

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 17 October 1996

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

MULTICULTURALISM

A petition, signed by 111 residents of South Australia concerning ill-informed sentiments expressed by a Federal member of Parliament and praying that this Council will strongly urge the Prime Minister of Australia to take note of the matters raised herein and give a firm commitment that the Australian Government will uphold the principles of multiculturalism and denounce racial discrimination which could divide the Australian community, was presented by the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin)—

Legal Services Commission of South Australia—Report, 1995-96.

QUESTION TIME

MUSIC EDUCATION

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question on the subject of teaching music.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: In 1994, a music review was held and, although no-one was told of the outcomes, the Minister has acknowledged that they were not implemented because of his decision to cut 23 music teaching positions. On 13 February the Minister announced that there would be a State-wide music education review in the wake of his decision to cut 23 music teachers. However, before this review could get off the ground, it was scrapped in favour of something called 'an internal consultation' between departmental officers and stakeholders to progress 'the final resolution of music issues in this State'. My questions are:

1. Why did the Minister fail to advise the instrumental and vocal music staff of the decision not to proceed with the 1996 review?
2. Why has the State-wide management of music in South Australia been reduced from principal level to coordinator level?
3. Does the Minister support the privatisation of instrumental music education in Government schools?
4. How many schools now engage private providers on a cash basis?
5. Have schools been offered salary funding to engage hourly paid private music instructors?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Although I will take some of those questions on notice and bring back a reply, there are some issues that I can address immediately. The Leader of the Opposition indicates that there was a review of music in 1994, or around about that period. It was the intention of the department during some part of 1995 and I think early 1996

to conduct a further review. It was my opinion as Minister that we ought to reconsider that view, because instrumental music teachers with whom I had discussed the issue had directly stated to me 'We have already had a review. Why are you having another review?' That seemed to be a sensible question.

I discussed that issue with the department and it was as a result of that discussion that I had with the department based on the information I obtained from my discussions with instrumental music teachers—and others—that we have moved to this new stage, which is basically looking at how we can implement a new strategic plan (I think that is the best way of putting it) in terms of instrumental music in schools in South Australia. So, rather than having another period of review and consultation, we are giving consideration to this being the amount of resource that we have within the Government and the Department for Education and Children's Services and how best we can use that resource to the benefit of what has, admittedly, always been a small number of students. The figure I have quoted before is that only 5 per cent of students under the previous Government enjoyed the privilege, or the benefit, of instrumental music lessons. I think 95 per cent of students were not involved in instrumental music.

I will be able to get the figures for the Leader of the Opposition, but I understand that, even with the reductions, the number of students who undertake instrumental music in our schools is about the same as it was prior to the reductions. So, there has been a significant increase in terms of the workload and the output, and I acknowledge the efforts of the hard-working members of the Instrumental Music Section of the Education Department.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, we are talking about the department's instrumental music program. If that is the case, I will confirm those figures. I am sure all members would welcome the fact that we have been able to achieve, if that is the case, the continued teaching of 5 per cent of instrumental music students with such a significant reduction in terms of the cost of the instrumental music program within Government schools in South Australia.

I will take advice on access to schools of private piano teachers or other such music teachers. My recollection is that in some parts of the country and also some parts of the city that has evidently been a practice in some of our schools for quite some time. I will take advice on that. I do not believe it to be a new circumstance. I believe that the Labor Ministers in the Labor Government allowed such a situation to occur within schools. However, I will take advice on that to clarify my recollection in relation to that question.

I think one of the other questions was why I did not personally advise the instrumental music teachers of one of my decisions. It is not my responsibility as Minister, with the up to 25 000 employees that I have in the Department for Education and Children's Services, to advise individual members of decisions that I take as Minister. I have some very efficient, effective and hard working senior and middle level managers within the department to undertake those sorts of responsibilities. I will inquire as to whether the Leader of the Opposition has accurately reflected the situation.

MIMILI SCHOOL

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and

Children's Services a question about the Mimili Community School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: On Tuesday 15 October I addressed some questions to the Minister in respect of the provision of an asbestos covered school with very little consultation with the Minister. He said on that occasion that he was unaware of the details but would bring back a reply. I pointed out that the building did have notices on it saying that it was built from asbestos. The Minister introduced into this Chamber yesterday a motion which, in part, said that this Legislative Council:

...reaffirms its support for the ongoing process of reconciliation and achieving a greater understanding between Australians of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal background and recognises the special needs—

this is the important part—

of Aboriginal communities, especially in health and education.

I was advised this morning that the Principal at Mimili has been advised in the following terms, under the heading 'Re: Asbestos buildings—Mimili School':

It has come to the attention of the council that damage has occurred to the asbestos building. A number of holes are present and asbestos debris is spread throughout the school grounds. Due to the extremely hazardous nature of this and for obvious occupational health and safety reasons, the council have decided to close Mimili School immediately. The school will remain closed until a qualified judgment can be made by the relevant authorities (presumably A.P. Services and the asbestos unit, Services SA). We would like you to make arrangements to take action in respect of this notice and also to deal with the interim problem of keeping all children away from the affected areas.

It is with some disappointment that I note that the Minister has not answered the questions posed on Tuesday. However, I pose this question: what is the Minister doing to ensure that the health and education needs of the children are being adequately met at Mimili School?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In his question on Tuesday the honourable member indicated that he believed the Minister was aware of the situation, and I said that on my recollection I was not. The honourable member approached me after Question Time and gave me a copy of the letter that had been addressed to me, which was dated 12 October. I understand that it arrived in my office on Tuesday of this week, if not late on Monday afternoon. So, I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was being a little mischievous in indicating that he believed that the Minister was aware of the situation when he knew that the letter had been posted only on 12 October, and that was the date of the letter that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition showed me.

The advice I was provided with as of lunchtime today—and we will be confirming this, because at the moment we have a senior officer en route to Mimili to try to help resolve the situation; he will be there in about 45 minutes, I understand, to try to work his way through the situation—is that when the building was delivered there was no hole in the facility. I am seeking further clarification of that advice, but the advice to my office at lunch time today was that when the building was delivered there were no such holes in the building and therefore the problems to which the honourable member referred in his question did not exist. I will clarify that. If that is the case, perhaps some damage has been caused to the building in the past 24 hours. That will be clarified and I am seeking urgent advice at the moment.

A senior officer of the department responsible for the schools in the Anangu lands is currently driving to Mimili to

try to sort out the situation. I have also been provided with a copy of a letter subsequent to the letter received by me and, I think, Ralph Clarke as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—the letter to which the Deputy Leader in this place has referred.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: What date is it?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The date is today. The letter comes from Mark Connelly, Coordinating Principal (I have been sent a copy), and states:

I have been given a copy of the letter from Mimili Council to Ms Joselyn King, the Principal of Mimili School. The letter is telling Joselyn to close the school. The Minister for Education is aware of the circumstances surrounding the classroom and I have spoken to his staff this afternoon about this letter. Unfortunately, the council does not have the authority to close the school in this way, so I have told Joselyn to return to work at the normal time after lunch. I have also spoken to Geoff Iverson, manager of Anangu Education Services, and he is on his way now to inspect the school and the damage. He will be there at about 3 p.m.—

I am wrong—30 minutes' time—

this afternoon. I am currently organising contractors from Chapman Building Industries to come and repair any damage to make sure that the building is safe. If you have any questions please contact me.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Given that the expert who will assess the damage up there is due to arrive in three quarters of an hour, why was it decided, against the background of the children's health, to send them back at 12 o'clock today?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The decision was taken that the Senior Education Manager, the Manager of Anangu Education Services (Mr Geoff Iverson), would drive immediately to Mimili to assess the situation and that the school council has no authority to close a school. Until we can have a senior manager there, the Coordinating Principal is the person responsible, the educational leader, and he is on site—I am not, and neither is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—to try to manage the circumstances. Mr Iverson is the Manager of Anangu Education Services. He has dropped everything to drive to Mimili to try to resolve this issue. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition either does not understand how the school system operates up there or is deliberately trying to be mischievous or political—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Or both.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Or both—all of the above—in relation to these circumstances. One cannot ask of any department or system any quicker response than, within hours of the Minister's having received the letter, a senior manager driving to the location to try to assess the problem and the expert from Chapman Building Industries trying to come in and repair any damage and make an assessment.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I do not think so.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There is not much more that the system can do, given that in 25 minutes—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has had his opportunity to ask his question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am advised that by three o'clock a senior manager will be there to try to assess the problems.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ron Roberts would be wise to sit back and listen for a moment.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: 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 the Olympic Dam expansion program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: On 19 August 1996 Western Mining formally applied to the Commonwealth for an expansion of its Olympic Dam project at Roxby Downs. The expansion goes beyond that already approved under the terms of reference and the indenture agreement with the South Australian Government which permits mining to 150 000 tonnes per annum of copper and associated products. The present scale is 85 000 tonnes per annum, and the new application is for 200 000 tonnes per annum. There are plans to increase it to 250 000 tonnes per annum. It is believed that the Commonwealth has determined that, under the EPIP Act, such expansion would require a new EIS, and the Opposition welcomes the Commonwealth's decision. It is further believed that the EIS is to be a joint State-Commonwealth study and that the State has been designated as a lead agent. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Is the EIS a joint State-Commonwealth study?
2. Has the State Government been designated the lead agent?
3. Have the terms of reference been set and, if not, will the State Government put out the draft terms of reference for public comment and feedback?
4. What is the time frame for the EIS process?
5. Is the State Government aware that Kinhill Stern is already working on an EIS for Western Mining Corporation, presumably before the terms of reference have been set? Will the Government comment on what status Kinhill Stern's EIS will have relative to the EIS that will be commissioned on behalf of the State Government?

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Do you support Roxby Downs these days?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It exists.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Roxby Downs exists! It exists, but no thanks to Mr Roberts or his colleagues. Fortunately, that 'mirage in the desert' does exist. At least the Hon. Terry Roberts can face facts even if he does not like supporting such positive economic development in this State, with major jobs, major housing—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much background noise.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I was quietly indicating that Roxby Downs has been an enormous success not only for regional development in this State but for the overall prosperity of the State. Many young people from rural areas have gone to Roxby Downs to start a new life and have probably never returned to farming; but there are many other extraordinarily able people who have found positive, secure, long-term jobs in that area. The proposed new development by Western Mining is absolutely stunning in terms of jobs, development and prosperity for this State. We need it badly. It certainly exists and, fortunately, it will get bigger and better for the good of everyone in this State. I am not sure whether that fact is also accepted by the Hon. Mr Roberts, but I hope

it is. In the meantime, I will refer his questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

AUSLAN

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about the introduction of Auslan as a school subject choice.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: My question relates to a proposal to introduce Auslan, an internationally recognised language for the hearing impaired, as a subject choice for South Australian students from years 8 to 12. With the recent decision to move the Centre for Hearing Impaired to Daws Road High School, support has been expressed for the establishment of a pilot program for more than 12 months in the south-west corner, which is currently being reviewed. I understand that there is enthusiasm amongst staff and the hearing impaired community in this area for Auslan to be offered as a subject choice.

