.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, it is not that they are not eligible: they will be assessed by the department. By having a smaller amount of money, it seemed pointless to have a large committee, which was seen as necessary to assess the bigger allocation of funds, visiting country areas. For example, a number of people from the committee would attend and therefore considerable costs were incurred. When the sum of money for the overall program was cut and the South Australian Country Arts Trust was touring country

areas, it seemed wise that it would undertake that assessment. It worked highly successfully last year; I have no doubt that it will again this year.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What proportion is country and what is metropolitan?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: That I will determine.

ROAD TRAFFIC (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961. Read a first time

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Road Traffic Act 1961 to improve the safety of road workers at road work sites and to increase the range of vehicles which may operate outside the provisions of the Act. The Act imposes a speed limit of 25 km/h for vehicles travelling past road works where workers are present. Road workers have expressed concern regarding the lack of compliance with this provision, particularly in rural areas. Examination of the issues involved revealed that a major factor in the lack of adherence to this requirement is the difficulty faced by drivers in adjusting vehicle speed to the low level required when passing roadworks, particularly when the vehicles have been travelling in a high speed environment. Speed limit requirements in the vicinity of roadworks will vary depending upon a number of factors, including the size of the site, its location, speed environment and approach sight distances.

Reliance upon a speed limit of 25 km/h is not necessary in all cases. This Bill will provide flexibility in deciding the appropriate speed limit to be applied to individual work sites. It also introduces the use of buffer zones with gradually reducing speed limits on the approach to work sites. Vehicle speeds will be reduced over a distance before the actual work site is reached so that drivers will be better able to adjust to the lower speed limit in the vicinity of the roadworks. Exemptions from compliance with certain provisions of the Act are provided to specified drivers who must drive in a way which contravenes the requirements of the Act and regulations when carrying out their duties. Until now, the Act has recognised a very limited range of vehicles to which exemptions apply. There has been an increasing demand in the types of vehicles which could fall into this category. Military ambulances, fire fighting appliances and military police have similar needs to their civilian counterparts. Army ordinance disposal vehicles must also be able to reach the scene of a bomb threat without delay.

The operations of these agencies are currently restricted by the obligation to comply with provisions of the Act. The Bill will allow these vehicles to operate effectively in certain emergency situations. Road workers are required to carry out construction, maintenance and inspection on roads but the Act provides no exemptions for them when doing this work. Some roadwork vehicles must drive astride a centre line of the road, others travel on the wrong side of the road and must park in a manner that contravenes the law. In these and similar situations where utilities must undertake work on roads, workers may be breaking the law because they have not been granted exemptions which permit them to carry out their vital functions. The Bill addresses these anomalies. I commend the Bill to honourable members and seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 20—Signs indicating work area or work site

This clause amends section 20 of the principal Act. Section 20 empowers a public authority, with the approval of the Minister, to place signs on a road for the purpose of indicating a maximum speed to be observed by drivers while driving on a portion of road on which works are in progress or on which workers are engaged. The maximum speed that can be set in relation to a portion of road on which works are in progress is currently 60 kilometres an hour, while the maximum speed that can be set in relation to a portion of road on which workers are engaged is 25 kilometres an hour.

This amendment provides that the maximum speed that can be set for persons driving on or towards a portion of road affected by works in progress (or any additional portion used to regulate traffic in relation to those works or for associated purposes) is 80 kilometres an hour, while the maximum speed that can be set in relation to a portion on which workers are or may be engaged is 40 kilometres an hour.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 40—Exemption of certain vehicles from compliance with certain provisions

This clause amends section 40 of the principal Act. Section 40 currently exempts certain categories of vehicles from compliance with certain provisions of the Act. In particular it exempts fire brigade vehicles, motor ambulances, S.A. police vehicles and S.E.S vehicles from those provisions of the Act relating to speed limits, stopping at stop signs or traffic lights, giving way, etc. when these vehicles are being driven in connection with a relevant emergency. This amendment adds the following exemptions:

(a) a fire-fighting vehicle used by the armed forces of the Commonwealth while it is being driven to any place in answer to a call for the services of a fire brigade or is in use at a fire;

(b) a vehicle (other than an ambulance) owned by a person licensed under the *Ambulance Services Act 1992* to provide ambulance services while it is being driven for the purpose of taking action in connection with an emergency;

(c) a motor vehicle driven by a member of the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Customs Service or a military police force forming part of the armed forces of the Commonwealth, in the execution of his or her duty;

(d) a motor vehicle used by the armed forces of the Commonwealth while it is being driven for the purpose of taking action in connection with the urgent disposal of explosives.

The amendment also updates references to South Australian fire brigades and the SA St John Ambulance Service Inc.

Section 40 also exempts vehicles of a class proclaimed by the Governor from those provisions of the principal Act relating to driving or standing on any side or part of a road, passing other vehicles on a specified side and the manner of making right turns where the vehicles concerned are being driven or used for road making or road maintenance purposes. Under this amendment that exemption will apply to vehicles of a class prescribed by regulation while they are being driven or used for the purpose of—

(a) road inspection;

(b) works on roads such as road making, maintenance or cleaning or works required for the provision of electricity, gas, water, drainage, sewage services or telecommunication or other services; or

(c) monitoring traffic.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 134—Bells and sirens

This clause amends section 134 of the principal Act. Section 134 provides that bells or sirens must not be fitted to motor vehicles other than those specified in the section. The vehicles currently specified include vehicles used by certain fire brigades, the SA police and the SES, as well as ambulances. This amendment adds the following vehicles to that list:

(a) a fire-fighting vehicle used by the armed forces of the Commonwealth;
(b) a motor vehicle used by members of the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Customs Service or a military police force forming part of the armed forces of the Commonwealth in the course of their duties;
(c) a motor vehicle (other than an ambulance) used by a person licensed under the *Ambulance Services Act 1992* to provide ambulance services;
(d) a motor vehicle used by the armed forces of the Commonwealth for the purpose of taking action in connection with the disposal of explosives.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL (DUTY TO VOTE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 April. Page 1322.)

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I support this initiative of the Government and the Attorney-General. I am sure that members opposite and the Australian Democrats do not need any reminding that this was a key plank in our election policy prior to the last election. If I can detect anything from the Democrats—and on occasions that can be difficult—I see that the Hon. Michael Elliott, over the past few weeks, has got out the Liberal Party policy of the last election, dusted it off, had a bit of a read of it and is now starting to ask questions or make comments about what parts of our policy we have or have not implemented. I would hope that in going through the election platforms and promises made by the Liberal Party prior to the last election one would hope that the Hon. Michael Elliott will stumble upon the provision and promise we made about non-compulsory voting and assist us in achieving the promises that we made prior to the last election. After all, I am sure the honourable member would not like to go down on the public record as being obstructionist—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: —in so far as this Government's endeavours and attempts to initiate some of the policies and promises made prior to the last election. I congratulate the Attorney-General. If one is to admire one of his qualities—and he has many—it would be that of persistence. It is important to note that great reformers have all had that quality and the Attorney-General certainly does not lack in that quality. One only has to look at the persistence shown by Don Dunstan in relation to electoral reform. We have to note the persistence of other great reformers in initiating what will eventually come to be good policy. Other great reformers have dealt with obstructionist, conservative and plain stubborn Oppositions. We are seeing it now in Canberra: I understand that two minor pieces of legislation have been passed and the rest have been referred off to committees—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Two minor ones were initiated by the new Government and the other 31 were in relation to legislation already initiated by the previous Labor Government.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Leader interjects that they would be a lot more comfortable. It is hard to tell them apart—they are another faction, but they will get drawn in. I turn now to why I support it, which I am sure will form part of the reasons why the Attorney-General places this matter as such a high priority in the Liberal Party policy made quite openly and without any secrecy prior to the last election. The three reasons include: first, it is our democratic right (or it should be) in this country not to vote. On many occasions Mr Jaensch says that this is not a matter of compulsory voting but of compulsory attendance at a pooling booth and that there is no obligation, once one has their name ticked off an electoral roll, to actually vote. If one adopts what Dean Jaensch said about this, the current law could only be described as hypocritical.

