

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 25 September 1985

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr E.S. Ashenden
 Mr T.R. Groom
 Mr J.H.C. Klunder
 Ms S.M. Lenehan
 Mr E.J. Meier
 The Hon. Michael Wilson

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: First, I should mention two matters. During the course of the Committee there have been requests for certain information that the Minister has been unable to provide at the time. However, in cases where the Minister has promised to obtain documentation, it should be in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard*, and I would appreciate if it could be provided by 18 October. Secondly, I am flexible with respect to the number of questions I allow each member, but if things get nasty I will become rather rigid about that.

Education, \$638 065 000

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Children's Services, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J.R. Steinle, Director-General of Education.
 Ms H.H. Kolbe, Director of Education (Resources).
 Mr W.C. Marsh, Deputy Director (Resources).
 Mr T.M. Starr, Assistant Director, Finance, Education Department.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: First, I indicate, with your forbearance, Sir, some alteration in today's program. The Minister and I have discussed this. We have an enormous amount to get through, and to have a fair time allocated for each section of today's proceedings, I suggest that we deal with the Education Department budget and capital line between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. and that this afternoon we allocate 2 p.m. to 2.30 p.m. for Technical and Further Education and its capital lines. We would like to bring the Minister's Miscellaneous line forward to 3.30 p.m. Those times are approximate, but the officers then would have more idea of when they are required. Following that, we would deal with the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority and the South Australian College of Advanced Education—both capital lines. From approximately 4.30 p.m. to 6 p.m., depending on how long those lines take, we would like to deal with the Children's Services Office. That would leave the evening session aside for the vote on the office of the Minister for Technology, and of course the employment area as well.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has no objection, if the Committee has none.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: For the benefit of members of the Committee, we have tabled a document entitled 'Education Department Supplementary Information for 1985-86, program estimates, prepared on an area basis' and dated September 1985. This was asked for last year in the Estimates Committee, and we have provided it this year. It contains names of schools, enrolments of schools, expenditure per school and cost per student per school.

Two caveats must go with it. First, what is not included is the actual staffing of the school, nor is there information about pay levels of people within the school. Therefore, two schools with identical characteristics and staffing may not have identically the same cost per student because of staff at different levels of promotion or scales within a pay scale.

The other caveat is that it does not take account of the fact that there are differences inherent in the costs of different schools due to size, geographic or other characteristics, so figures may appear different and indicate that significantly more or less is being spent on one school than another when in fact that is not the case in terms of education at the classroom door. With those two caveats in mind, they are quite indicative figures.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I thank the Minister for the presentation of the supplementary information. I have not had a chance to digest it, but it is valuable to have. I take this opportunity of welcoming Education Department officers to the Committee and state, as I did last year, that it is a great shame that we have to cover some \$700 million worth of expenditure in only two hours, but, with the nature of the portfolio and the fact that we only have one sitting day to cover a very large area, I guess there is no alternative. However, it is a shame, and I place that on record.

In opening my questioning, I note that the program papers, the yellow book, show an increase of 6 per cent in combined recurrent and capital expenditure for 1985-86 over last year. If we look at the recurrent figures alone and delete the provision for superannuation, we find that the increase is only of the order of 4.34 per cent, which shows a reduction in real terms of over 3 per cent. If the Minister is to maintain teacher numbers at current levels, I can only assume that wage rises are estimated to be less than last year. Furthermore, we know that the Commonwealth has reduced Participation and Equity Program grants as well as library resource grants by some \$3 million in a full year, and I assume that at least half that amount is included in this budget from State sources. I ask the Minister to confirm that or otherwise.

This points in my view to a greater reduction over 1984-85. In any case, I invite the Minister to explain the reasons for the reduction of the recurrent budget in real terms, bearing in mind that he has to maintain teacher or staff numbers and has to make up for those Commonwealth reductions.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In a moment I will be seeking leave to incorporate some tables in *Hansard* and will provide photocopies to honourable members. The first figures I will quote are Education Department real expenditure figures for recurrent purposes in 1977 dollars. Last year I tabled similar information, so we can have a common benchmark. Those figures take account of wage escalations over previous years that have taken place and indicate what has actually happened with respect to recurrent expenditure. They also take account of other adjustments such as years when there were 27 pays as opposed to the normal 26 pays and other necessary contingency items.

The outcome of those figures is to indicate that, in 1985-86, the 1977 dollar figure for salaries will be \$282 981 000 compared with \$277 114 000—an increase of roughly

\$5 800 000. The contingencies item figure is \$36 874 000 compared with last year's figure of \$36 662 000—an increase to \$1 200 000. The overall figure is \$319 855 000 compared with last year's figure of \$312 776 000.