I understand that the Minister has already been approached by a colleague about this matter and there is keenness for this subject to be offered from next year. The language is not presently taught as a subject within the secondary school system, but I understand that it is on the SACE curriculum stream of subjects. Offering this language as a subject to the school system would expand communication skills and offer increased career choices for the whole student population. The subject is available through Adelaide TAFE, but it has been suggested that it is really not appropriate for secondary students, first, because of the different educational culture and age differences, and also because of the cost, which is somewhere between \$800 and \$1 000 per student.

Deaf and hearing impaired students are currently being discriminated against by not being able to study their first language in the school system, unlike other students for whom English is a second language. The cost for the program would come from the sale of the Marion High School campus where the Centre for Hearing Impaired is presently located and which is due for closure. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister approve the establishment for an Auslan pilot program to commence next year?
2. Will the proposal be picked up now under the current review of the south-west corner and be ready to be incorporated for the start of the first semester in 1997 and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will need to take some advice on that question. I know that the Centre for Hearing Impaired located at Marion High School is being transferred to the Daws Road High School site to provide specialist services that the current Marion High School Centre for Hearing Impaired unit provides to students. There will be a continuation of that service. I will need to take some advice about whether there will be an extension in the area that the honourable member has recommended and supported and bring back a reply.

RESTRAINING ORDERS

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Police, a question about restraining orders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Last May I was approached by a woman concerning certain difficulties she was having with her former de facto partner of 18 months. The relationship had broken down. She informed me that on 5 March 1996, she told the police that her relationship had ended but that, during the course of that relationship, she had been subjected to verbal and physical abuse and, on occasions, had had to seek medical attention. The police indicated to her that she was not entitled to a restraining order because there was no bruising or corroborating evidence of her complaints.

That advice was given notwithstanding the fact that section 4 of the Domestic Violence Act provides that a restraining order can be made when there is reasonable apprehension that the defendant may, unless restrained, commit domestic violence. Subsequently the woman approached a senior officer who said that the police would endeavour to obtain a restraining order. However, the next day she was told that the police could not apply for a restraining order because her former partner had already obtained a restraining order against her. She was told that, as a consequence, there was no need for her to apply for a restraining order as his restraining order would stop him from approaching her.

His restraining order was served on her a week later. Some four days after that, she complained that he had attempted to approach her. A friend was present and had witnessed the incident. She complained to the police and was then told that she needed an order before anything could be done. Subsequent to that a series of incidents occurred: on 24 March he went to her house, she complained to the police and statements were taken from two others; on 29 April he visited again; on 14 May he visited her in hospital; on 24 May he intimidated her friends at the Royal Hotel and subsequently threatened her at the Broadway Hotel; on 16 June he drove past her house on a number of occasions; and, on 19 June, he approached her at work and threatened and abused her and waited for her at the end of work that day and again threatened her.

In the early hours of the following day he went to her house and banged on the doors. As a consequence of this she asked her employers, the TAB, to change her work place. Two days earlier he had made a false allegation against her alleging that she had assaulted him. The allegation was investigated by police and found to have no substance. Subsequent to that I wrote to the police on her behalf and I received some advice from the Minister for Police who informed me that the Commissioner of Police had advised him that, first, all matters reported to the police are being investigated; secondly, that where a suspect denies allegations, corroborative evidence is required before a charge is laid and, in this case, there was no corroborative evidence available; thirdly, that there had since been a subsequent report of unlawful imprisonment; and, fourthly, that she had now obtained a restraining order against him, which was served on 4 September 1996.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that my constituent is living in great fear and trepidation as a consequence of the actions of her former partner. The unlawful imprisonment incident, which is currently being investigated and may well go before the courts, involves an alleged incident which occurred late in the evening and involved her being forced into his car and driven around (I will not for obvious reasons go into any detail with regard to that).

My constituent has told me that no firearms were confiscated when her restraining order was served on her former partner, despite the fact that he had a gun during the course of their relationship. Further, he has access to guns in the course of his employment as a security guard with the MSS. The woman has come to see me again today to express her fears. I spoke to a senior police officer, and I must say that he was very helpful and sympathetic. He said that he had reviewed every file and that, unfortunately, there was internal conflict which made it difficult for the police to do anything.

She also told me that he has moved his residence to be near her house. She said that she is unable to sleep and spends evenings away from her home on many occasions in order to avoid the fear of his numerous approaches. However, the police officer to whom I spoke did advise me that he was very concerned that on occasions advice has been given to people that restraining orders taken out by their former partners will protect them and, therefore, they do not need to take out their own restraining orders: he agreed that that was wrong advice. He also said that the police were unable to take out mutual restraining orders because of the issue of conflict of interest, and I understand the difficulty in that regard.

The police officer said that it is not an uncommon problem. He told me that my constituent's former partner was 'a nitpicking ratbag' who has been a real 'pain in the backside'. However, as he had taken out the first restraining order with the assistance of the police there was little that the police could directly do in the initial stages to assist my constituent in obtaining a restraining order. My constituent believes that the Government should set up a protocol so that unscrupulous men do not get a restraining order from the police first in order to prevent women from using the police to assist them in granting restraining orders as a consequence of continuing violence and threats at the end of the relationship. In the light of this, my questions are:

1. Will the Minister investigate with the Commissioner of Police a protocol to be established so that women are not disadvantaged merely because their former partners get in first and obtain a restraining order?

2. In the light of the Commissioner's advice, will the Minister advise whether it is the practice of the police to require corroboration in every single case where domestic violence is alleged and, if so, why? Do police make judgments as to the truthfulness of the complainant in the absence of corroboration?

3. What is the normal practice in searching for firearms as a consequence of a restraining order being served? Did a search take place in this case?

4. Will the Commissioner investigate whether or not my constituent's former partner is a person who is fit and proper to hold a firearm's licence or have access to firearms through the course of his employment? Will the Commissioner of Police look into whether or not the woman's former partner is a fit and proper person to hold a licence under the Security Investigation Agents Act 1995 and whether or not the matter ought to be referred to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs?

I am authorised to give the Minister all the relevant information for the purposes of his making the appropriate inquiries.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will pass on those questions to the Minister responsible and ask him to bring back an urgent response.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: My questions are directed to the Minister for Transport and are about Australian National. Did the Minister receive a briefing from Great Southern Railways in March this year? If so, was the possible sale of Australian National discussed at this meeting? Was the Minister aware of Mr Brew's involvement with Great Southern Railways when she received the briefing? Was Mr Brew at the briefing?

On 1 October 1996 the Minister told Parliament that she had met six or seven companies which had shown an interest in all or some of the aspects of AN's business. Has the Minister informed the Port Augusta task force, which is looking into the future of AN, what those proposals were and, if not, why not?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Great Southern Railway company, as I understand the situation, was not formed in March, so I hardly met that company or the proponents of that company at that time, so the rest of the questions are irrelevant.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Not the last question.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As to the last question, I have spoken informally to the members of the task force about those groups. It is not a secret and I am happy to ring them this afternoon if they want it formally, but I have spoken to them. Even while I was there, there was positive publicity in the paper about Bechtel mining company, which is also very involved in railways, and that was supported by task force members, particularly the local council and work force representatives, in terms of Bechtel's interests in the workshops. According to the workplace representatives to whom I spoke that day, Bechtel representatives had actually been through the work—

An honourable member: The union?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, the union representatives from the workshops—PTU and AWU, I think—told me that they are encouraging everybody, including Bechtel, who may have some interest in helping them and the Government to ensure that there is an engineering business that will focus on rail and general engineering. I support the work force totally in their endeavours.

LITERACY AND NUMERACY

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a precised statement prior to asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question on the subject of education and training in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Very recently a conference was held in Adelaide, and the theme of this meeting was the Learning Environment Technology Australia conference. The person who gave the opening address at this event was Ms Verville, who holds the job as General Manager for Worldwide Education for the world computer giant IBM. Hers was the keynote address. Amongst the audience was the Premier of this State, the Hon. Dean Brown. Members of this Chamber will be interested in hearing some of the remarks he made when he officially opened the conference, as follows:

The State Government is absolutely committed to ensuring that young South Australians grow up technologically literate...the State's commitment to education and training would set it apart from other

Australian States as a centre for investment in the Asian Pacific region.

Those members of this Council who over the past week or so have watched some of the current affairs program reports on the lack of literacy and numeracy amongst our younger people may well be concerned about this matter. If the program contents reflect accurately the true position, that may well concern the viewers even more.

Some of the commentators assert that skills in literacy and numeracy are necessary basic fundamentals to enable one to embark successfully on future employment or even to higher levels of skills and knowledge as taught in our higher, tertiary, seats of learning. With that as a backdrop, I direct the following questions to the Minister:

1. How much impact will the recent Federal Government budget cuts have on the capacity of the State Government to fully implement the contents of the assertions made in the delivery by Mr Dean Brown of his Government's stated policy at the opening of the Learning Environment Technology Australia conference, with particular reference to the two quotes that I used in the preamble to this question?

2. If the assertions about lack of literacy and numeracy which have appeared in the last week are true, what impact will the Howard-led Liberal Government's budget cuts have on the capacity of this State Government's ability to address this matter?

3. If these allegations are true, will the Minister cease his Government's present policy of staff cuts within the State's education system, so as to ensure that teachers may spend more time with students who have specific learning difficulties in the fields of literacy and numeracy?

4. Does the Minister believe that proper knowledge levels in both literacy and numeracy are absolutely essential if children are to successfully pursue a better and higher level of learning in our tertiary institutions, thus giving some accord to Dean Brown's oft-stated position that it is only by this State becoming clever that we will be able to compete effectively in the global world markets that have emerged over the past decade or so?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for that question, but I can only say to the Hon. Trevor Crothers—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It was very eloquent. Where has the Hon. Trevor Crothers been for the last 20 years?

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: That's a good question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Terry Roberts says that is a good question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: A light amidst the darkness of the Labor Party in relation to education! As the Hon. Trevor Crothers will know, Governments of his personal political persuasion have governed and controlled our school system for the past 20 years, and the young people leaving our school system now are the ones who have suffered the trauma of being educated under a Labor Government for most of that time.

The problems of literacy and numeracy of which the Hon. Trevor Crothers so eloquently speaks are the problems that should have been identified and corrected and should have been given the additional resources 10 and 12 years ago, when those children were but youngsters in our school system in their preschool, junior primary school and in primary school years. There is very little point in trying to tackle the

issues of literacy and numeracy at age 15, 16 and 17 as these young people leave our school system to move into the university system.