Secondly, in my view and in the experience of the United Kingdom, it encourages higher Party membership. Political Parties have a much greater responsibility in a system where there is non-compulsory voting. The third matter, perhaps not of greatest importance, is the issue of safe seats. I am sure that political Parties from both sides from time to time reward Party hacks with safe seats and those Party hacks are foisted upon the electorate, which in turn votes for them simply because they are a member of a political Party or at the same time vote for them because they are forced to attend the pooling booths.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: No it does not, as the honourable member interjects. Another issue is that of electoral rolls. The unique approach the Attorney has adopted in this strategy, as he is seeking ways in which the Opposition and the Democrats might change their views—perhaps we can accommodate some of their concerns—is that in this piece of legislation he has not made it compulsory for people to be enrolled on an electoral roll. When one looks at it from a privacy viewpoint, that is another reason why this legislation ought to be supported. It is no secret that electoral rolls are used by political Parties in quite legitimate ways. They are also used by debt collectors and various other people to locate debtors and people of that nature in the community. It seems that the Labor Party ought to consider some of the benefits in not having people who do not want to be on the electoral roll being forced into enrolling.

When we first debated this issue we had not had our run of by-elections and the Australian Democrats indicated that they had conducted a poll on this topic of compulsory voting and came up, if my memory serves me correctly, with a figure that their polling showed that 68 per cent of the electorate supports the current compulsory voting system. On every occasion that this topic has come up in the Parliament the Democrats have been invited to provide us with information about how many people they polled, who they polled, what method they used and what was the question they adopted in that sense, and on every occasion the Democrats have not given and not provided that piece of information.

I might give them some suggestions about how they can go about polling. Perhaps they could have conducted a poll during the Elizabeth by-election on the retirement of Martyn Evans from the other place shortly after the last State election or, if they wanted a larger group of people, they could have done an exit poll of those electors who had to attend Bonython in March 1994 to elect Martyn Evans to the Federal Parliament. Indeed, in April 1994 they could have conducted an exit poll when Lea Stevens was elected as the member for Elizabeth. In my simple view, their polling is somewhat outdated, but I would be most interested to see what they did in the first place.

If there were non-compulsory voting, there would be fewer by-elections. Parties, their machines and individual

politicians—I am talking about the other place because it does not have an effect in terms of cost when a member retires from this place—might think twice about retiring at their own personal whim or to suit their own machinations, and that applies to both political Parties. If there were non-compulsory voting, they might think twice. Indeed, as I have said on previous occasions, it is my view that the system of compulsory voting is not there to serve the people; it has nothing to do with the people. In fact, it is there merely to serve political Parties and politicians.

I will use a simple example. If I am a manufacturer of soap powder and if there is a law that makes it compulsory for people to buy two packs of soap powder a week, half my marketing battle is done for me through the law. I do not have to convince people of the need to buy soap powder or of the importance of soap powder. All I have to do is get them to pick my soap powder over and above that of my competitors. It is important to look at it in the context of a democracy. In my view, compulsory voting leads to a grave risk that people will take democracy for granted.

It has been suggested in some quarters, particularly in previous debates in this place by former MLC Chris Sumner, that there is a very low turnout of voters in other countries where there is non-compulsory voting. Let us look at the turnout of a number of countries that have non-compulsory voting. In its most recent election, Austria had a 92 per cent turnout; Sweden, 91 per cent; Italy, 90 per cent; and Iceland 89 per cent. New Zealand, which is perhaps the country that is most closely associated with Australia and which has non-compulsory voting, had a turnout of 89 per cent.

Australia is said to have a voter turnout of 94 per cent but, if informal votes are added, that drops quite significantly. The number of informal votes tend to chop and change depending upon the political climate that exists at the time. It seems to me that quite a number of people vote informally deliberately. It also seems to me that these people should not be forced against their will to attend a polling booth merely for the purpose of voting informally. It is my view that compulsory voting can be described as both paternalistic and patronising.

I notice that the Hon. Michael Elliott has left the Chamber, but it also interesting to note some of the funny ideas that the Australian Democrats come up with from time to time. We in this place debated the issue of proportional representation when we dealt with the report of the Joint Committee on Women in Parliament and the minority report of the Hon. Sandra Kanck, which recommended that more women would be elected to Parliament if proportional representation was adopted in both Houses. I have set out my reasons on previous occasions as to why that is just utter nonsense.

It is interesting to note that, when the Australian Democrats have their own internal votes, they do not have a system of compulsory voting, nor does the Australian Labor Party. Notwithstanding the fact that prior to the last election the Liberal Party made a very clear, unequivocal promise on this topic, one would have thought that if this is such an important principle they would ensure that it is part of their internal Party rules. One would have thought that they should have a rule that states that, if a member does not vote in an election in which that person is entitled to vote, their membership is forfeited or suspended. That is not the case, and that shows up the hypocrisy of the position adopted by the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Democrats.

In this place we do not have a system of compulsory voting. It is entirely acceptable within the rules of this place for members not to turn up to a vote. I know that does not happen very often because the numbers are so tight but, as a matter of principle, there is no compulsory voting by members of Parliament on legislation. One might say that that is a double standard. We expect the ordinary citizen of South Australia to abide by a compulsory system of voting but, when it comes to members of Parliament, there is no compulsion. The double standard is stunning.

Whilst I am on the topic of double standards, I noted yesterday that the Hon. Trevor Crothers, when speaking on the topic of the bicameral parliamentary system, indicated that he supports the abolition of the Upper House. One might suggest to him that he could follow that viewpoint all the way through and never turn up for a vote. If that view was shared by a couple more of his colleagues, all the debates we have about an obstructionist Upper House would disappear and the Government could get on with its job.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Democracy reigns, does it?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Well, as to the honourable member's interjection, the position of the Hon. Trevor Crothers is such that, when a Liberal Government is elected, particularly with the sort of stunning majority that we had at the last election, and when it is riding high in the polls as this Government is, he ought to stay away, send his salary and allowances back and be done with it. The only time he votes—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: What about when we were in government?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The honourable member interjects, but we in the Liberal Party support the retention of both Houses of Parliament, which is different from the position adopted by the Hon. Trevor Crothers and the ALP. I am just using this as an example of the sort of hypocrisy we get from the position that the ALP has adopted. If members opposite were really true to their principles, the Hon. Trevor Crothers and some others who share his viewpoint should not collect their salaries and entitlements and turn up to vote on two separate occasions: first, if there is a motion to abolish the Upper House (and that is consistent with their policy); and, secondly, if the Australian Labor Party achieved a majority in the Lower House and their vote was needed to get Labor Party legislation through. On any other occasion, in order to avoid having the label 'hypocrite' placed upon them, perhaps they should not turn up and allow this Government to get on with it. I am not saying that in any serious sense: I am just pointing out that the position adopted by the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Democrats on this issue is hypocritical.

In closing, I urge all members to support the Bill proposed by the Attorney-General. I believe that compulsory voting enables politicians to take people, particularly their interest and attendance at the polling booth, for granted. I believe that political Parties in the longer term suffer as a result, our political system suffers as a result, and democracy as a whole would be enhanced if we had a system of non-compulsory voting. I commend the Bill to the Council.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FAIR TRADING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 July. Page 1587.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I support the second reading of this Bill, which seeks to amend some of the provisions of the Fair Trading Act, particularly in relation to the functions of the Commissioner and to assurances and enforcement orders.

I warmly support the repeal of sections 44 and 45 of the existing Act which deal with trading stamps. Those sections actually prohibit trading stamps. Notwithstanding the definition of 'trading stamp' in the existing legislation, there has always been a doubt about the precise limits of the meaning of 'trading stamp', which is broadly defined. There has always been legal argument about it. It has been difficult to mount prosecutions, and many might legitimately query why in this day and age it is necessary to have prohibitions against trading stamps. I doubt that these measures have much relevance in modern conditions. These days there are a number of loyalty schemes (Fly Buy schemes, Frequent Flyer points and sundry other marketing programs) which are far more sophisticated and, one assumes, far more attuned to the modern market than the earlier concept of trading stamps. The existing regime has been widely circumvented.