That is the real figure based on actual salary adjustments for all years, except that in this budget at this stage no provision for salary increases has yet been provided for. That will happen at the end of the year. The figures to take into account of course are the actual figures that will apply at the end of the year. Those are the details of the first table that I will incorporate in the *Hansard* record. On the matter of superannuation, I would like to ask Helga Kolbe to comment.

Ms Kolbe: The table to which the Minister has just referred has superannuation excluded from the values that have been quoted.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The other point was whether teacher numbers would be maintained. They will be maintained, and I can provide more figures on that if the honourable member wants me to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Minister that in relation to tabling of information, unlike normal parliamentary procedure, the Minister does not need to seek leave. The Committee will look at the material, and if it is all right with the member for Torrens and suitable for insertion in *Hansard*, that will be done.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I thank the Minister and Helga Kolbe for their explanations. Without having the figures in front of me, it is difficult to comment on what the Minister has said, but I am still not sure how the Minister intends to maintain teacher numbers and also make up for the Commonwealth cuts, with what appears to be a reduction in real terms in the recurrent budget. I shall leave that question with the Minister and perhaps he could have another look at that matter.

My second question relates to teacher numbers, and is based on the premise that the Minister is to retain teacher numbers at current levels. How many of the retained teachers are to be allocated to reducing class sizes in both primary and secondary schools? Further, what will be the proportion of retained teachers allocated to primary schools? Will the Minister also inform the Committee of the estimated enrolment decline in both primary and secondary schools for the next four years?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, on the matter of salaries, the information that I have been provided with is contained in actual expenditure over previous years and proposed for this year. Comparing figures for 1982-83 through to 1985-86 indicates that in 1982-83 the number of actual full-time equivalent teachers was 14 753, while the proposed figure for 1985-86 is 14 832, which is actually an increase on the 1982-83 figure. The figure for last year was 14 840, and the figure for 1983-84 was 14 835.

For 1983-84, in terms of State funded positions there was an overexpenditure in that year, which was made up in the 1984-85 budget. In this regard a legitimate subsequent question could therefore be, 'Why does that not show up in these figures in terms of the coming back in 1984-85, in those figures that I have just quoted?' The reason is that those figures are an accumulation of both State funded and Commonwealth funded positions, and there have been some increases in Commonwealth funded positions. The State funded positions are as near as possible to maintaining 1982-83 levels.

For the most part, Commonwealth programs have been either maintained as they were or are now being picked up in separate ways. Within the Education Department budget we are not specifically picking up the PEP shortfall as a PEP program. We are picking that up in other ways, through other means of assisting Participation and Equity Program problems in terms of funds that we are allocating for salaries in 1986.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: So, in fact the State is not making up the shortfall.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Not in terms of giving a grant to the PEP committee to work it out.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It is not contained in this line?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: No. For example, I can identify the salaries that have been committed to providing tutoring support for students in isolated circumstances, in which regard we would argue very firmly that these are participation and equity issues. That is how we have chosen to put in those resources.

At this stage I would insert the following tables in *Hansard*:

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REAL EXPENDITURE (FOR RECURRENT PURPOSES) IN 1977 DOLLARS

	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Salaries and wages	267 525	284 763	312 270	362 165	389 168	444 658	476 658	514 681	527 809
Less—Salary Certificates—									
77-78	9 249	17 389	17 389	17 389	17 389	17 389	17 389	17 389	17 389
78-79		5 869	11 115	11 115	11 115	11 115	11 115	11 115	11 115
79-80			17 102	24 655	24 655	24 655	24 655	24 655	24 655
80-81				26 854	37 619	37 619	37 619	37 619	37 619
3.6 per cent					14 308	12 606	12 606	12 606	12 606
81-82					16 375	46 272	46 272	46 272	46 272
82-83						24 128	27 981	27 981	27 981
83-84							24 455	56 476	56 476
84-85								3 454	10 715
85-86									
Museum Exp.	1 956								
Exp. in 1.77 dollars	256 320	261 505	266 664	282 152	267 707	270 874	274 566	277 114	282 981
Adj. for No. pays				13 200		1 204			
A: adjusted exp. '77 dollars	256 320	261 505	266 664	268 952	267 707	269 670	274 566	277 114	282 981
Contingencies	31 660	33 575	36 123	39 337	45 081	50 293	61 530	68 979	75 099*
Less—Museum	383								
	31 277	33 575	36 123	39 337	45 081	50 293	61 530	68 979	75 099*