The error of the previous Government and of previous Ministers was that they refused to acknowledge the importance of and they refused to provide the resources for the early years of education to identify the problems and to provide additional resources. This Government has provided more than \$10 million extra for the early years strategy. It is new, additional money for the early years of education to provide more assistance to help those students with learning difficulties within the classroom.

The problems of which the Hon. Trevor Crothers speaks are those of the previous Labor Government, previous Labor Ministers and previous Chairs of advisory committees to the Minister for Education, such as that chaired by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles. It rests on the shoulders of the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, the Hon. Susan Lenehan, the Hon. Greg Crafter and the Hon. Lynn Arnold—former Ministers for Education and advisers to Ministers for Education who have created the problems that this system has inherited. It is only this Government that is genuinely setting about putting resources into the early years of education, for the first time ever, to try to tackle the problems of children with learning difficulties.

This Government is proud to be the first Government and I am proud to be the first Minister to genuinely tackle the issues of an early years strategy and to put in additional resources to tackle the problems of students with learning difficulties.

The list is just too long for me to go through, but I intend to do so in the Address in Reply speech, in relation to all of the examples where we are tackling this problem. There has been more than \$10 million put in. Next year \$3 million will go into schools in cash grants to assist students with learning difficulties: the introduction of the basic skills test, for example; the compulsory training of over 6 000 pre-school and junior primary teachers in the whole area of assisting children with learning difficulties, providing them with assistance to identify the problem and the resources to do something about it; and the establishment of a learning difficulty support project team, using some of the very best people we have in South Australia to provide assistance to students with learning difficulties. The list goes on and on of all the assistance—

The Hon. T. Crothers: It is getting longer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is getting longer, yes. The new First Start program, the Eclipse program, and Parents as Teachers are all new programs established by this Government for the first time ever to provide additional assistance to students with learning difficulties in the early years of education.

I am delighted to have the Hon. Trevor Crothers for the first time acknowledge the problems the previous Ministers of his own persuasion have caused for young people within our education system. We still have a shadow Minister for Education who opposes basic skills testing for young people. Even though more than half of her shadow Cabinet opposes her view and supports the Government, this shadow Minister for Education still obstinately and steadfastly remains with the hard-core left minority leadership of the Institute of Teachers in opposing literacy and numeracy tests, something as simple as that, supported by 80 per cent of the parents in South Australia. People like the Hon. Paul Holloway do not support her. Half of the shadow Cabinet do not support her.

Probably half of the Caucus do not support her. But the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, with that small hard-core group that controls the leadership of the Institute of Teachers, refuse to support it. I suspect even the Hon. Terry Cameron—heaven forbid that I should acknowledge this—does not support the Hon. Carolyn Pickles on this issue. He has spoken about everything else for 2½ hours in the Address in Reply. Maybe this afternoon he might—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: I am not finished yet.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly. We know that he is there seeking to undermine the leadership. This is his *magnum opus* to take over the leadership and to establish his credentials. Maybe this afternoon we will hear that he does not support the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the basic skills test and he will say publicly what we suspect he is thinking privately and what he says to the other members of the Labor Caucus when he is skulking around in the corridors: 'This Leader of the Opposition, Carolyn Pickles, does not know what is going on in relation to education. She is out of touch in relation to what the mainstream wants. Let's undermine her,' as he is effectively—or perhaps ineffectively—doing; I am not sure. I suspect last night, after two hours and 10 minutes, he lost a lot of support from his colleagues, from the look in their eyes.

There are some other issues that the Hon. Trevor Crothers raised and I will have a look at the details in relation to them. I will be happy to provide a list for the honourable member of the innumerable new initiatives that this Government is implementing and providing additional resources to assist students with learning difficulties in the early years.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I have a supplementary question. The nub of my question lay in the first of the four questions I asked. That was not answered at all by the Leader. Instead, he endeavoured to refocus my questions by his usual general broad assertions.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Just ask the question. We do not need an explanation.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Don't gag me in this democratic society of ours, Mr. President. My question to the Leader is: how much impact will the recent Federal Government budget cuts have on the capacity of the State Government to fully implement the contents of the assertions made in the delivery by Mr Dean Brown of his Government's stated policy at the opening of the Learning Environment Technology Australia conference, with a particular reference to the two direct quotes which I used in the preamble to this question? It is a simple question. I call on the Leader to answer it.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Given the statements being made by the Prime Minister, both at that LETA conference, which he so eloquently opened with a very powerful, passionate speech on education and the importance of technology in education, and given the other public statements that the Prime Minister has made in relation to the education budget, if I can summarise it the Prime Minister is saying that education will be generally quarantined from the budget reductions. Given the statements being made by the Prime Minister, I suspect the answer to the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: TC, you need to listen to the answer.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Which TC are you calling on?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You: TC senior, not junior. Given the statements that have been made by the Prime

Minister, I suspect that the answer to the honourable member's question is, 'Not much at all.'

RAIL TRANSPORT

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about rail services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yesterday, in answer to a question from my colleague the Hon. Terry Cameron in relation to the Leigh Creek rail service, the Minister said:

...our preferred position is that any future operator, if they are to be introduced to the system, would not be encouraged to pick out the eyes of AN's business and, if the rest of the business is to be transferred back to the State, that the State be not left with only the major difficulties in the business other than the debt. That would mean all lines other than the Eyre Peninsula and Leigh Creek lines.

In view of that answer, my questions to the Minister are:

1. Given the State's preferred position, how will the State Government ensure that unprofitable lines such as the grain lines in the Murray-Mallee and the mid-north remain open under private operators?

2. Will the Minister rule out the subsidisation of private operators to run these lines?

3. Has the Government ruled out accepting the transfer of any or all of the rail lines operated by Australian National in South Australia?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I have not ruled out anything, nor is it appropriate that I rule anything in or out, because we are still waiting for the Federal Government to make a decision. I suspect that even the honourable member, if he thought through the questions he was asking, would think it foolish for the Government or the Opposition to rule out any proposition that is—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I know. It is the preferred position, but it is not the only position. It is important that we establish that, and I would think it regrettable if the Opposition ruled out any opportunity to ensure that we keep secure, long-term rail jobs and a viable rail business in this State. The Opposition may be prepared to do so: I am not.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Auditor-General's Report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: In the report from the Auditor-General he raised serious concerns about two related issues. The first of these is the level of exposure to liability of the public in the case of large-scale outsourcing such as the Government has done in its water privatisation deal. The second is the rundown in competence of skills in the public sector as a result of downskilling and contracting out. The Auditor-General gives examples of these private contractors supplying services and states:

Where that hospital is the Government's agent and it fails to comply with statutory provisions relating to public health services, the Government may be liable as the principal (part A, page 81).

The Auditor-General says that there has been a deskilling of the public sector work force (page 133) and that South Australian Water, for example, had a faulty understanding of the implications for its national competition policy (page 66). My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Is the Attorney-General concerned about these findings about public liability arising from outsourcing, and what does he intend to do about them?

2. Is the Attorney-General concerned about the additional dangers arising from large-scale outsourcing posed by deskilling of the public sector, and will he support the Government's undertaking to look into these areas where the skills are lacking?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The week before last I addressed some remarks to the issues of liability and the observations of the Auditor-General. I will refresh my memory on the matters that were raised then and my answers and, if necessary, will amplify the remarks I made on that occasion. In respect of the so-called deskilling, one must recognise that if any contract is outsourced there will still be a need for Government to manage effectively any contract that is outsourced and that that in itself will require skills, perhaps of a different nature. Ultimately, it is no prejudice to the Government or to the public if the services are still being adequately performed. It does not really matter who performs the services as long as they are being performed to a particular standard.

In the outsourcing contracts that the Government has entered into, performance standards are set. In some instances statutory obligations must still be complied with in the performance of particular functions and the provision of particular services. It is not a matter that I would have thought should be any concern of members of the public or members of the Parliament.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of the ministerial statement made today in another place by the Premier on the subject of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee.

Leave granted.

GREAT AUSTRALIAN BIGHT MARINE NATIONAL PARK

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 in another place by the Premier on the subject of the Great Australian Bight Marine National Park.

Leave granted.

TELEPHONE TOWERS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of a circular to principals and site managers on mobile telephone towers.

Leave granted.

WOMEN, NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs a question about women from a non-English speaking background.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: The platform that the Brown Opposition brought to the election in 1993 contained a number of undertakings that were generally well received by those concerned. I am talking about the area of women from a non-English speaking background, and I refer in particular to actions which may cut across different agencies and departments but which were generally grouped under the ethnic affairs portfolio: in particular, the promise to encourage women from non-English speaking backgrounds to participate in programs that will help them progress in the workplace on an equal basis; to establish a culturally appropriate trauma support system for abused women from a non-English speaking background; to specifically target women with non-English speaking backgrounds to receive English language training; and to provide translating facilities in women's services. The same women who were looking forward to the practical implementation of these undertakings are now expressing concern and disappointment at the fact that very little action seems to have taken place since then. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister inform this Council of what specific actions have been taken with regard to these undertakings?
2. Will the Minister inform this Council of the outcomes of those initiatives?

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

WIRRINA AND GLENELG DEVELOPMENTS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government in the Council a question about Worrina and Glenelg developments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I understand that the State Government will pay significant costs in relation to infrastructure for both developments. In relation to Worrina, I understand that it will pay for breakwaters, half the cost of the road to the marina, the cost of upgrading the road to Worrina and the provision of a substantial water supply. My questions to the Minister are:

1. What costs to the State Government will be associated with each of these items, what other Government moneys are also being committed for the Worrina project and for what purpose are those moneys being committed?
2. Will the Minister itemise all monies that have been or will be expended by the State Government in relation to the Glenelg redevelopment?
3. Will the Minister also include indirect costs such as public assets that are being given to the developers?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer the questions to the appropriate Ministers and bring back a response.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 16 October. Page 176.)

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Last night when I sought leave to conclude I was—fortunately for members on the

other side of the Chamber—near a conclusion; but the Minister for Education has provoked me yet again and I may go a bit longer than the original three or four minutes that I had intended.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I cannot recall speaking to your Whip this morning.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You missed an appointment at 9.30 this morning.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Has the Minister for Transport finished? I had no appointments at 9.30 this morning.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You did not keep one with the Registrar.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: There may have been one made at 9.15, which was cancelled at 8.45.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Bit early!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No, I am in at 8.30 every morning. The telephone call had already gone into the Minister's office. If she wants to make appointments with me, she should speak with my secretary Ron Williams—not go making them with other people. If her office operated a little more efficiently, we would not get these communication breakdowns. If she goes back she will find that an appointment has been set down for Monday morning and the reason given was that the Minister for Transport promised me some transcript in relation to the Bill she put forward yesterday. I want to read it before I meet the Registrar. That was the reason the meeting with the Registrar was cancelled this morning.