Notwithstanding the fact that I welcome the repeal of the provisions relating to trading stamps, I express some doubt about the efficacy of the new provisions which have replaced them in the Bill. The new provisions relate not to trading stamps but to the wider concept of third party trading schemes. These schemes are defined in the Bill as:

> A scheme or arrangement under which the acquisition of goods or services by a consumer from a supplier is a condition, or one of a number of conditions, compliance with which gives rise, or apparently gives rise, to an entitlement to a benefit from a third party in the form of goods or services or some discount, concession or advantage in connection with the acquisition of goods or services.

It is clear that most forms of customer loyalty schemes (such as Fly Buys and the like) would come within this type of arrangement. Frankly, I am in two minds as to whether this type of arrangement requires any control at all. Rather, one would have thought it possible to outlaw the unsatisfactory elements of any such scheme, identify them, prohibit them and define them.

My main concern about this new scheme is a matter of principle. The model used in this Bill creates an offence in section 45B for acting as a promoter of a prohibited third party scheme. 'Third party scheme' is, as I have already said, defined in very wide terms. Anybody who promotes a scheme that is prohibited commits an offence and is liable to a penalty of $5 000.

Proposed new section 45 provides that the Minister may approve third party trading schemes. There are no specific criteria which the Minister is required to apply other than the very general provision in section 45(2), which provides:

> The Minister must not approve a third party trading scheme under this section unless he is satisfied that the scheme is genuine, reasonable and not contrary to the interests of consumers.

They are very broad and general concepts. The Minister in his second reading speech said that generally such schemes will be permitted, and one might be reassured by the fact that the current Minister is a sensible person who will presumably adopt a sensible and fair approach in considering applications for approval.

However, leaving matters such as this purely to ministerial discretion is, as a matter of principle, a dubious form of legislation in my view. It might have been better to adopt the type of model used in the New South Wales Fair Trading Act where, in relation to trading stamp schemes and similar schemes, there is provision for the making of regulations declaring any scheme to be an unlawful scheme.

Under section 60c of the New South Wales legislation, the Commissioner must be satisfied that a prohibited scheme is either 'likely to have an inflationary effect on retail prices or is likely to promote unfair competition between a retailer who is a participant in the scheme and one who is not, or the Commissioner must be satisfied that the scheme concerned is likely to be prejudicial in some other respect to fair trading or the public interest'.

Once again, they are fairly general expressions of unsatisfactory elements of trading schemes, but the necessity for the Commissioner in New South Wales to have regard to the inflationary effect on retail prices, and also to have regard to considerations of unfair competition of those who are participating in the scheme and those who are not, seems to me to be a good principle to follow. Our legislation will have no such criteria and, as I say, will leave the matter entirely up to ministerial discretion.

The Act also provides that the Minister may prohibit a scheme under section 45A only on the recommendation of the Commissioner. Once again, that is a sensible measure, but it is with some concern I note that no criteria are laid down in the legislation that might guide the Commissioner in his recommendation or the Minister in relation to the exercise of his discretion. More particularly, however, no criteria are laid down in the legislation that would enable a trader or someone contemplating establishing a third party trading scheme to know whether or not the scheme is likely to be approved. The matter is left to bureaucratic and ministerial discretion.

There is no specific provision in the legislation that would enable any person who is aggrieved by the failure of the Minister to approve a third party scheme, nor is any redress available in the legislation in circumstances where the Minister exercises his power to prohibit a third party trading scheme. The decisions are apparently not open to appeal and not open to review. That also, in my view, is an unsatisfactory model of legislation.

It might be argued that, notwithstanding the absence of specific appeal provisions, any person who has a scheme prohibited or any applicant for approval who has the application rejected can exercise common law powers and take the Minister to court for a review of the decision under some form of judicial review.

Whilst that may be true in certain circumstances, it would be better, in my view, if the legislation specifically laid down a right of appeal. However, notwithstanding the reservations I have about these provisions in part 9 of the Bill, I think the provisions are an improvement. This is not an area where much difficulty has been caused in the marketplace in recent times. It is not a highly pressing area, and I do not believe that serious prejudice will be caused to any section of the community by reason of the adoption of the model that has been adopted. I support the second reading.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 July. Page 1621.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. The Premier

claims to have brought down a caring budget which provides more for our schools that are breaking under the strain of expenditure cuts, with our formerly enviable retention rates in free fall. Yet the reality is that after inflation the real level of the increase in education funding is a pitiful $2 million and a drop in the bucket of the $47 million worth of cuts made in the first two Brown budgets.

This was to have been a budget that delivered relief to our haemorrhaging hospitals. The supposed extra $69 million to be spent this year shrinks to a paltry $1.3 million after inflation and, once again, does next to nothing to make up for the $79 million in cuts delivered in the first two Brown budgets.

The budget delivers yet more cuts to the police, to Correctional Services and to TAFE. This budget is no more a caring budget than Dean Brown's first two. That is before the effect is felt—by our kids, our teachers, our nurses, our hospitals, our young school leavers looking for work or training and education—of the devastating impact of John Howard's and Peter Costello's ruthless slash and burn of Federal programs and funding to essential State programs.

The Premier wanted to be loved for at last showing some social responsibility to children whose parents cannot afford or do not wish to send their children to a private school. At last, he wanted to appear to the electorate as caring about the elderly and the sick—a cunning plan, with just one flaw: the increases in health and education, parsimonious and trivial as they are, depend entirely upon increased funding from John Howard and Peter Costello.

The Premier has been exposed for bringing down a budget telling South Australians he has a deal with John Howard that will see South Australia better off, in spite of the belief of everyone else knowing that John Howard's budget will harm South Australia. Three weeks after the Federal election Dean Brown said:

> Now that there is a new Government in Canberra, the States have a golden opportunity to ensure that we have a much more effective Commonwealth-State relationship than occurred under the previous Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: That is not what the Premier of Tasmania thinks. In April, after telling South Australians he had a cast iron guarantee from the Howard Government that State grants would not be cut, the Premier met with John Howard and told him he should cut Commonwealth public sector employment by 10 per cent— that is, throw 30 000 people out of work.

Dean Brown urged the Howard-Costello program of cuts. At no time did he challenge the Commonwealth to do that which it has thus far utterly failed to do: provide real, believable evidence in support of the need for its $8 billion in spending cuts. There is no policy, economic or intellectual rationale for these cuts, save the nineteenth century ideologies of the Prime Minister, his Treasurer and the Premier of this State.

For the first time in living memory, a Premier of South Australia went to the Prime Minister of the day not to argue the State's interests and to keep Commonwealth programs and jobs in South Australia but to have them cut. From the way this Premier behaves, anyone would think that South Australia did not have the highest level of unemployment on the mainland and the highest rate of unemployment in the entire country. Dean Brown waded into the debate on the coming cuts. He said:

> Therefore, it is clearly now time to cut Federal Government expenditure but not in any way to cut allocations to the State Governments. I am delighted to say that. . . John Howard has given a commitment to give a fixed share of the income taxing revenue to State Governments and to increase that in relation to the growth of the Australian economy.

Despite all the supposed assurances the Premier had received from John Howard, even the Premier came to understand that cuts would be made in Federal grants to South Australia. And what could he do about them? Almost nothing, since he had urged that the cuts be made. He had spent so long complaining about what he called the big spending policies of the Keating Government and had been so fulsome in his commitment to harsh Commonwealth cuts—just like the ones he has made here, as he boasted at the time. The Premier had critically weakened any capacity for South Australia to argue against and effectively oppose those cuts.

On 30 May he and the Treasurer brought down a budget with precisely no credibility. Instead of factoring in the prospect of harsh cuts to Commonwealth grants to this State—the cuts that he had been urging—he brought down a budget that assumed not cuts to Federal grants, not even maintenance of Commonwealth grants but, wait for it, actual increases in funding from John Howard and Peter Costello. It was an act of consummate and appalling dishonesty that fooled no-one.