	1977-78 \$'000	1978-79 \$'000	1979-80 \$'000	1980-81 \$'000	1981-82 \$'000	1982-83 \$'000	1983-84 \$'000	1984-85 \$'000	1985-86 \$'000
Deflated by C.P.I. '77 dollars	.951	.886	.805	.737	.667	.597	.554	.517	.491
B: adjusted exp. '77 dollars	29 744	29 747	29 079	28 991	30 069	30 025	34 088	35 662	36 874
A + B: total adj. exp. 30/6/77	286 064	291 252	295 743	297 943	297 776	299 695	308 654	312 776	319 855

*Estimated only

SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICE POSITIONS CATEGORY C AND Z (AND SOME Y * SHOWN)

Activity	Central		Adelaide		Northern		Southern		Eastern		Western	
	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85
O.S.T.P.												
<i>Environment Education</i>												
Agriculture	1.0	1.0								**		0.5
Natural Resources										**		
Management	—	—										
Geography	1.0	—			1.0	0.5						
Heritage	1.0*	1.0*						0.5				
<i>Health and Personal Development</i>												
Health	2.0	1.0				**						
Health Development Unit	2.5	2.5	—									
Home Economics	1.0	—	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	**	1.0	1.0
Outdoor Education	2.0	1.0							1.0	1.0		
Physical Education	3.0*	1.0*	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
Road Safety	1.0*	1.0*										
<i>Human Society</i>												
Business Education	1.0	1.0	—		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5				1.0
Economics	1.0	—										
History/Politics	—	—										
Legal Studies	1.0	1.0										
Religious Education	2.0	1.0					**					
Social Studies R-7	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0		**	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Social Studies 8-12	1.0	1.0									1.0	1.0
<i>Language Studies</i>												
English R-7	4.0*	1.0*	2.0	2.0		**	2.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
English 8-12	2.0	2.0	0.6	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0			1.0	1.0
L.O.T.E. Policy	2.0*	3.0*										
Asian Languages	0.5	1.0										
French	1.5	1.5										
German	1.2	1.2					0.5	0.5				
Greek	1.0	1.0										
Italian	1.0	1.5										
<i>Maths</i>												
Maths R-7	3.0*	3.0*	1.0	2.0		1.0	1.0	1.0				
Maths 8-12	2.0	1.0			0.5	0.5			1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
<i>Science and Technology</i>												
Science R-7	1.0	—	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	0.2	**		
Science 8-12	1.0	—					1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0
Physics	1.0	1.0										
Chemistry	1.0	1.0										
Computing	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Technical Studies	1.0	1.0				0.5				**	1.0	1.0
Technology	—	1.0*										
<i>The Arts</i>												
Arts in Education	3.0	3.0							1.0	2.0		
Drama	1.0	1.0			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0				**
Media Studies	2.0	2.0			0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5			1.0	
Music	2.0	—	1.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		**	1.0	1.0
Visual Arts	1.0	—	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.4	**		1.0
<i>Transition Education</i>												
ED/TAFE Cooperative	—	1.0*			1.0	1.0			1.0	1.0		
<i>Whole of Curriculum</i>												
Early Childhood	3.0*	3.0*	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	0.5
R-7	2.0*	1.0*	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	9.0	4.0	1.0
8-12	4.0*	2.0*	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
Library Resources	2.0*	2.0*	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Senior Secondary	—	2.0*									1.0	
Counselling	1.0	—							1.0	1.0		
Aboriginal Education	1.0*	1.0*								**		1.0
Special Education	2.0*	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		
E.S.L.	1.0*	1.0*						0.5		**		
N.A.P.	1.0	1.0										
Conductor Music	1.0	1.0										
Teacher Induction			0.3	—								
Equal Opportunities			1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Skills for Social Living					1.0	1.0			1.0	2.0		
Evaluation and Curriculum					1.0							

Activity	Central		Adelaide		Northern		Southern		Eastern		Western	
	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85
Professional Development ..									2.0	1.0	5.0	5.0
Education Technology									1.0			
Community Liaison					1.0	1.0			1.0	1.0		
Short Term Projects				1.9				1.0		1.0		
Curriculum Learning Unit ..												7.3
Resource Centre Libraries ..	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5

SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICE POSITIONS CATEGORY Y—CENTRAL ONLY (NOT INCLUDED IN PREVIOUS TABLE)