Yesterday I was almost at the conclusion of looking at some of the promises made by various members of the ministry, by the Liberal Party and by the Premier. This is not a bad promise—Liberal local government policy, December 1993, and I quote:

A Liberal Government will continue to support the State local government negotiation process, believing it to be essential to cooperative and effective decision making in the areas of legislative reform, planning, funding and management of services.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: As the Hon. Paul Holloway interjects, what a gem of a promise that was! Look at what has happened over the last little while. It continues:

The State Government will introduce legislation to seek major local government reform. The Government will be seeking to reduce the number of councils by around 50 per cent.

They were quotes from John Oswald, the Minister for Local Government Relations, on 17 August 1995. We now find that the Government is moving to sack the Adelaide City Council, not for what it has done but apparently for what it has not done.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I can hear the Hon. Angus Redford interjecting and one would have thought that a lawyer of all people would believe in the presumption of innocence. Apparently like his fellow Liberals he is more than happy to sack a council not for anything that it might have done or for any sin that it might have committed but for a whole bundle of things that it apparently has not done. Anyway, we will all have an opportunity to say more about that if and when the Bill eventually finds its way into this Chamber. We all have our fingers crossed that they might finally get their act together on the Adelaide City Council and have the final Bill prepared. It has been deferred a couple of times now.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It would appear, as the Leader of the Opposition has interjected, that they cannot make up their minds on what they want to do. I guess the Premier woke up in the middle of one night and it seemed like a good idea, so he put it to the ministry the next morning and one would only guess that John Olsen opposed it, so they all got in behind the Premier and now we will intervene on the Adelaide City Council. In conclusion—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I knew that I would finally say something that would bring a smile to the faces. I have only been going for two and a half hours and it is the first time I have seen the Minister for Education and Children's Services smile. It is such a pleasure to have the Hon. Legh Davis back in the Chamber, leaning over the front bench with fond memories of what might have been, glaring and interjecting, as is his wont. I will concede that the Hon. Legh Davis's interjections are at times extremely humorous if somewhat inaccurate.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: You were coming to a conclusion, in case you were distracted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No, I have not been distracted, but it seemed to bring so much joy to your faces that I might be nearing the end of this extremely valuable contribution to the debate on where South Australia is heading. In conclusion, how should the people of South Australia judge the efforts of the Brown Government over the past three years?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. Davis: You couldn't give this speech away in Rundle Mall!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Legh Davis. We want to conclude.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Legh Davis has just added another 15 minutes. As long as he wants to keep interjecting, I will stand here and keep talking. I thank members opposite for their indulgence last night. It was getting late and the incessant interjections made me go longer than I had intended, so I thought that I was doing the right thing when I sought leave to conclude and allow everybody to go home and have a good night's sleep. So how should the people of South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I have been going 12 minutes now and I cannot get past 'In conclusion—'.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Some things never change.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Legh Davis interjects again and says that some things never change. I will make one last attempt to wind up. It is obvious that members on the Government benches are enjoying this contribution.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Let us be crystal clear about this: after three years of a Liberal Government we have a litany of broken promises, only a few of which I touched on last night—and had I gone through the lot I would still be on my feet, without an adjournment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr President, is there a full moon tonight? They are all howling from the back benches.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Thank you for your protection, Mr President. Some people would suggest that I have a thick hide and that these interjections have very little impact. I do thank you, Mr President, for your protection, as valiant as your efforts are, to ensure that democracy is upheld in this place and that when members are on their feet they are given a decent hearing. I do appreciate your attempts to silence some of your more erratic comrades on the other side of the Council. Let us be clear about this: after three years we have an economy which any responsible economist would have to call dismal. Gross State Product remains weak; retail sales are flat; new vehicle sales have fallen; home approvals are weak; investment by private business is at its lowest level since the 1991-92 recession; exports have risen at a level below the inflation rate; manufacturing exports are in a dismal position—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Manufacturing exports have risen at a level below the inflation rate: I thank the Hon. Legh Davis for his perspicacious interjection; he was on the right track. It is manufacturing exports that have risen at a level below the inflation rate: I think the figure is 2.3 per cent. If one looks at the overall level of exports one will find that they have been substantially boosted by probably a one-off 70.8 per cent increase in rural exports. But I did address that in quite some detail yesterday—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: And wine exports.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes, and wine exports. For the Hon. Angus Redford's edification, yesterday I did inform him that agriculture is a business which does vary from one year to the next.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Well, I cannot quite hear your interjection; perhaps you could speak to me about it later. The real litmus test of this Government and what really shows it as a cold, heartless, uncaring bunch of economic rationalists is unemployment. We have the highest level of unemployment in mainland Australia. I went into quite some detail about the disgraceful position of South Australia's youth unemployment, despite some fairly solid efforts by the Hon. Bob Such. It is obvious that he is not being supported by his ministerial colleagues. I cite youth unemployment as one of the most serious plights facing the South Australian economy. As I said yesterday, I encourage the Hon. Bob Such to continue to fight his colleagues in the Cabinet and to fight for the young people of South Australia. If he can win that battle and bring his Cabinet colleagues around to his way of thinking we might see some progress made in reducing the deplorable 40.8 per cent youth unemployment rate in this State. It is an utter disgrace, and I am sure that when they cast their vote at the next election every parent of an unemployed teenager in Australia will remember the Liberal Party's efforts to reduce youth unemployment.

When one examines the litany of the hundreds of broken promises the Liberal Party made on assuming office, it seems that it cared very little about the people. President Lincoln once said: 'You can fool all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.' It is something that this Government should well remember when it freely and carelessly makes promises at the next election. This Government and its Ministers have broken literally hundreds of promises made either at the last State election or on the run since then. Let us face it, not only has this Government run out of steam but

it never had the energy, commitment or ideas to get South Australia moving in the first place.

There has been a great deal of speculation around the Council about the prospects of an early election. When one stops to consider the sickly malaise that our economy is in as a result of this Government's incompetence, and when one considers the long list of broken promises made by every single Minister and the Premier, it becomes quite clear that this Government, if it had any brains at all, would see out its full term. But the constant assurances by the Premier that the Government will serve its full term worry me. Based on past experience, the Premier's performance with the promises he made prior to the last election and his capacity to fudge the truth, I guess we can look forward to an election early next year.

I will take a few moments to look at those Liberal members who are most likely to be unsuccessful at the next election. The electorate is waking up. There is a sea change in the way the electorate looks at this Government. I refer to Scott Ashenden, Michael Armitage, Colin Caudell, John Cummins, Julie Greig, Stewart Leggett, Lorraine Rosenberg, Joe Rossi and David Wade. We have nine Lower House members in the firing line. Scott Ashenden is a wet; Michael Armitage is a wet; Colin Caudell is a wet; John Cummins is a Brown supporter; Julie Greig is a Brown supporter; Stewart Leggett is a wet; Lorraine Rosenberg is a dry; Joe Rossi (if he survives) will vote for Brown; and David Wade is a wet. I make that 8:1.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: You've got that all wrong.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: As one of the dry's foremost political operatives in this Council and as one who has demonstrated time and again that he has an excessive interest in Liberal Party factional matters, one would have thought that the Hon. Angus Redford might heed the call of the Premier and tone it down a little bit. I am sure the Hon. Angus Redford will correct me if I am wrong, but it is quite clear that the seats that will go at the next election—and believe you me there will be a swag of them—are all held by Brown supporters. Despite the Hon. Dean Brown's best efforts at breast beating over the Adelaide City Council and his desperate attempts to adopt a Kennett persona, he will hang on to office until the bitter end, because even if he wins the next election he will still lose. At the first Liberal Party caucus meeting after the next election South Australians will get a shock, because the caucus with the new numbers and with all of Dean Brown's supporters tipped out in the election will elect John Olsen as its leader and, members, it could very well be a welcome change. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I support the motion. I will resist the temptation of a bottle of Grange to beat the Hon. Terry Cameron's record speech, but my colleague has very precisely dissected what was promised by this Brown Liberal Government when it came to power and what it has delivered. The difference is absolutely astounding. This is the Government that has promised everything, delivered nothing and, before we have it, taken it away from us again. The Government made all the promises under the sun, none of which it has actually kept. People in South Australia were most unfortunate with the collapse of the State Bank.

The collapse of the State Bank delivered the Brown Liberal Government to South Australia. Who is the Brown Liberal Government? They are the people who ought to treat the State Bank building like a shrine because, had it not been for the State Bank, those same tired, old people who strug-

gled along in Opposition, bereft of ideas and bereft of vision, would still be languishing on the Opposition benches. For once in their history an opportunity was handed to them to show some leadership, to show some vision—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: They had no vision in the first place. They had an opportunity to show vision. They showed that much vision that they preselected the Hon. Angus Redford, with no anticipation that he would win, and we have two burdens: first, we have the Government and, secondly, we have to put up with the incessant interjections of the Hon. Angus Redford for another four years—so we have all lost.

The Brown Liberal Government was given an opportunity. In its desperate grab for the reins of Government it promised South Australians everything. I will not go into the area of education in as much detail as did the Hon. Terry Cameron, but they promised the education community an increase of \$40 million in the first year. What did this Liberal Government deliver? It was a cut of \$47 million. This is particularly interesting to me, having been involved in a discussion in the City of Port Pirie about a proposition to combine the two high schools there into one college with two campuses. I spent some time on that proposition, trying to establish decent standards of education in decent standard buildings for country people because, unlike the Liberal Party, the Labor Party has a commitment to all the people in South Australia.

Labor is the Party for South Australians, not for the budgets of the State. It is not the Party that wants to make the Treasurer and the Premier look good. Labor is the Party that actually cares about the people of South Australia, and it was in that light that I was trying, with my former colleague the Hon. Greg Crafter, to get some education opportunities of a reasonable standard for those people in Port Pirie. To that end we did a lot of work. A great deal of cooperation was shown by the two school councils to have one college with two campuses.

It was envisaged that there would be a gradual transition into a re-established one-site operation over time and at a pace that the people of Port Pirie and those education communities would have accepted. But what happened? With the change of Government in came the bureaucrats and the economic rationalists and what we saw was a speeded up process. The Government created one college, all right, but put it on one campus. One would have thought that a new college building would be worthwhile for the period of the transition but, instead of providing decent standard buildings, decent working environments for school teachers and SSOs, and a decent teaching environment for the kids of that district in Port Pirie, the Government picked up the Loveday huts from the new building—which were obsolete in 1956—and transported them down to the site of the John Pirie High School and made it look like a graveyard for obsolete buildings.

This Government has not dispensed with that particular principle: now it is picking up the asbestos buildings from metropolitan Adelaide and transporting them to Mimili. They are transporting asbestos-clad buildings. I know that you, Mr President, have had some experience with housing in Aboriginal areas. Anyone with any experience whatsoever—and we are supposed to have experts here—would know that asbestos buildings or Hardiflex buildings in those situations are completely inappropriate.