But the Premier tried to make the best of it, not by coming clean, not by acknowledging the truth, and not by changing course and arguing against honest John Howard's fraudulent $8 billion black hole: the Premier tried to change tack by bringing down a phoney 'caring' budget that assumed actual increases in Federal funding to the vulnerable areas of education and health while, in the next breath, claiming that, if special purpose payments were to be cut, that was somehow no concern of the South Australian Government. That is just how little this budget qualifies as a caring budget. The Premier told ABC radio on 31 May:

> All of the States have a three year agreement with the Federal Government for what we call general purpose grants. Now if the Federal Government cut special purpose payments for special programs. . . they do not in any way undermine the integrity of this budget.

The Premier was saying to John Howard, 'Okay, I know you are going to cut us, but could you at least confine the cuts to special purpose payments?' So much for the Premier's assurances of a golden age under John Howard.

But even worse than this is the fact that subsequent experience has shown that these words were doubly untrue. First, cuts to special purpose payments do harm the integrity of the budget, and they certainly hurt South Australians. Special purpose payments provide essential services such as to our health system which received $490 million in special purpose payments last year. The agreement to maintain general purpose payments was in fact one made between the States and the previous Keating Government. It had one more year to run, but honest John Howard, the friend of the States, friend of the battler, has broken that agreement. It survived little more than three months of his Prime Ministership.

So, the Premier's statement was untrue also because he was not prepared to stand up to John Howard and enforce it. The outcome of the COAG meeting saw savage cuts to general purpose payments to the States of over $1.5 billion over the coming three years, with a 3 per cent cut to special purpose payments next year alone, equal in value to about $320 million in payments to the States. The Premier is prepared to admit this means a cut to revenues to this State

of $83 million this year. We in the Opposition believe the real figure could be substantially higher.

Time and again during the budget estimates session, senior Ministers have been unable to answer the real questions about their own portfolio budgets. When asked about the effect of the Federal cuts on hospitals, the Minister for Health told us, 'I am unable to give an answer and will not bother. The information is unavailable.' The Minister for Family and Community Services told the Estimates Committee that he could give no commitment that State funding for the home and community care program would remain as claimed in the budget. The Treasurer told the Estimates Committee that the Government would only handle the cuts with difficulty, and the Government was looking at all options. Finally, the Education Minister, the Hon. Rob Lucas, told us what he knew about the effect of the cuts on education. He said, 'I am not sure how that will affect general purpose grants. I am not in a position to guarantee anything. As the Minister, I am not in a position to guarantee that until the Commonwealth budget comes down.'

The claim of an extra $150 million in spending on health and education is a complete fraud. The Government knew that when it published hundreds of thousands of glossy leaflets at taxpayer expense for release to South Australian households on budget day. The Premier's own budget paper said:

> This budget reflects the State Government's own priorities. As such, it takes no account of any budgetary adjustment which may flow from this year's Commonwealth budget. Any budgetary adjustment which the State Government is forced to take as a consequence of announcements in Canberra in August will be reflective entirely of the Commonwealth's priorities, not the State's.

On the critical issue of State-Commonwealth relations, the Premier has no credibility. On 21 June, the day of release of the National Commission of Audit, the Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* as hailing the report as follows:

> Billions of dollars would be saved by adopting its recommendations and cutting duplication of the State and Federal services.

The Premier went on by stating the report's recommendations provide, and I quote:

> . . . the best opportunity to achieve fundamental reform of Commonwealth-State relations since Federation in 1901.

One wonders if the Premier had read any of the report at all before he applauded it.

The Opposition Leader in another place has raised the question of precisely what recommendations of the report he does support, and some of the key points are worth repeating here: the promise to hand over health to the States provided they cop a 10 per cent cut; the delineation of the State's education role to primary, preschool and secondary education, once again, presumably with a 10 per cent cut for all functions transferred; moving post secondary education funding to a scholarship basis; the withdrawal of subsidies from publicly funded child care centres; the movement of family services to the States, again with a 10 per cent cut built in; the abolition of the Regional Development Program; the reduction of the value of special purpose payments; the introduction of means tested entry fees for aged care accommodation; the abolition or cutting of the Export Market Development Grants Scheme; cuts to or abolition of the taxation concession for industrial research and development; means tested co-payment for Medicare and pharmaceutical benefits schemes; and cuts to pensions.

Does Dean Brown support all these cuts? This Premier is not to be believed on the South Australian economy, either. This budget provides further confirmation, if any were needed, that Dean Brown and his Treasurer, Stephen Baker, have pushed the South Australian economy into what the Opposition has rightly described as a low growth, high unemployment rut. The Premier has made outrageous claims about the State's economic performance under this Government. He has encouraged others to share his weird fantasy that he has somehow transformed South Australia into some Australian analogue of the Asian Tigers. On 31 March the Premier told listeners of ABC radio, that:

> Within two years of being elected, we have produced the highest economic growth rate of any State in Australia and they are facts you just cannot refute.

If only it were true; but it is not. The economic performance of this State under Dean Brown has been disastrous. Let us take the one, the only, piece of economic data that remotely support the Premier's claims. The latest ABS State accounts data show South Australia has, in trend terms, finally reached a level of growth equal to that of the Australian economy in 1995 after having lagged disastrously during 1994.

Let us look at the facts. During 1994, the ABS shows that South Australia's economy actually contracted by minus .4 per cent. At this time, two things were happening. One was that Australia was growing by the fastest rate in the OECD, by 5.5 per cent. The Premier also publicly claimed:

> Now we are out there with the best, and they started their recovery before us. We have had, without a doubt, the biggest turnaround in our economy of any State in Australia.

The biggest turnaround of any State: undoubtedly, but in the wrong direction! In the last year of Labor in 1993, South Australia grew at close to the national rate. In that year South Australia grew by a solid 4.3 per cent. Then we went down disastrously. The net effect of two years of Dean Brown is that, during the calendar years 1994 and 1995, Australia under the Federal Labor Government grew by an impressive 8.8 per cent while South Australia grew by a pitiful 2.9 per cent.

Of course, the figure being quoted by the Premier in making these claims is the ABS's more erratic, seasonally adjusted estimate of our growth. The ABS estimates our growth for the calendar year 1995 to be 4.9 per cent. If the Premier will not listen to the Opposition, he should at least heed the views of the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies, which is normally supportive of conservative economic policies. In an *Advertiser* article of 18 June entitled 'Impressive result at odds with reality', the centre points out what the Opposition has also been saying. With almost all the major economic indicators pointing the wrong way—investment, housing approvals, retail sales and most of all employment—the latest ABS estimate is the result of an abnormally large balancing item. That is the part of the data that covers stock accumulation and decumulation, trade and statistical discrepancy. This is what the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies had to say:

> The interesting feature of the latest State accounts is that the balancing item—or what might loosely be called the error component—was responsible for almost all of the growth in the South Australian economy in 1995.

It was on this basis that the Premier claimed that South Australia is leading the way in economic growth. If we take the ABS's previous estimates for South Australia's growth performance over 1994 and 1995, both trend and seasonally adjusted, we find that in its latest release it has revised its previous estimates of growth overwhelmingly downward.

The latest ABS estimates of our growth over 1995 will certainly also be revised downward in the future.

In reinforcement of this point, we need only recall the clear, demonstrated facts of the economy under the Liberals as follows: Since December 1993, growth in the South Australian labour market has been just 2.8 per cent. Over the same period, employment in the Australian labour market grew by 6.9 per cent. During 1996 there has been virtually no growth in jobs at all in South Australia.

Building approvals are at their lowest in over 30 years and are currently at levels about half those of the recession years 1991-92. Retail sales are down, as is reflected in the loss of jobs from major Adelaide retailers. Finally, there is the disgraceful level of private capital investment in South Australia. In the year 20 March 1996, according to the ABS, South Australia was the only State to record a fall in private capital investment. While national private capital investment rose by 9.4 per cent, South Australia was going all the way down by no less than minus 12.2 per cent.