Activity	Central		Adelaide		Northern		Southern		Eastern		Western	
	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85
Australian Languages Levels	0.5	1.0										
Adviser to Parents	—	1.0										
The Arts	1.0	1.0										
Business Education	0.5	—										
Curriculum Officer	1.0	—	(converted to X for 1986)									
Curriculum Writers	2.0	—	(converted to X for 1986)									
Evaluation	—	1.0										
E.T.C.	10.0	7.0										
O.S.T.P.	1.0	1.0										
Primary Text Books	1.0	1.0										
Technology Packs	1.0	1.0										
Toxic Metals	—	0.6										
J150	4.5	4.5										

SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICE POSITIONS CATEGORY IS (CENTRAL POSITIONS ONLY)

Activity	Central		Adelaide		Northern		Southern		Eastern		Western	
	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85
A.B.C.	1.0	1.0										
Constitutional Museum	1.0	1.0										
Festival Centre	1.0	1.0										
Museum	3.0	3.0										
C.S.I.R.O.S.E.C.	1.0	1.0										
Pioneer Village	0.8	1.0										
Botanic Gardens	1.0	1.0										
Art Gallery	3.0	3.0										
Zoo	2.0	2.0										
St Kilda	—	1.0										

SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICE POSITIONS CATEGORIES C AND Z (AND SOME Y * SHOWN)

Activity	Central		Adelaide		Northern		Southern		Eastern		Western	
	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85
O.S.T.P.												
<i>Environmental Education</i>												
Agriculture	1.0	1.0								**		0.5
Natural Resources											**	
Management	—	—										
Geography	1.0	—			1.0	0.5						
Heritage	1.0*	1.0*							0.5			
<i>Health & Personal</i>												
<i>Development</i>												
Health	2.0	1.0				**						
Health Development Unit ..	2.5	2.5	—									
Home Economics	1.0	—	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	**	1.0	1.0
Outdoor Education	2.0	1.0							1.0	1.0		
Physical Education	3.0*	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
Road Safety	1.0*	1.0*										
<i>Human Society</i>												
Business Education	1.0	1.0	—		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5				1.0
Economics	1.0	—										
History/Politics	—	—										
Legal Studies	1.0	1.0										
Religious Education	2.0	1.0				**						
Social Studies R-7	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0		**	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Social Studies 8-12	1.0											1.0

SCHOOL SUPPORT SERVICE POSITIONS CATEGORY X (CENTRAL POSITIONS ONLY)

Activity	Central		Adelaide		Northern		Southern		Eastern		Western	
	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85
Statistics/Research	5.2	5.0										
School Management	2.0											
Facilities	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Personnel	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Publications	5.8	5.8										
Totals	138.0	115.6	28.3	30.0	27.4	30.0	28.0	30.0	34.5	37.5	36.5	38.8

SUMMARY

Activity	Central		Adelaide		Northern		Southern		Eastern		Western	
	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85	84	85
C	24	14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Z	26.7	21.7	23.3	25.0	22.4	26.0	24.0	26.0	28.0	32.0	24.5	27.8
Y	46.5	41.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.5	4.3	9.0	8.0
IS	13.8	15.0										
M	10.3	9.0										
X	17.0	14.8	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Total	138.0	115.6	28.3	30.0	27.4	30.0	28.0	30.0	34.5	37.5	36.5	38.8

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I draw members' attention to the figures that I had inserted in *Hansard* earlier to show that there have been significant reductions in class sizes. The shadow Minister has asked what will be allocated from this year's budget. At this stage we anticipate that some 60 salaries out of 250 from the liberated positions, as I have taken to referring to them, will be used for two effects—the displacement effect and for targeting in on further reductions in class sizes. The preferential area remains primary education. Other programs will be using the remainder,

including the reserve element that is there for unexpected changes that may well occur in 1986.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The portion in primary?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That will be mainly for primary schools. Some of the other staff allocations will be targeted for secondary schools, but they are normally quite specific targeted programs. With respect to the enrolment changes, I have here a set of statistics of actual enrolments from 1979 to 1985 and enrolment projections from 1986 to 2001. Subject to everyone's concurrence, I think it is useful if they are inserted in *Hansard*.