This Government has made pious assertions about its commitment to the health and education of Aboriginal people in particular. Today this Minister for Education and Children's Services admitted in this Council that he would look after the education side of the situation that has been created at Mimili and that he would ensure that the kids went to school, but he forgot about the health aspects. In answer to my question today, the Minister said that an expert was travelling to Mimili and would arrive there at approximately 4 o'clock. In that same answer he acknowledged that the school council, in his view, did not have the power, but he did not acknowledge the proper concern that the school council has for the health of those children at Mimili as a result of the spread of asbestos-bearing materials around the school site.

He is quite happy to order the children and the school teachers back into the school to fudge the issue. It is a classic example of how good this Government is at shifting the blame, fudging the truth and getting out of its responsibilities. Two days ago I raised this matter with the Minister and nothing has been done. We are now going into damage control, and the children of Mimili will suffer.

But, back to Port Pirie. The Government put all these obsolete buildings on the site and, over the past three years, the member for Frome (Hon. Rob Kerin) has been working with the school council at Port Pirie on the John Pirie site, and all the promises under the sun have been made about new buildings. But what has happened in three years? After three years one can see only some crusher dust around the obsolete buildings, a quick coat of paint and a couple of sun shelters on the oval.

The latest fiasco is that the school cannot attract school teachers, and that means that those kids in country areas who are trying to compete for scarce jobs are not getting the proper attention that they deserve. Their curriculum choices have been cut back and their opportunities obviously will be diminished.

Recently, the Minister for Education and Children's Services travelled to Port Pirie to consult with the school council. His response was that he enjoyed having conversations with the people and listening to what they had to say but, as we have seen time and again, it is tokenism at best and arrogance at worst. When the parents of some of the children at the school were interviewed, they were absolutely appalled at his lack of sensitivity and his lack of will to address the problems that are facing those school councils in attracting school teachers to teach the fundamental subjects for those children living in country South Australia.

What we have seen with this Government is probably the greatest sell-off of the State's family milch cows. This Government has no mandate for privatisation. If it wants to claim a mandate for privatisation, let us look at the history of the matter. In 1981-82, before Dean Brown was rejected by the electorate and sent out to sell chook yards to the Chinese for a few years, he was a great advocate for slaughtering the industrial system in South Australia and of privatising Government utilities in South Australia. What was the result? He stood against Mr Stan Evans for the seat of Davenport, and Stan Evans has said that it was the hardest and dirtiest campaign he ever had to fight. Dean Brown was soundly rejected in that blue ribbon Liberal seat, as were his colleagues, with their privatisation stance—rejected for 13 years.

I return to the point about the State Bank being a godsend and how this Liberal Party ought to treat it as a shrine, because it was not by any will of the South Australian people for privatisation that Dean Brown was elected: it was an

absolute jag. The Liberal Party jagged the Government benches.

What has the Liberal Party done with respect to public utilities? It promised public servants that there would be very few job losses, and it has absolutely crucified the Public Service. It has sold off those core business assets that have been available to Government to provide services to South Australia.

What are some of the family milch cows that this Government, after fattening in most cases, has dragged off to the knackery? This Government has sold the State Bank of South Australia: we knew that would happen. It has sold the Pipelines Authority to Tenneco, and that is now being sold to who knows? That was one of the absolute milch cows of South Australia which was dragged off to the knackery and is now not available to the people of South Australia to provide them with milk and sustenance.

The State Clothing factory was another facility about which promises were made, in Whyalla in particular, that it would not close—but it is gone. The StatePrint plant and the Amdel shares were flogged off. The *Island Seaway* has been dragged off to the economic knackery and sold. The State Chemistry Laboratories are gone. The Marino asphalt department has also been dragged away and slaughtered. Other property worth about \$61.2 million has been sold off. The SGIC has been sold. The latest facility that has been sold is Forwood Products. There is also the privatisation of the STA: they are classic examples of what this Government does. That is a classic example of how the Government does the dirty work for private industry.

This Government said that it would contract out STA services, but it did not wait for private industry to cut the throat of the travelling public of South Australia: it did it first. It jacked up the fares and then privatised it. This is exactly what the Government does: these economic knackers fatten the cow and then drag it off to the knackery to stop these income earning facilities staying in Government hands. What happens when you drag away the State's milch cows? I will tell honourable members: we finish up with no milk.

What we have here is a Government which is bereft of income and which has no idea what it will do. My colleague in another place, John Quirke, two years ago told me, 'These people have no economic brains whatsoever. They will build themselves into a black hole.' That has been backed up: it has been revealed by the Auditor-General just how incompetent the Government really is. After flogging off all those public milch cows, the Government has ended up with about \$4 million but no income.

The last year in which the State Bank operated it made about \$360 million: this year the Government will get nothing. That is where we are left with these people. What must they do? We have seen the evidence of the last couple of weeks. They have no income, and the Government has to cut services even further. That will mean that people in country South Australia will be the first, as they have been over the past three years, to lose more Government services. There will be more amalgamations. More Government offices will be ripped out of country areas, and there will be fewer services for those people to access.

Almost every Government office in the towns and cities of country South Australia has been closed or amalgamated into the post office. Today country post offices are like Rundle Street. However, the only thing we cannot do in a post office is buy a stamp, because there are people paying

gas and electricity bills, registering cars, rifles and so on. It has cost jobs.

What can we look forward to? It will be more of the same, because there is no Government income. This Government has no reorganisation policy with regard to taxation so that some of the people who can bear more of the burden will pay more. The Government is bereft of ideas, so it must come up with some smokescreens—some smoke and mirrors routine. So, what does it do? It thinks, 'Let us attack the Adelaide City Council, and because we cannot do anything we will shift the blame to the Adelaide City Council.' What does the Government do? This is the typical private school prefect bullies that Government members are: they attack someone smaller. These are the people who protect the powerful and pound the powerless.

Here is another example of what Government members want to do: they wanted to sack the council—but for what reason? People have asked, 'What has the council done wrong?' The Act has been there for 13 years and not once in those years have Government members raised the issue of any amendments. Not once when in Opposition or in Government have members opposite raised this matter.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: They got some research that said Brown looked weak.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: He wanted to look tough: he wanted to be another Jeff Kennett. I reckon South Australia needs another Jeff Kennett like it needs a hole in the head. Dean Brown is bad enough: you would not want twice Dean Brown, surely. We have had blight and pestilence; we have had flood and mice; and the last thing we want is another Jeff Kennett. However, because somebody said to Dean Brown that he looks weak, he has decided that he would like to look tough.

We saw another example of Dean Brown's kowtowing to Jeff Kennett, whereby he has now extended daylight saving, against the will of country people, to embrace the Moomba Festival. This leadership, this Cabinet, has no foresight and no right to be in government. It was a stroke of luck on its behalf.

I return to the family milch cows that this Government has dragged off to the economic knackery. I have to mention the forest situation. Over a period of time we have watched the saga of Forwood Products unfold. Just after the election Dale Baker indicated that he favoured selling Forwood Products, and a myth was created that Forwood Products was always set up to be privatised. That is not true.

The Hon. Terry Groom was in charge of that operation. Forwood Products was to be rationalised and there were to be changed arrangements. The ultimate aim was that a joint venture company was to be set up: it was never meant to be sold. Anyhow, it was finally decided by this Government that another public milch cow had to be fattened up and dragged away, because it was this Government which reduced the work force and negotiated greater efficiencies: and for what reason? I use the analogy once again—it was fattening that family milch cow to be flogged off to the knackery and sold for beans. Jack at least got a beanstalk: we got nothing.

We were then told, 'We are not really going to sell the forests, but we are going to sell Forwood Products.' But what happened? The asset management team rushed off to America, where it was told, 'We can buy a dozen timber mills. If you sell us the forest, we are interested.' The team could not get back here quickly enough, and then the charge was led by the Premier, Stephen Baker and the asset management team to try to come up with a way to sell the forests.

Mr President, at that stage you will remember the saga of the flogging off of water management—another family milch cow was dragged away to the economic knackery. We lost that. At that stage the public was outraged and said, 'You cannot sell the forests,' and to his eternal credit—I do not give him a lot of credit from time to time—Dale Baker, the member for MacKillop, who has forests in his electorate, resisted strongly those attempts by the Cabinet subcommittee on asset sales to flog off the forests.

It has been said publicly that the Cabinet never made a decision on selling the forests. That is true, Mr President, because it knew that it did not have the numbers. These are principles with which some of our people have become familiar over time: that if you do not have the numbers it is no use putting up the proposal. So, he struggled on three or four occasions to try to draw it in and try to convince some of his Cabinet colleagues. Unfortunately for the Premier, there were more dries than wets in Cabinet and he could not get the numbers.

What do we see? We saw the first reshuffle of the Brown Government. Out they went: the member for MacKillop was gone, as was the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, John Oswald. He was also thrown out. What happened? We saw two factional sycophants implanted into the Cabinet to give the Premier the numbers.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Who were they?

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The Hon. Scott Ashenden and the Hon. Rob Kerin were put in. They were the two factionally aligned people, but they were not the first picks. A couple of other people were not prepared just to be a number, and I understand that they refused to serve under those circumstances.

After public pressure was applied, it was announced that the Government was to sell only Forwood Products. First of all, a promise was given that there would be a proper review of our forest estate, and some assurance was given that there would be value adding in South Australia and that we would determine how best to utilise our forests in the interests of all South Australians. That still has not happened. That report has never seen the light of day; it has never been laid on this table.

What happened? We flogged off Forwood Products, but the Premier softly announced that it was sold to a New Zealand company, and that this was really like still having it here. Carter Holt Harvey is a New Zealand company, but the truth of the matter is that Carter Holt Harvey is 51 per cent owned by International Paper, which is a giant American company. Once again, the people of South Australia have been duped.

All the polls show—including the Government's poll, although even freedom of information cannot get that one for us—that the people of South Australia are sick to death of this Government dragging the economic milch cows away from the people and flogging them off in an economic knackery. What the Government did was sell another one. Having fattened it right up, cut down all the expenses and made it completely attractive, it sold it.

It can be said that it is still only the mills and the infrastructure. However, one must remember the contractual arrangements that go with Forwood Products. Those arrangements provide Forwood Products with about 65 per cent of the harvestable forest reserves that belong to South Australians per year for about 30 years. For the first 10 years, it is about 65 per cent, but because the forest rotation has

changed, after that time it goes up to a greater percentage. Why would not International Paper want to get its hands on that family milch cow of South Australians, because now they have access and they do not have to spray one weed or grow one tree. The high cost side of that will be socialised, so the people of South Australia will pay for that, and the mates of the Liberal Party will reap the profits once again.