This may be 'leading the nation', as the Premier claims, but it is leading the nation in entirely the wrong direction. In fact, the Premier's words were prophetic, even though he did not realise it. Because the South Australian economy, weak and anaemic as it is, is shown by the ABS to be largely based upon a rise in private consumption, South Australia in fact had the largest rise in private consumption for the calendar year 1995 of any State. That growth—one of the very few bright spots in the picture of the South Australian economy provided by the ABS data—will be stubbed out by the fiscal and macroeconomic scorched earth policy of John Howard and Peter Costello, the $8 billion cuts that this Premier and this Treasurer have been urging the Commonwealth to make.

For all the hyperbole and self congratulation of this Premier about having created an economic miracle, the Government's own budget papers come closer to reality. For the Government's budget papers directly and unequivocally contradict the unbelievable utterances of this Premier on the South Australian economy. As I have said, the Government's own budget papers confirm that South Australia is caught in a high unemployment, low growth rut under the Liberals. On pages 3.7 and 3.9 of Budget Paper 1 it is shown that the Government expects South Australia to grow at a full half percentage point below even the pathetic growth rates that John Howard has in mind for the national economy, and this lag will continue until the turn of the century.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Well, we all know what will be in that budget, don't we? He has been prophesying it so far. About the year 1994-95, the year in which the Premier claimed we were 'out there—close to the best', the budget papers confirm that our performance was the worst in the nation, at a miserable .0 per cent. Note that the earlier quoted figure of minus .4 per cent was for the calendar year; the last mentioned figure relates to the 1994-95 financial year. The expected growth rates outlined in the budget papers will not be sufficient to prevent a continuing rise in unemployment in the coming years, and with it we will see a continuing outflow of working age population to other parts of Australia.

I now turn to budget issues in the area of Education and Children's Services. This year's education budget is unique in that, within one month of its being presented to Parliament and before being debated in this Council, it is obvious that the document does not represent the true position of either receipts or expenditure. The first problem with the 1996-97 education budget is that it is predicated on an increase in special purpose payments from the Commonwealth of $2.3 million from $125.9 million to $128.2 million. Given the deal brokered by the Premier that will result in special purpose payments to South Australia being cut by $33 million and the agreement that the State will pay the Commonwealth a further $50 million from special purpose payments in lieu of cuts to general purpose grants, I wonder whether the Minister still seriously believes that an increase is likely.

The second problem relates to the bungled negotiations with the teachers over their claims for a salary increase. The teachers' original claim would have cost $66 million. This claim was rejected by the Government and, following the pay increase granted to teachers in Western Australia and wage increases for our police up to 15 per cent, the teachers mounted a revised bid. After two years of botched negotiations, the Government's own offer to teachers is now reported to amount to $130 million per annum. The problem is that only $70 million of this offer is funded by Treasury and, in the department's letter of offer dated 31 May 1996, it was revealed that the department's contribution towards this cost remains at $23.6 million—total funding of $93.6 million and a shortfall of $30.4 million on the Government's own announced offer.

The Minister told the Estimates Committee on 18 June that any additional funds above the $93 million figure would have to come 'from either reductions in expenditure elsewhere or an increase in taxation revenue'. The next day the Treasurer confirmed that the $93 million was factored into the forward estimates and anything above that amount would cause budgetary stress. Before this Council is asked to pass this Bill it would be reasonable for the Minister to provide clarification on whether the Government intends to pay for its latest offers to the teachers by cutting more jobs, by other reductions in expenditure or by increased taxation.

The Premier's glossy budget pamphlet boasted a $150 million boost to education and health, $60 million more for Smarter South Australia and more than $100 million for new schools. Just one month later it is obvious that those claims are simply not true. They are as phoney as the rest of Dean Brown's budget. After allowing for inflation, the real increase in the recurrent budget is just $2 million, before allowing for the impact of the Federal budget or the final outcome of negotiations on teachers' salaries. The notional increase of $2 million compares with cuts of $47 million in real terms made to the recurrent budget from the consolidated account in the past two years and shows how phoney is the claim of an extra $60 million for a smarter South Australia.

The claim of more than $100 million for new schools is just as phoney. A simple reference to the budget papers shows that the expenditure on new schools will be just $35 million. This is down $18 million from last year's budget and pays for the promise of $15 million for information technology.

In another twist, the DECS' offer to teachers dated 31 May guaranteed some of this money for teacher training as an integral component of advancing the use of computers in schools. The rest of the $100 million is earmarked for the purchase of land and furniture; and $45 million is allocated for maintenance. Even the $35 million to be spent on new schools is a hoax. Fourteen of the projects announced as new projects to cost $13 million this year were actually recycled from last year and should have already been under way. Two of the projects have been announced as 'new works' in all three Brown budgets and still have not started. In the past two years, the capital works program has been under spent by

$24 million. In yet another twist, this year's program will depend on revenue of $14.5 million from the sale of school land and buildings. The total value of recycled projects and the sale of property makes up $27.5 million of the $35 million for new schools. The claim that $100 million will be spent on new schools is simply not true.

This Parliament is being asked to pass a budget that the Premier has already acknowledged has a black hole of $83 million—it could be bigger. On top of that, according to statements by the Minister, is another hole of up to $34 million to pay the teachers. It would not be unreasonable to ask the Government to detail the cut it intends to make to the budget to meet the $33 million cuts in Commonwealth special purpose grants and the $50 million payment in lieu of cuts to the general purpose grants. After all, the Parliament is being asked to pass a Bill authorising expenditure that the Premier and all senior Ministers have acknowledged will be changed by decisions to be announced in August by the Commonwealth and the outcome of negotiations with the teachers.

As shadow Minister for Education and Children's Services, I believe that this Chamber should be informed of how these issues might affect the education budget, whether teacher jobs will be cut and whether the capital program will go ahead. I place one question on notice and, in accordance with the agreement made during the Estimates Committees, ask the Minister to provide a response before the debate on the Appropriation Bill is completed. The Minister will recall that this procedure is in line with a precedent set by him as shadow Minister for Education in 1993 for which we are very grateful. Will the Minister provide a reconciliation of funding in the 1996-97 education budget for teachers' salaries, together with supplementary funding to be provided by Treasury, to meet the teachers' pay claim and the latest offer made to teachers valued by the Government at $130 million; and indicate the total amount not yet funded and how the Government intends to fund the difference?

I now turn to the budget's implications for women and programs affecting women specifically. The Minister for the Status of Women has two other portfolio areas—transport and arts—and she has only one day in which to deal with all these issues and questions. Questioning on the status of women line at the Estimates Committee took place very late in the evening following all the other questioning. In fact, we had only about half an hour to 40 minutes to deal with these issues. So, there are a number of issues that I still wish to raise with the Minister. I have discussed these issues with the Minister and it is much more to her liking if these issues are raised at the second reading stage rather than the Committee stage. It also facilitates a process of dealing with the answers. We do not wish to delay the passing of the Appropriation Bill. As always, we cooperate in the Upper House and we would like these questions to be answered. I hope that this brief statement has made this issue clear because, prior to delivering this speech, I was somewhat concerned that I would not be able to raise these issues. However, the Minister is very happy for me to raise them, as is the Leader in this place.

When one considers the activities set out in appendix B to the Financial Statement 1996-97, which is titled 'Impact of the Budget on Women' there is nothing new. One good thing, at least, is that many of the projects and agencies funded under the policies of the previous Labor Government have been continued by this Minister. One new item which appears in connection with the budget this year is the Women's Statement. This has been promised by the Minister for the Status of Women for the Spring session of Parliament, although this item was referred to in the Program Estimates for 1995-96. The Minister has offered no explanation why the Women's Statement could not have been prepared in time for the 1996 Estimates Committee. I hope that the Minister can get her Women's Statement ready by next year's Estimates Committees so that we can look at it in the overall context of budget estimates.