I do not want to go on much longer because other issues need to be canvassed today. In conclusion, let me say this: it is appalling that a Government with no mandate for privatisation of our State's resources has got away with such vandalism. As I said, what it has done is absolutely scandalous. It has left this State with practically no income earning core businesses for the future. The biggest scandal is that it was not happy just to sell them off: it cut the throats of the workers and duped them into introducing rationalisations and more efficiencies. We are seeing it once more at Islington and Port Augusta, where in good faith those people have rationalised and become more efficient, and now they are being abandoned. Having fattened the family milch cow, the Government has dragged it off to the knackery. In economic terms, the Hon. Dean Brown and the Hon. Stephen Baker are the two biggest economic knackers that this State has ever seen.

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

ANZ EXECUTORS & TRUSTEE COMPANY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) LIMITED (TRANSFER OF BUSINESS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 October. Page 111.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her indication of support for this Bill. It is a straightforward piece of legislation carrying no hint of controversy and, in those circumstances, I am pleased to see that it is passing quickly through the processes of the Parliament.

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

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Mr Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

MULTICULTURALISM AND ABORIGINAL RECONCILIATION

Consideration of the House of Assembly's message:

That this House—

(a) affirms its support for policies relating to multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation being based upon the principles of non-discrimination, racial harmony, tolerance and the Australian concept of a 'fair go' for all;

(b) recognises that South Australia is a multicultural society which places value on the significant contribution which continues to be made to the development of the State by all South Australians, irrespective of ethnic or racial background;

(c) reaffirms its support for the ongoing process of reconciliation and achieving a greater understanding between Australians of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal background and recognises the special needs of Aboriginal communities, especially in health and education; and

(d) calls for the conduct of public debate concerning multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation to be undertaken according to these principles.

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

That the House of Assembly's resolution be agreed to.

South Australia has had a long history of bipartisan support for the notion of multiculturalism and, in more recent years, broad bipartisan support for the notion of Aboriginal reconciliation.

I will refer briefly to my own portfolio area of education and children's services to illustrate the degree of bipartisan support which has broadly existed within the South Australian community for some years. As a shadow Minister back in 1986, when first appointed, I recall having to speak at a number of multicultural educational forums on the then Labor Government's policies in relation to multicultural education and, in particular, their 10 year language development plan (1986-96) for the compulsory teaching of languages within primary schools in South Australia. It was at that stage a relatively bold and innovative move. I am not sure whether at that time any other State Governments or Territory Governments had embarked on that particular course. If there were some, I suspect they were in a minority.

The then Liberal Opposition at that stage, and consistently for the past 10 years, supported that 10 year language development plan as one of the priority planks of multiculturalism in the education and children's services policy. So, as an Opposition the Liberal Party was a strong supporter of multicultural education and multicultural education policies and has continued in Government to be a strong supporter.

Therefore, one of the great strengths we have had in South Australia in this sensitive area of public policy formulation has been broad bipartisan support within the South Australian community for the essential planks of the policy of multiculturalism. Members of our ethnic communities in South Australia have warmly endorsed that broadly bipartisan support. It has meant that, with the election of a new Government, whilst obviously some of the details change, and our ethnic community members respect and accept that, nevertheless the essential core of those policies continues to receive the bipartisan support of the new Government and now the new Opposition in terms of most of the major planks of the Government's policy.

I believe that members of the South Australian Liberal Party, members of the new Liberal Government in South Australia, have a proud and very fine record of support for multicultural education but, more broadly, for multiculturalism as a policy framework in South Australia. The Liberal Government in its three years has built on that very proud record, and I want to refer to just a couple of areas. One was the launch in the past 12 months or so of the 'Multiculturalism in Education and Children's Services' policy by my own Department for Education and Children's Services. That document was launched, from recollection, at Unley High School, with very broad support from members of our ethnic communities within South Australia attending that launch, and was an indication that the Government and the Department for Education and Children's Services placed a priority on the importance of multicultural education and culturally inclusive education policies within our schools.

We are now embarking upon the development of a second 10 year language plan to take us through to the year 2005 and, whilst we acknowledge that there have been some areas

of criticism in relation to the first language development plan, which is the reason why the Government appointed Joe Lo Bianco to review our first 10 year language development plan, we nevertheless believe that it is an important program, not only for the development of language skills for the students who participate in the program but, importantly, to try to build bridges within our multicultural community in South Australia and Australia, because our language programs are not just programs relating to language; they relate to the culture, traditions and beliefs of many of our ethnic communities.

They are a most important way for our future adult citizens of South Australia in effect to become adult citizens who are broadly accepting of people from many cultures and races having come to South Australia, accepting of their backgrounds, their beliefs and their culture, and accepting of the important position that they can and do play in the South Australian community. It is important in those junior primary and primary years that we continue with our language development programs, our cultural enrichment programs, even if at the end of some 12 years of schooling we might not have too many language-fluent students leaving our education system. People who seek to judge the value of language programs within our school system solely on the basis of how many year 12 students leave our schools system able to be fluently bilingual to the degree that business contracts can be negotiated are not judging appropriately the value of our language programs within our schools.

They provide a base upon which further language study can be attempted but they also provide a most important glue, we hope, in terms of building bridges and keeping our multicultural South Australian community together. The Premier—I am not sure exactly when but in the past 12 months or so—has also put the whole-of-Government stamp in terms of support for multiculturalism through the release of the 'Declaration of principles for a multicultural South Australia'. This declaration was developed by the Government in consultation with the ethnic communities of South Australia and the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. I want to congratulate the Premier of South Australia and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs (Hon. Dean Brown) for his strong leadership both past and present in this important area. I know that prominent members of our ethnic communities were in this Parliament in the past 24 hours to listen to the debate in another Chamber and were delighted at the leadership the Hon. Dean Brown was taking in this important area.

I hasten to say that we are delighted that the Leader of the Opposition was prepared to support the leadership given by the Premier on this issue. We in this Chamber look forward to support from the Labor Opposition—and also, we trust, from the Deputy Leader of the Australian Democrats in this Chamber—to the leadership that this Liberal Government is showing. I know from discussions that I have with prominent members of the ethnic communities and from my colleagues the Hon. Mr Stefani and the Hon. Dr Pfitzner, who work tirelessly with the South Australian community and in particular with the ethnic communities in South Australia, that they are already hearing the pleasure of leaders of the South Australian ethnic communities at the leadership that the Premier and the Government are showing, and their pleasure at the support for that leadership that has been given by other Parties within this Parliament.

I want to quote briefly from the speech that the Premier gave yesterday in another place talking about this 'Declara-

tion of principles for a multicultural South Australia', because for the first time ever it provides the badge of approval from a Government for support for a multicultural South Australia. The Premier said yesterday:

It clearly confirms that the South Australian Government believes that all members of the South Australian community should participate in and benefit equally from our democratic South Australian society and that we value the diversity of the knowledge, experience and skills which enhance South Australia's social, cultural and economic development.

It also affirms that:

...it is the right of everyone to maintain his or her cultural heritage within the legal and social framework of this State, and that we are committed to access equality for all South Australians and to the prevention of discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, language and culture. The declaration, which is now available in 15 languages [including English], also plays an important role in promoting an understanding and appreciation of the benefits of our cultural diversity.

Therefore, I am delighted to be able to place on the public record the proud tradition and continuing strong record of the Liberal Government of South Australia in support of a multicultural South Australia. Why do we arrive at this situation today, where we are having to debate a motion of this type? In recent times we have seen some members of the broader Australian community making what many of us would brand as outlandish claims about Aboriginal reconciliation and about multiculturalism.

One particular new Federal member of Parliament, according to press reports, has warned that Australia risked civil war unless it ended separatist policies towards Aborigines and migrants. That same Federal member has warned that Australia was in danger of being swamped by Asians and of being invaded by Asian neighbours within 15 years. I do not want to give any more credence to claims made by that Federal member than those brief three references. I could have spent a long time in this contribution listing some of the many claims made by that Federal member. I give only those three brief references because I do not believe that we in this Chamber should give many of those outlandish claims much more credence than that.

Suffice to say that I was pleased in recent times to see the strong statements from the Prime Minister of Australia, the Hon. John Howard, in terms of rejecting many of those outlandish claims made by that Federal member. Equally, I am pleased to see that the Federal Leader of the Opposition also was strong in condemnation of those claims. I refer to an *Advertiser* headline of Monday 14 October: 'PM brands Hanson claim ridiculous'. The Prime Minister referred to the particular claims from the Federal member as being silly and ridiculous. I refer to the *Hansard* record of some week and a half ago—8 October—when the Prime Minister of Australia said:

The Liberal and National Parties will yield to nobody and no political force in this country in our commitment for racial equality and racial tolerance. Let me make it very clear to the Leader of the Opposition that no matter what arguments there may be about immigration policy in this country, once a person has come to this country that person is entitled to the respect that is due to every other Australian, irrespective of that person's background.

Further on, the Prime Minister said:

Let me return to the first part of the honourable gentleman's question. I will always denounce racial intolerance. I will always defend the non-discriminatory character of Australian immigration policy. I believe that the contribution that Australians of Asian descent have made to this country has been immense. I want to place on record, as I have on numerous occasions, the high regard in which the Liberal and National Parties hold Australians of Asian descent.

They have brought to this country many skills; they have made a contribution to our society; and have brought their commitment to individual freedom, their commitment to small business and their commitment to the strength of the extended family. They have brought those values with them and they have made a valuable contribution.

Again the Prime Minister, in a number of those statements in the press and in the Parliament, placed firmly on the public record his condemnation of some of the more outlandish claims that have been made in recent times. Again it is pleasing to see that the Leader of the Australian Labor Party and the Leader of the Australian Democrats have all joined that condemnation of some of the more outlandish comments that have been made.

In conclusion, we as a community have to acknowledge the right of rational, sensible people, in a logical and sensitive way, to question policies and directions that Governments of either persuasion might adopt, whether it be Commonwealth or State Governments. There has to be a process that allows genuine people in a sensitive way to disagree, if they want, with policy directions such as the level of immigration to Australia, for example, and also important questions, allegations or claims of wastage or misdirection of funding in terms of the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio.

I do not think we can accept a situation in a community where there is no prospect of anyone being able to enter into sensible rational criticism of a Government's policy or direction for fear of being labelled a racist or a bigot. The onus rests, as this is a most sensitive issue, on the important proviso that, if these issues are to be raised, they should be raised in a non-inflammatory, sensitive way, capable of rational and sensible debate. We should be able to have the debate on whether 100 000, 150 000 or 200 000 new migrants to Australia is the appropriate level of immigration in any year.

We should be able to have a sensible and rational debate about the value and effectiveness of the tens of millions of dollars that are spent each year on Aboriginal Affairs' programs. As Minister for Education and Children's Services I, within the education and children's services forums, constantly question my own officers, the department and the Commonwealth departments and officers, about whether we are getting the maximum value for the tens of millions of dollars we spend on Aboriginal education programs, for example. That is an important issue that ought to be canvassed and debated without the fear of someone being labelled a racist or a bigot for having the courage to raise sensible, albeit sensitive, questions about some of these issues.

In conclusion, I am confident that this parliamentary Chamber, the Legislative Council, will give broad and strong support for the leadership the Liberal Government is showing in relation to this issue of affirming the support of this Parliament and the South Australian community for the broad policies of multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation within the South Australian community.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I support the motion moved by the Minister for Education and Children's Services. I do so with great pleasure, both on a personal basis because of my convictions on the subject and also as a member of the Australian Labor Party, which is traditionally wedded to principles of democracy and social justice. I am somewhat puzzled at how this debate should arise some 25 years after the introduction of multiculturalism as a philosophy of life

and a formula in its practical implementation for harmonious community life. As such it responds well to the cultural diversity that exists in our community, State and country.

It is disappointing that, some 25 years from the introduction of this concept, we are still affirming and repeating what should by now be fairly obvious and should have permeated and impregnated the body social and influenced policies and practices as well as the general thinking of the community in terms of tolerance, acceptance of diversity and, as some of us would have it, celebration of such diversity for the benefit that it brings to our community. I share the views of the Minister on the broad bipartisan support we have witnessed in this State for many years but point out that, useful and appropriate that the lofty statements and solemn declarations may be, I do not disagree with repeating and reaffirming certain principles.

The Latin Fadas used to say, 'Repetita Juvant'—and I would not disagree with that. But at the same time it does justify some members of our community who feel that there is a certain discrepancy among these solemn declarations, the facts and the practice.

In Question Time today I referred to some of these discrepancies when I questioned the promises and undertakings which the Brown Liberal Opposition took to the election in 1993 and which in many cases have not been realised. There are only a few, but there will be many others to which I will refer in the future. But that in itself does justify the position of those who are concerned at this discrepancy between the words and the practice. I can refer to a number of areas without, of course, denying those areas where progress and position has been maintained.

In recent times a number of planks or organisations in the multicultural house that has been built over the years have experienced difficulties. This would be known to many members. I have referred to the Overseas Qualification Board that has for quite a while been unable to perform fully the job that it is expected to perform because of delays in the appointment of members, delays in the appointment of executive officers, delays in the provision of resources and, therefore, the inability of an organisation such as the Overseas Qualification Board to do what it is expected to do. It is a very important job because every time that overseas qualified people are unable to rejoin the work force in South Australia as quickly as they could it is from behind this stark statistic that human tragedies occur. There are stories of humiliation, embarrassment, loss of earnings and loss of self-esteem. Ultimately, the process goes on for too long and deskilling occurs to the point where those overseas acquired qualifications are not able to be utilised at all.

To some extent, the same happened with the Tertiary Multicultural Education Committee (now the Tertiary and Multicultural Educational Advisory Committee). Again, it experienced delays in appointments and, as a consequence, the inability—hopefully temporary—to pursue its institutional aims, which are also very important in promoting multicultural education in tertiary areas.

The Centre for Languages, which has replaced the South Australian Institute of Languages, is another case in point. To date, it has not been able to achieve anything, and some highly qualified people doubt what—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Why are you trying to make this a political exercise?

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I am not: I am just listing—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You can raise this any other time. This is a chance for the Labor Party to support in a bipartisan way—

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I said that in my opening statement.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: But you are not. You are trying to make this political.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: No, I am not.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Yes, you are.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: Unfortunately, at this stage it has not delivered. The Minister referred to the Lo Bianco report. Again, that report has not produced many initiatives at this stage. We look forward to the practical implementation of those recommendations, but we have yet to see any. The same could be said for the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission where, again, delays in appointments have prevented this organisation from producing a significant output.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Why do this now?

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I am just referring to some aspects which, as I see it, complete the picture.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I will give you another opportunity to speak. Why not, in effect, affirm support for these principles without getting political?

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I have. I have categorically stated that I support the motion, but I would be remiss in my presentation if I did not also indicate—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T. Crothers): Order! I find it ironic in a debate on consensus that the interjectors destroy that consensus. I call the Council to order.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: I referred briefly to an opportunity loss when in the case of the racial vilification legislation the consultation with the people to whom we are providing valuable advice was overlooked or discarded, or both. I bring up a case in point. I quote this not because I want to blame anyone but because I want to put the record straight. This discrepancy in producing the truth was evident on Tuesday this week when the Premier spoke to an audience at the Campania Club. He stated emphatically in front of this audience that he was the first Premier to visit the Campania region.

As I said, I am not apportioning blame, but the audience knew perfectly well that this was an untruth—a falsehood. It was not true at all. Most of the people knew perfectly well that the first Premier to visit Campania was John Bannon on 1 October 1990—not the current Premier. This is another way of producing information or pretending that it is information when, in fact, it is totally false. I mention this only so that the record can be put straight and so that in the future people in positions of authority avoid presenting false information as if it were the truth.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: We have always had a bipartisan approach in South Australia, and you know it.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: Yes, and long may that continue. As I said at the start of my contribution, personally and as a member of the Australian Labor Party I support the motion, because it reflects ideals of democracy and social justice.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I am pleased to support the motion and, in so doing, I would like to place on record some important facts about multiculturalism in South Australia. However, before I explain those facts, I express some disappointment that the Hon. Paolo Nocella has chosen to

politicise this bipartisan approach to supporting the motion that was promoted by the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. The community will be the judge of that when *Hansard* is printed.

The Hon. G. Weatherill interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: It is estimated that one-third of South Australia's population has some link with other than British or Irish ancestry. One in five South Australians was either born overseas in a non-English speaking country or has at least one parent born in such a country. Many others are descendants of earlier immigrants from outside Britain and Ireland. In addition, about 1 per cent of the population is of Aboriginal descent.

In November 1838, less than two years after the proclamation of South Australia as a colony, the first German immigrants arrived at Port Adelaide. They settled in the Adelaide Hills, establishing towns that still bear German names such as Hahndorf and Lobethal. By 1900 some 18 000 Germans had settled in the State, particularly in the Barossa Valley—a region now famous for its wines. German, Polish, Silesian and other European immigrants and Chilean muleteers were also attracted to the new copper mines that opened in the 1840s in Kapunda and Moonta. However, their numbers never equalled those of the Cornish miners (themselves a linguistic minority in Britain).

Also among the earliest settlers were the Chinese, attracted to Australia by the gold rushes of the 1850s, the Afghan camel drivers, who helped to build the telegraph line from Adelaide to Darwin, and the Italian and Greek fishermen who settled in Port Pirie and Port Adelaide.

Festivals such as the Schutzenfest at Hahndorf, the Cornish festival in the Upper Yorke Peninsula, the Port Pirie Blessing of the Fleet, the Greek Orthodox Blessing of the Waters and the Highland Games still celebrate the cultural diversity that has been part of the State from its earliest settlement. Other festivals such as the Greek Glendi, the Italian Carnevale and numerous other ethnic and folkloric activities are, by contrast, the result of post-war migration. Over a quarter of a million immigrants from Britain, Ireland and Europe settled in the State in the first three post-war decades. Refugees from Eastern Europe began to arrive in 1947 and were followed shortly after by economic migrants from Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Greece and the former Yugoslavia, as well as most Western European countries, North America and the Middle-East.

While the mid 1970s saw a downturn in migration, the introduction of a non-discriminatory immigration policy opened doors to Asian migration for the first time since Federation. The new migration has resulted in the formation of significant Vietnamese, Chinese, Indian, Cambodian, Malay, Indonesian, Sri Lankan and Filipino and other communities. Post war immigration has made a major contribution to the industrialisation of South Australia. Immigrants in the post-war period were attracted to the growing manufacturing sector, particularly the motor car and whitegoods industries, as well as the construction and service industries. The majority of immigrants were blue-collar workers, but significantly a higher proportion than the Australian born work force held post-school qualifications, and their skills were vital to the post-war boom.

For nearly four decades there has been hardly one construction site, a new road or a rail road, a pipeline or a powerline, a mine or a factory in which immigrants have not been part of the work force. Many post-war immigrants have

also established businesses in such areas as retail, light manufacturing, building and construction, export-import and horticulture. Immigrants and their children are now represented in a broad cross-section of the professions.

Multiculturalism is a term which describes the cultural and ethnic diversity of contemporary Australia. We are and will remain a multicultural society. As a public policy, multiculturalism reflects the Government's strategies, designed to respond to that diversity. Since the 1980s, these strategies have included community relations, access and equity, social justice, equal opportunity and anti-racism policies.

Of all States, South Australia has been the Leader in the transition to multiculturalism, with the introduction of human rights legislation, including racial discrimination legislation, land rights for Aboriginal people; the right to vote in local elections for non-citizen, permanent residents; the right to permanent employment in the Public Service for permanent residents; and the repeal of the legislation which prohibited the establishment of schools using languages other than English as a medium of tuition.

Other firsts for South Australia include the appointment of ethnic affairs advisers (a role now taken over by the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, which was established by the Tonkin Government in 1980); funding for after hours language and cultural schools, known as Ethnic Schools; funding assistance for the first ethnic public broadcasting group, EBI; and funding of the ethnic festivals and the establishment of the Migration Settlement Museum, an initiative of a former Liberal Minister for Ethnic Affairs, the Hon. Murray Hill.

The most recent legislative reforms in the area include amendments to the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980, which requires all State Government agencies to develop policies for the provision of services to ethnic groups; the equal employment opportunity provisions of the Public Sector Management Act 1995 that apply to all State Government agencies; the racial discrimination components of the Equal Opportunity Act in 1984 that cover the provision of services, education and employment; and the racial vilification legislation, which was reintroduced yesterday by the Government after previous delays caused by the Opposition. Mr Acting President, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a statistical table showing the South Australian population by birthplace.

Leave granted.

Birthplace	Persons	Percentage
Australia	1 065 286	76.1
U.K. & Ireland	145 440	10.4
Germany	14 360	1.0
Greece	13 627	1.0
Italy	28 951	2.1
Netherlands	9 806	0.7
New Zealand	10 018	0.7
Poland	8 271	0.6
Vietnam	9 249	0.7
Yugoslavia	9 052	0.6
Other	86 175	6.1
Total	1 400 245	10.00

Source: Census of Population and Housing—Australian Bureau of Statistics 1991

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Multicultural policies in South Australia have been an effective means of managing our cultural diversity. In social and cultural terms, multiculturalism has contributed to the gradual change in lifestyle. Gone are the 'English Sunday' and the 6 o'clock closing of pubs. In their place have come a proliferation of restaurants, diverse

forms of entertainment, greater recreational use of open spaces, radical and beneficial changes in food habits, less conformism in dress and behaviour, curiosity about other cultures, and openness to new ideas and to changes. Multiculturalism has changed the very fabric of our society.