As was mentioned in the Estimates Committee by the member for Napier, the most significant innovation in the past 12 months in terms of services to women has been the establishment of the Women's Legal Service in Adelaide. Unfortunately, the Minister can take absolutely no credit for that since she did not support the establishment of this service. It will be funded exclusively by Commonwealth money—well, as long as they keep the Commonwealth money coming. The funding was promised by the former Federal Labor Government following the recommendations of the Justice Statement prepared by Mr Michael Lavarch and Mr Duncan Kerr who served as the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice respectively in the former Federal Labor Government. I only hope that funding will still be forth-coming under the new Federal Liberal Government.

The only other new development which warrants some praise is the establishment and ultimate reporting of the Joint Committee on Women in Parliament. Although that was not an innovation that directly led to improved services for women in the community, many recommendations in that report are of great significance to current members of Parliament and to those women who would aspire to be in Parliament. If the recommendations of the committee are carried out, there will be great long-term benefits for the women of our community when they see that it is a perfectly normal and unremarkable event for both women and men to be in Parliament, providing leadership in the community, and that it is not necessary to adopt a masculine bravado in order to reach these goals.

It will be a real test for the Minister for the Status of Women to see whether she can enlist the support of her Cabinet colleagues for the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Women in Parliament. Certainly as a member of that parliamentary committee I will do what I can to support the Minister because she is trying so very hard to get the recommendations of this parliamentary report through. I am sure that other members of the committee in this place—the Hon. Sandra Kanck (Australian Democrats) and the Hon. Angus Redford—will also support the Minister as she tries to get this Parliament to be more contemporary and more appropriate for women to enter.

In preparing to speak to the Appropriation Bill, of course I reviewed the *Hansard* of the Estimates Committee in which the topic of women was dealt with. It is obvious that the Minister for the Status of Women attempted to give the most cursory answers to questions from the Labor member for Napier, while the Minister went to some effort to give the most expansive answers possible to the questions from the Liberal member for Reynell. I suppose the Minister thinks that this is a clever tactic and I expect that we will see it again in the Estimates Committees next year if there is still a Liberal Government at that time.

As a consequence of the Estimates Committees process being as it is, I have a number of issues that I would like to raise with the Minister. On page 193 of the Estimates of Payments and Receipts is reference to a $29 000 reduction

anticipated in accommodation costs. I would like the Minister to advise how that is to be achieved. Can the Minister also advise whether there have been any cuts in real terms for women's health centres in this budget? Following the incorporation of the Domestic Violence Resource Unit within FACS last year, which agency or agencies now provides specialised domestic violence training to health, welfare and law enforcement officers? If drastic Federal funding cuts are implemented in the forthcoming Federal budget, as it appears likely, what will be the impact on programs of particular importance such as mammography and cervical cancer screening?

In respect of the Women's Register referred to on page 321 of the Program Estimates, how many women are on the register and how does the current number on the register compare with the number on the register kept by the previous Labor Government? What action will the Minister take in response to recommendation 7.2(7) of the Women in Parliament committee report? The committee notes:

> There is currently held a data bank of women qualified for appointive office, but that its existence is not particularly widely known.

The committee recommends that 'the data bank be widely publicised'. How many requests have been made by the Minister's Cabinet colleagues for names to be supplied from the Women's Register with a view to filling forward vacancies? What percentage of women whose names are on the register have actually been appointed to Government boards? Following claims made a month ago by Australian National University criminologist, Dr Patricia Easteal, at a recent forum held in Sydney on migrant women, namely, that a number of migrant women are virtually kept prisoners by their husbands, what steps has the Minister taken to investigate this problem in South Australia? It is interesting to note in today's *Advertiser* in the World News another rather derogatory statement about what some Australian men do with brides from overseas countries. It is disappointing to see that we are getting a rather bad reputation in this area.

Can the Minister tell why has funding for the Aboriginal and Multicultural Women's Project of Workmate Incorporated been cut out as of 31 July? What action has the Minister taken to persuade the Minister for Family and Community Services to continue funding for the Aboriginal and Multicultural Women's Project and the neighbourhood development worker employed by the project for the past 18 months? What action has the Minister taken to persuade the Minister for Family and Community Services to maintain funding for the SPARK Resource Centre, which does so much good work for sole parents in South Australia, instead of cutting SPARK funding by over 30 per cent? What action has the Minister taken to persuade the Minister responsible for TAFE to restore sufficient funding to the Women's Studies Resource Centre to enable the centre to operate with two full-time coordinators so that the levels of service provided by the centre in 1995 can be maintained and improved?

I appreciate that, in planning the Estimates Committees process, it is difficult to know how long particular topics will take, so it is perhaps not surprising that a number of questions remained unasked at the end of that process. Accordingly, I would appreciate receiving answers from both the Minister for the Status of Women and the Minister for Education and Children's Services to the various questions before we vote on the Bill.

Finally, returning to the themes with which I began, the budget is essentially a fraudulent document, supposedly based on the assumption that there would be no substantial cuts to State funding by the Commonwealth. When that approach was decided upon by Cabinet, every Minister would have known what a ridiculously artificial assumption that was. Now that the Commonwealth's intentions have become clearer and there appears to be something like a $83 million shortfall of funds as against the State budget figures, few Ministers have been left without gaping holes in their budget and the answer is going to be further cuts to services in education, health and community welfare programs. The list goes on and on.

The community will not be fooled by this and will be awake to the Premier's attempts to deflect all criticism henceforth to the Federal Government. It is about time this Liberal State Government took responsibility for the savagery of the cuts to services inflicted over the past 2½ years. Ultimately, every one of these cuts can be traced back to the self-centred philosophy at the heart of the Liberal Party, that the law of the jungle should apply and each person has to make their own way in a harsh and brutal world. That is a repugnant philosophy and one that I reject. This Liberal Government will pay the price when the community has a chance to react to it at the next State election. I support the second reading.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FAIR TRADING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1633.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): On behalf of the Attorney-General, I thank honourable members for their support of this measure. The Attorney-General's staff have provided me with a considered response to issues raised by the Hon. Anne Levy, and I propose to respond on behalf of the Attorney. The Hon. Ms Levy raised a number of questions in the course of the second reading debate, and I take this opportunity to provide some additional information on those matters.

The Bill establishes a new regime for dealing with third party trading stamp schemes, which will now be called 'third party trading schemes' in recognition of the fact that electronic transference and redemption of points has largely replaced the traditional stamp. The honourable member suggested that requirements with which we are all familiar concerning proof of purchase are a result of our current laws relating to trading stamps. This is not correct. Proof of purchase laws, whereby South Australian entrants in competitions relating to products did not have to submit wrappers, bar codes and so on, have their origin in the Lotteries and Gaming Act, but the regulations under that Act were amended last year to provide that entry and trade promotion lotteries can be conditional upon purchase of goods that must otherwise be free.

The matter of proof of purchase has never been a matter governed by the trading stamp provisions in the Fair Trading Act. The Hon. Ms Levy has also suggested that consideration be given to the imposition of a penalty for breach of the conditions of approval. I advise that it is considered that the best penalty for breach of conditions is prohibition of the scheme. This is provided for in proposed section 45(1)(b) whereby the Commissioner can recommend prohibition of a

scheme if a condition of approval is contravened. If any person then promotes, is a party to, or advertises a prohibited scheme, a penalty applies. It is considered that the regime proposed in the Bill is a more serious and appropriate deterrent than a fine against, say, one officer of the promoter or the corporate promoter itself, which may decide to wear the fine and continue with the scheme.

Where a breach of conditions is of a minor nature, the Commissioner may seek an assurance under the Fair Trading Act. Breach of the assurance also carries penalties. The honourable member has raised the issue of who is responsible if the participating retailer is no longer in existence. She has suggested that responsibility should fall to the promoter of the scheme. In virtually every scheme that officers of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs have seen, the promoter bears the ultimate responsibility for a scheme's failure or success, regardless of whether or not the participating retailer is still in business. This is because the participating retailer would have been making contributions to the promoter to fund the scheme prior to ceasing business. Where the payments stop, the right to participate in the scheme would also be withdrawn from the retailer.