Our values, attitudes and the way we do things have all been influenced by different cultures. Multiculturalism is one of South Australia's success stories. The success of multiculturalism in this State is a reflection of the South Australian Government's vision and commitment to the development of an economically productive and socially cohesive society. Integral to this vision is a belief that all people are equally entitled to participate in and benefit from society. Our vision also embraces the right of all South Australians to express and share their cultural and linguistic heritage within the State's legal and social framework.

I made an earlier reference to the fact that in South Australia 23.9 per cent of our population was born overseas, nearly 12 per cent were born in non-English speaking countries, and 1 per cent of the population is of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent. In addition, 11.6 per cent of the population born in South Australia have one or both parents who were born in a non-English speaking country. A significant number of our population, 24.6 per cent, originates from a diverse cultural, linguistic and racial background. The implication of this diversity provides us with challenges, responsibilities and opportunities.

Social cohesion, economic development, social justice and cultural identity are the cornerstones of the South Australian Government's multicultural policy. South Australia is leading the way in creating a society that provides opportunities for all South Australians to participate regardless of cultural, religious or racial background. The enhancement of cross-cultural understanding and relations between community groups has been a priority. Innovative information programs and education campaigns have been implemented to promote cultural diversity as an asset and a resource that enhances the State's social, economic, political and cultural life. In addition, legislative and policy initiatives aimed at eliminating racist behaviours ensure that all South Australians can live in safety and harmony.

In South Australia we have a sound legislative and policy framework from which to launch our multicultural initiatives. The South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980 (as amended) requires us to promote and advance a multicultural South Australia in which all groups and members of the community may live and work together harmoniously, fully and effectively participating in the economic, social and cultural life of the community, thus maintaining and giving expression to their distinctive cultural heritage.

The Government's 'Declaration of Principles for a Multicultural South Australia' now underpins the policies, practices and activities of all Government departments. They are expected to demonstrate a commitment to these principles and to actively ensure that cultural and linguistic diversity are an essential part of management practices, policies and services. In particular, the Government believes that access to information in community languages is vital to the successful settlement and participation of individuals in society.

The Interpreting and Translating Centre of the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs operates a service in various languages and dialects spoken in South Australia. This service is available to the public, private and community

sectors. The Interpreter Card, an innovative Liberal Government initiative designed to facilitate access to Government services, has been issued to all recent non-English speaking settlers.

Multiculturalism represents a significant resource with very real benefits for South Australia. We have harnessed an immense wealth of knowledge, experience and skills which exist in this culturally diverse State. The Liberal Government is committed to maximising the benefits of this expertise and to fully utilising South Australia's linguistic and cultural diversity for the economic and social advancement of the State.

The establishment and ongoing support to the Council for International Trade and Commerce is another Liberal Government initiative which was a first in Australia. The council was established to maximise the benefits of cultural diversity for the economic development of the State by fully utilising South Australia's cultural links with the rest of the world. The council aims to promote the linguistic diversity and international experience, improve bilateral trade relations with migrant source countries, and provide a focal point for government, business and overseas visitors wishing to pursue international trade and commerce opportunities.

The State Liberal Government also has a country specific Chambers of Commerce Grants Scheme which assists and encourages South Australian business enterprises to achieve greater trade and investment opportunities through the various country specific chambers of commerce and is designed to coordinate and take advantage of the skills and knowledge within the State's ethnic communities by promoting international bilateral trade relations.

The South Australian Liberal Government is actively promoting South Australia's unique lifestyle to prospective skilled migrants to attract a greater number of skilled migrants to settle in our State. An interdepartmental task force has been established to further develop immigration promotion strategies to assist in increasing the population of South Australia. The Liberal Government has taken many other initiatives to support, promote and maximise the benefits of our cultural diversity. These initiatives facilitate an open, inclusive and fair society where cultural, linguistic, racial and religious diversity is a shared and valued asset for the benefit of all South Australians. I support the motion.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I support the motion. I am surprised that the Hon. Mr Paolo Nocella, whom I have liked and respected, has chosen to be political rather than bipartisan in speaking to this motion, but I guess politics sometimes changes people.

I congratulate the Premier for moving such a constructive motion which, in essence, recognises that debate on multicultural and Aboriginal reconciliation should be based on the premise of non-discrimination and racial harmony. It is a given that it should also be based on fact. My contribution to the motion will be brief and precise since, in my speech on the Address in Reply, I have already raised my deep concerns with regard to the ill-informed and inaccurate debate on this issue.

As the motion identifies, the special needs of Aboriginal communities should be recognised. I will reiterate some of the sad data that relates to the health status of Aborigines. An article which appears in the magazine *Aborigines*, dated 1995, and which was compiled by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, shows that diabetes is a major health problem and has a 30 per cent prevalence which is four times the rate

of non-Aborigines. It shows that life expectancy is 16 to 18 years shorter than that for non-Aborigines. It shows that infant mortality is two or three times higher than that for non-Aborigines. It shows that early childhood morbidity has seen severely infected ears resulting in deafness and at four years of age speech development for Aboriginal children is two years behind that of non-Aborigines possibly because of the hearing loss.

Further, in another article, Aboriginal babies start life more than 200 grams lighter than non-Aboriginal babies. By 25 years of age the risk of dying young is five times higher than for non-Aborigines. By 62 years of age an Aboriginal woman is likely to be dead. On every economic and social indicator, Aborigines are the most disadvantaged group.

We ought to address the eight key issues as identified by the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation and debate them openly, frankly, honestly and fairly. These key issues are and I quote:

- (1) Understanding the country: and the importance of land and sea in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander societies.
- (2) Improving relationships: a better relationship between indigenous Australians and the wider community.
- (3) Valuing cultures: recognising indigenous cultures as a valued part of the Australian heritage.
- (4) Sharing histories: a sense for all Australians of a shared ownership of their history.
- (5) Addressing disadvantage: a greater awareness of the causes of indigenous Australians' disadvantage.
- (6) Responding to custody levels: a greater community response to addressing the underlying causes.
- (7) Agreeing on a document: will the process of reconciliation be advanced by a document or documents of reconciliation?
- (8) Controlling destinies: greater opportunities for indigenous Australians to control their destinies.

Now to define multiculturalism: simply put, it is a description of the cultural and ethnic diversity of contemporary Australia. We are a multicultural society and our public policy or multiculturalism plays no part in immigration selection. Rather, multiculturalism is a way to respond to the diversity that composes the community of this our Australia.

We can identify three dimensions of our multicultural policy as follows:

- Cultural identity—the ability of all Australians, within defined limits, to express and to share their individual cultural heritage.
- Social justice—the expected equality of treatment and opportunity and the removal of such barriers as race, ethnicity, culture religion, language and gender.
- Economic efficiency—the need to maintain, develop and utilise the skills and talents of all Australians, regardless of background.

There are also limits to Australian multiculturalism, including the following: multicultural policies are based on the premise that all Australians should have an overriding and unifying commitment to Australia, to its interests and future, first and foremost. This is a very important point.

Secondly, multicultural policies require all Australians to accept the basic structures and principles of Australian society: the Constitution and the rule of law, tolerance and equality, parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as the national language and equality of the sexes. Multicultural policies also impose obligations as well as conferring rights. The right to express one's own culture and beliefs involves a reciprocal responsibility to accept the right of others to express their views and their values.

In the final part of my contribution, I should like to discuss briefly ethnicity and our Australian identity. Professor Smolicz from the Centre for Intercultural Studies and Multicultural Education at the University of Adelaide, whom I should like to congratulate on recently being elected to a

Fellowship of the Polish Academy of Arts and Science, discusses ethnicity by identification, referring to people's feelings and attitudes towards belonging to a particular group.

The Australian census, unlike the Canadian census, does not provide for detailed information on this sort of self-identity. Indeed, there would possibly be some confusion should such a question be asked. However Professor Smolicz provides a suggestion in his book entitled *Australian Diversity* as to how we can identify with Australia, as follows:

The growing identification with Australia can be perceived in a number of ways. Probably one of the best is to recapture the feelings of Australians, whatever their ethnic language or ancestry, when they return 'home' from overseas and the plane lands on Australian soil. Many are deeply moved to be once again under the Australian sky, with its vivid brightness, to experience the Australian landscape with its starker colours, or to smell the reddish Australian soil when it rains after a dry spell. They then feel a bond with the land which cannot be readily quantified but which is so important for our self-identification as Australians. This feeling affects many first generation Australians and confirms their 'belonging-ness' to the country, a feeling which they share with Aboriginal Australians.

Professor Smolicz says that the Australian identity at large has been strengthened and invigorated by this cultural and ethnic diversity, and he quotes Malcolm Fraser, who said in 1988:

My Government wanted to emphasise to Italians and to Greeks or to people from Vietnam, wherever they may come from, that they brought something distinctive with them—not just a body, not just hands, not just feet, but a mind, an attitude, a part of their history, a knowledge of their own language and culture, which would be of value to Australia. Because it blends in and it builds in and it creates something over time distinctly Australian.

However, I note that Hugh McKay, a long-time observer of contemporary Australia, a psychologist and a social researcher, is not as confident that our attitudes are so clear-cut. Indeed, as we note that 70 per cent of the community has asked that immigration be stopped or reduced, he may be correct.

In his book entitled *Reinventing Australia—The Mind and Mood of Australia in the 1990s*, in a chapter entitled 'Are we all New Australians?', he says that Australians have entered into a period of anxiety and insecurity and calls this time the 'Age of Redefinition'. He says that there is an anxiety about our cultural identity. Multiculturalism may still be a new and uncomfortable concept for the Australian community at large. He suggests that, because the development of Australia has taken place only over a short 200 years, we are in an adolescent phase. Our identity is in a state of flux. Old traditional simplicities and certainties are gone, and the social and economic future appears uncertain.

Therefore, like adolescents, we are going through an identity crisis, with its associated mood swings and the 'have it all mentality'. In other words, we want to enjoy the enrichment of the Australian society through immigration while, at the same time, we expect migrants to leave big chunks of their cultural heritage at home and start behaving here like the rest of us. To put these issues into perspective with the rest of the world, Mr Hugh McKay observes:

The attempt to create a multicultural society is [indeed] a brave experiment, but it is not as harrowing as the redefinitions of national identity which are taking place in Eastern Europe or Southern Africa. Unemployment is a debilitating and frightening experience, but it is not in the same league as famine.

However, relative to the standards that we are used to, we are suffering from a big angst as we move into the year 2000. We do have to debate these issues fully, frankly and fairly and perhaps we will move on from our perceived national adolescence into maturity. Meanwhile, this motion will go a long way towards our understanding of all these issues and I strongly support it.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 22 October at 2.15 p.m.