Under such schemes the consumer's contract is with the promoter and not the participating retailer. Under some schemes the promoters and participating retailers are the same people. Fly Buys, GM Card and other schemes with large corporate players appear to be structured in this way. With such schemes it is unlikely that no one will be around to deal with the disgruntled consumer.

The honourable member does not refer to the situation where the promoter has ceased business, which in fact could have more serious ramifications for a scheme if participants were made up of largely smaller retailers who might suffer bad publicity and harassment from consumers. Unless the scheme specifically provided for it, there would not normally be any right to claim for the lost benefit against a participating retailer who was not a promoter.

In the light of this information, it is difficult to accommodate the honourable member's suggested amendments. In relation to door to door trading, the honourable member has asked that the amendments relating to competition forms be extended to information obtained at temporary stalls, presumably set up for promotional purposes in shopping centres, etc. I consider that this situation would be covered by the proposed amendment to section 14(2), which significantly broadens the ambit of the section. Once again, I thank the honourable member for her contribution and support the measure.

Bill read a second time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (COMPETITION) BILL

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

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The purpose of this Bill is to establish an independent source of pricing oversight to apply to the prices of selected monopoly or near monopoly Government businesses in South Australia. The framework proposed will also establish a mechanism for the investigation of competitive neutrality complaints. To this end, this Bill establishes the office of Competition Commissioner which draws these elements together in a cohesive and flexible framework which will promote efficiency and competitiveness in the supply of services by government enterprise.

At a meeting of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in April 1995, Heads of Government signed agreements to implement the national competition policy reform package. This package comprised a number of key policy elements, including pricing oversight of Government monopoly businesses and competitive neutrality between competing private and Government owned businesses, as embodied in the Competition Principles Agreement.

The *Competition Policy Reform Act* enacted by the Commonwealth amends the *Prices Surveillance Act* so that its provisions can be applied to State owned businesses. Strict conditions govern its application, requiring a finding that another jurisdiction has been adversely affected by the pricing of a State monopoly before the Commonwealth Minister can declare the business for price surveillance.

In agreeing to this framework, the States committed to an approach which would allow jurisdictions to develop State based pricing oversight regimes. This recognises the sovereignty of the States and the crucial role they play in the implementation of competition policy. Consequently, the Competition Principles Agreement enables States to establish and administer their own pricing oversight regimes, provided these accord with a set of agreed principles.

This Bill will enable South Australia to perform this function, avoiding the need for a Commonwealth administered pricing oversight regime of government businesses in South Australia, while also providing a mechanism for competitive neutrality complaints to be lodged and investigated. The introduction of such arrangements was foreshadowed in the *Competition Policy Reform (South Australia) Bill* recently introduced to the House. The framework established in this Bill will complement this legislation and put in place a key element of the Government's competition policy strategy.

This Bill is intended to provide a flexible legislative framework which will enable the investigation of future price movements of designated Government Business Enterprises (GBEs). This oversight will only be required in instances in which a GBE dominates the market and effective competition is weak or cannot occur. It is intended initially that the prices oversight regime would be applied to the electricity and water sectors.

This model will ensure that price increases of declared Government businesses will first be subject to independent assessment and scrutiny prior to decision by Government. This will enhance public accountability and introduce greater rigour and independence in the setting of prices for declared government businesses.

A Competition Commissioner will be empowered by this Bill to review the pricing policies of declared GBEs and to recommend to Government a suitable price structure to apply for a period of up to five years. Commissioners will report to the Premier as the Minister responsible for administering this legislation.

Once the services of a GBE have been declared for the purposes of this Act, a pricing investigation will be required before any decision can be made regarding pricing policy. The process envisaged will involve several key stages.

Firstly, the enterprise must notify the portfolio Minister of its intention to seek a price increase. In turn the Minister would then notify the Minister responsible for the administration of the Competition Commissioner, in this instance the Premier. A Competition Commissioner would be appointed by the Governor and requested to undertake an investigation into the pricing policy of the enterprise. Following the preparation of an interim report, a final report must be delivered by a fixed date recommending a pricing strategy and the reasoning underlying these recommendations.

The recommendations will cover a period of up to five years and may be based on a formula, and will therefore not necessarily be restricted to actual increases. This will provide greater certainty for both consumers and the enterprise and reduce the cost and disruption which could result from multiple investigations. Within six sitting days the final report must be tabled before both Houses of Parliament and its recommendations thereby made public. Its recommendations and findings will also be published in the Government Gazette.

Based on these public recommendations, the Government will make a final decision concerning the pricing policy of the GBE. These measures ensure the price setting process is transparent and that final accountability remains with Government.

While the recommendations of the Competition Commissioner will not necessarily be accepted in all instances, this will clearly provide a greater level of independent scrutiny and rigour in the establishment of prices levied by declared government businesses.

In the establishment of prices for key services provided by Government businesses, it is important that a range of relevant criteria and objectives be considered and that these factors be clearly and explicitly identified. This Bill establishes efficient resource allocation as the primary objective of the Competition Commissioner and provides that the factors considered in undertaking investigations will include:

- the need to protect consumers from potential abuse of market power;
- the efficient costs of production and supply;
- the costs of complying with government directions and community service obligations;
- relevant intergovernmental agreements;
- the efficiency of the operations of the enterprise and reasonable efficiency targets in delivering services;
- service quality considerations;
- the need to achieve a return on assets.
- the cost of complying with statutory and other legal obligations.

A Commissioner will also be required to take other objectives into consideration and any further factors which the Minister may specify, as appropriate to the specific investigation. However, Commissioners will not be subject to Ministerial direction in relation to either recommendations or findings.

Importantly, the Bill will provide for public input in investigations, and allow consumers to have a say in future price adjustments. Inquiries will be publicly advertised and input will be sought from the wider community. In this way, investigations will be placed in the public arena, enhancing the level of public scrutiny and giving the community greater influence on the decision making process.

As mentioned earlier, this legislative framework will also establish a competitive neutrality complaints mechanism. The Bill will enable the appointment of a Commissioner who can investigate such complaints as they arise. The objective of this element of competition policy is to ensure that GBEs do not enjoy any net competitive advantages purely by virtue of their government ownership.

Competitive neutrality principles will be proclaimed by the Governor, and will be entirely consistent with the set of principles embodied in the Competition Principles Agreement. The model will enable competitive neutrality complaints to be lodged and investigated at any stage. This will allow such complaints to be promptly and efficiently addressed, highlighting the flexibility of the proposed approach.

The Commissioner will report on competitive neutrality investigations to the Minister, the complainant and the agency concerned. As a further reporting mechanism, the results of such investigations will be reported in the annual report of the Competition Commissioner, to be incorporated in the annual report of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. As previously announced, the Government also intends publishing a policy statement detailing how it will give effect to these principles.

A key advantage of the Competition Commissioner model lies in its simplicity, providing a straightforward approach to pricing review and the investigation of competitive neutrality complaints. The model also adopts a less bureaucratic and prescriptive approach for South Australia than that applied in some other States.

The framework outlined in this Bill forms a key element in the implementation of competition policy in South Australia, and will deliver tangible benefits for consumers. This initiative also represents an important step in the on going reform of GBEs and builds on the range of regulatory, structural and financial reforms implemented by the Government, while also increasing the level of transparency and public scrutiny.

This approach will assist in promoting more competitive and efficient outcomes in the absence of market competition by producing pricing outcomes similar to those which might be expected to result from a more competitive environment. This is in line with the central thrust of competition policy and will lead to the achievement of greater efficiency in the wider economy. The model is also broadly in accordance with approaches adopted in other jurisdictions, consistent with the vision of a national approach to competition policy.

The elements of competition policy together with the Bill now before the House make up a comprehensive framework for delivering greater economic efficiency by increasing competition. It is vital to ensure fair and efficient pricing of key Government services in the economy, consistent with the objective of encouraging efficient service provision and improving the overall business climate in South Australia. This will stimulate efficiency and provide a degree of assurance to business and consumers alike, enhancing the State's competitiveness and thereby helping to maintain South Australia as an attractive place in which to invest and do business.

I commend this Bill to the House

Explanation of Clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This sets out a number of definitions that are required for the purposes of the proposed new Act.

Clause 4: Pricing recommendation

This clause deals with certain aspects of pricing recommendations. A pricing recommendation may set out recommended principles for fixing prices and may contain recommendations about price limitation.

A pricing recommendation remains current until superseded by a later pricing recommendation. However, if it is not superseded by a later recommendation within a term stated in the recommendation or 5 years (whichever is the lesser), it lapses at the end of that term.

A pricing recommendation is advisory only and does not bind the GBE to which it relates.

PART 2

COMPETITION COMMISSIONERS

Clause 5: Appointment of Commissioners

This clause provides for appointment of Commissioners by the Governor. The terms and conditions of appointment are to be as determined by the Governor. However, an appointment cannot be made or renewed for more than 2 years. A Commissioner cannot be removed from office except for misconduct or mental or physical incapacity to carry out official duties satisfactorily.

Clause 6: Independence of the Commissioners

A Commissioner is not subject to Ministerial direction about a recommendation, finding or report. However, the Minister may, by written direction, require the Commissioner to take into account specified facts, policies or issues in a particular investigation.

Clause 7: Power to require attendance of witness or production of documents

This clause gives a Commissioner power to summon witnesses and gather evidence.

PART 3

PRICES OVERSIGHT

Clause 8: Liability to prices oversight

This clause provides that the Governor may declare a GBE to be subject to prices oversight. The Governor must be satisfied, before making such a declaration, that the GBE has substantial market power in one or more markets. The declaration must identify the market or markets in relation to which the GBE is subject to prices oversight and fix the period for which the declaration is to be effective. The Governor may amend or revoke a declaration under this clause.

Clause 9: Requirement to make investigation and make pricing recommendation

This clause empowers the Minister to assign a Commissioner to carry out an investigation into the prices charged by a declared GBE in a declared market. This may be done whether or not there is a current pricing recommendation in force.

If a declared GBE notifies its portfolio Minister of an intention to increase prices in a declared market, the Minister must, at the request of the portfolio Minister, assign a Commissioner to carry out an investigation into the prices charged by the GBE in the declared market.

A Commissioner assigned to carry out the investigation must be independent of financial or other relationships with the GBE which might improperly influence the Commissioner's judgment.

The Commissioner is required to provide a report on the investigation including a pricing recommendation within a period fixed by the Minister.

Clause 10: Budget for carrying out investigation

This clause provides for the preparation and approval of a budget for an investigation. The GBE must, if the Minister directs, pay the costs of the investigation or a proportion of those costs decided by the Minister.

Clause 11: Public notice of investigation
This clause requires the Commissioner to give public notice of an investigation inviting representations from interested persons. The Commissioner is required to consider all representations made in response to the notice.

Clause 12: Matters to be considered by Commissioner in carrying out investigation
This clause sets out the prime objective of an investigation and the matters to be considered by the Commissioner.

Clause 13: Draft report and pricing recommendation
When the Commissioner completes an investigation, the Commissioner must prepare a draft report setting out the findings made on the investigation, the proposed pricing recommendation and the reasons for it.

The Commissioner must give copies of the draft report to the Minister, the GBE and other persons to whom the Minister directs. The Commissioner must allow the persons to whom the draft report is submitted a reasonable opportunity to comment on the report.

Clause 14: Final report
The Commissioner must consider comments made on the draft report and make any recommendations to the report and the proposed pricing recommendation that the Commissioner considers appropriate in the light of those comments. The Commissioner is then to issue the report as a final report.

Clause 15: Increase of prices
This Clause prevents a declared GBE from increasing prices for services in a declared market unless a pricing recommendation is current.

PART 4
PRINCIPLES OF COMPETITIVE NEUTRALITY

Clause 16: Principles of competitive neutrality
This clause provides for the promulgation of principles of competitive neutrality—*ie* principles designed to ensure that private sector bodies are able to compete, on a fair and equal basis, with government and local government agencies engaged in significant business activities in the same market.

Clause 17: Complaints
This clause provides for the making of complaints of infringements of the principles of competitive neutrality.

Clause 18: Investigation of complaints
This clause provides for the assignment of a Commissioner to investigate a complaint of infringement of the principles of competitive neutrality.

Clause 19: Investigation of complaint
The Commissioner is to report the result of the investigation to interested parties. If the Commissioner finds that there has been a breach of the principles of competitive neutrality, the Commissioner may recommend the adoption of policies and practices to avoid further infringements of the same kind.

PART 5
MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 20: Confidentiality
This clause protects the confidentiality of information obtained in the course of investigations under the new Act.

Clause 21: Annual report
This clause provides for a report on the investigations carried out under the new Act to be included in the annual report of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Clause 22: Regulations
This is a regulation making power.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (OBJECTS OF FUNDS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Friendly Societies Act in order to provide friendly societies the ability to offer a new product to counter the effects of extended deeming, which came into operation as a result of Commonwealth law on 1 July 1996.

There are seven friendly societies registered in South Australia. Four of these societies offer financial products to their members. These societies are a significant force in the non-bank financial institution sector.

The Federal Government passed legislation on 29 November 1995 for the introduction of extended deeming provisions. Deeming is the method used by the Department of Social Security to assess the income from investments held by a person to determine the amount of pension that will be paid to them. This method has been in use for some time, but did not apply to friendly society products that were established prior to January 1988. Extended deeming captures all friendly society investments held by pensioners, irrespective of the date when the investment was made. Although the Commonwealth legislation received Royal assent on 9 January 1996, the commencement of extended deeming was delayed until 1 July 1996 in order to allow pensioners sufficient time to review their investment arrangements.

Friendly society products have typically offered investors a tax paid return. Deeming does not treat investments which are tax paid or taxed in the hands of the investor differently. While the changes to the deeming arrangements do not affect the pension income of all pensioners, some pensioner members have sought alternative investment options in order to maximise their income allowed under the new arrangements.

It is the Government's view that the new product will provide friendly societies with the ability to offer existing members alternative investment opportunities within the sector. Additionally, the new product will be marketed to attract new investments to friendly societies.

The new product, which is known as a bonus bond, was designed by the Australian Friendly Societies Association and drafted in Victoria. Although the bonus bond was supposedly designed for adoption by friendly societies throughout Australia, no account of the differences in State legislation was made. Consequently, the Government is faced with having to amend the Act in order to enable South Australian based friendly societies to deliver this product to the market place. The Government is aware that a Victorian friendly society is already advertising the product here in South Australia.

In this particular case of the rules for the bonus bond product, the Government will support a proclamation based on a thorough examination of the rules, and because it considers that South Australian friendly societies should be given the same opportunities to provide this product compared to interstate friendly societies, which have already commenced marketing a similar product in South Australia.

Any future application to establish a new fund by this mechanism will need to be accompanied with sufficient details of the proposal, so that the Registrar of Friendly Societies can convince himself that the change is desirable when considered against the legal and financial criteria set out in the Act. With the impending commencement of the national scheme of supervision for friendly societies, it is anticipated that the Government will find it difficult to be convinced of the need for any further new objects to be established under the Act.

I commend the Bill to the House and I seek leave to have the explanations of the clauses inserted in Hansard without my reading them.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title
This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 7—Objects for which funds may be maintained
Provision has been made for the Governor, by proclamation, to declare objects (other than those already listed in section 7(1) of the principal Act) to be objects for which a friendly society may raise and maintain a fund.

If such a fund is raised, it must be maintained in a separate fund (as is currently required in respect of certain other funds raised and maintained for other purposes by friendly societies—see section 7(7) of the principal Act).

A proclamation made for this purpose may be varied or revoked by subsequent proclamation and the day fixed by the Governor as the day on which the proclamation comes into operation may be a day prior to the day on which the proclamation is made or the day on which this proposed subsection comes into operation.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 9 July at 2.15 p.m.