ACTUAL ENROLMENTS 1979-85 AND ENROLMENT PROJECTION 1986-2001
South Australian Government Schools

Year	Primary	Change	Secondary	Change	Total	Change
1979	142 710		82 490		225 200	
1980	139 270	(3 440)	79 920	(2 570)	219 190	(6 010)
1981	134 060	(5 210)	78 510	(1 410)	212 570	(6 620)
1982	128 680	(5 380)	78 770	260	207 450	(5 120)
1983	122 740	(5 940)	81 460	2 690	204 200	(3 250)
1984	117 840	(4 900)	83 010	1 550	200 850	(3 350)
1985	113 630	(4 210)	82 400	(610)	196 030	(4 820)
1986	112 000	(1 630)	79 800	(2 600)	191 800	(4 230)
1987	111 200	(800)	76 900	(2 900)	188 100	(3 700)
1988	111 300	100	73 600	(3 300)	184 900	(3 200)
1989	112 500	1 200	70 600	(3 000)	183 100	(1 800)
1990	114 200	1 708	68 200	(2 400)	182 400	(700)
1991	116 900	2 700	66 700	(1 500)	183 600	1 200
1992	119 300	2 400	66 100	(600)	185 400	1 800
1993	120 000	1 500	66 400	300	187 200	1 800
1994	122 300	1 500	67 800	1 400	190 100	2 900
1995	124 200	1 900	69 800	2 000	194 000	3 900
1996	125 800	1 600	71 700	1 900	197 500	3 500
1997	127 000	1 200	73 700	2 000	200 700	3 200
1998	127 802	800	75 800	2 100	203 600	2 900
1999	128 508	700	77 300	1 500	205 800	2 200
2000	129 500	1 000	77 800	500	207 300	1 500
2001	130 100	680	78 200	400	208 300	1 000

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The honourable member asked about the next four years: the 1985 figure for primary is 113 630, and it is estimated that that will fall next year to 112 000 (a decline of 1 630); by 1989, it will be 112 500. So, from next year until 1989, there will be an increase over the four-year period of about 500. For secondary, in 1985 there are 82 400 students within our system, and we anticipate that that will decline by 2 600 next year to 79 800 and that by 1989 that will have declined to 70 600. Overall, the combined Government school figure for primary and secondary this year is 196 030, and next year it will be 191 800, a decline of 4 230; and by 1989, 183 100, a further decline of some 8 700 on next year's figure. I will have that information photocopied as well.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Minister's answer prompts me to alter the order of my questions, bearing in

mind the figures that he has given for the reduction in secondary school enrolments. Last year in the Estimates Committee we discussed an important question of the effect of the decline in enrolments on secondary schools. The Committee will recall that I used as an example the cluster of schools concentrating around Seacombe High, Dover Gardens, Mawson, Aberfoyle Park, Christies Beach and the new R to 10 school at Hallett Cove. The Minister said that he would have his officers prepare a discussion paper on the options available to deal with the problems of declining enrolments in some secondary schools, bearing in mind that, based on the previous Estimates (and confirmed by the Minister a minute ago), we are to lose a school population equating to approximately 15 to 20 average size high schools in the next few years, with the enormous problems

that this presents in terms of viable classes, subject to availability, etc.

I must say that I am disappointed that the Minister has not yet released that discussion paper, because I regard it as an extremely important document in terms of education planning. When can we expect the release of that document, and what are the Minister's present plans to meet the problems that I have just mentioned?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Last year we did discuss this matter. It is our intention to release that paper, but the problem is that we have released a number of policy development papers and initiated other discussion matters, and we have received the strong message from schools that they have not had enough time to digest the matters we have been circulating. I understand that, and I understand that they want the opportunity to seriously consider the issues raised and respond to them. We really have been forced into the situation of slowing down the rate at which we are issuing matters for discussion. Earlier this year I announced that this year three policy papers would be coming out: one on school and community, one on equal opportunity and opportunities and one on the secondary school enrolment situation. So, we have had to slow down that program. In addition, we have had to extend the time periods for earlier policy development papers. The ordered learning environment one was extended and has now been completed and publicly commented on by the Government.

The school council matter has been referred to me and will be commented upon shortly, so it is simply for that reason that that matter has been delayed. I do not renege from my acknowledgment of the critical importance of this issue. I believe it is important that the community at large comes to terms with and adopts a community kind of reaction to what should be happening, so we certainly continue with our belief that it should be issued.

In addition, several of the areas are presently undertaking studies to examine actual impacts in terms of facilities availability in secondary areas. That information will be presented to the department and will become part of the policy development paper.

Mr KLUNDER: There has been a recent reorganisation within the Education Department, one assumes mainly for educational reasons. Can you tell us whether it has also been a cost effective change?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It certainly was primarily for educational reasons. We believed that we could better deliver the services to people in the classrooms as a result of reorganisation. Can I just briefly recapitulate the reason for our thinking in that regard? In 1970 the Karmel report indicated that there could be significant improvements in education if there was a regionalised structure within the department. As a result, that matter was implemented by the Labor Government at the time, and 10 regions were created.

However, by the early 1980s it became quite clear that, if we were to adequately support those regional divisions with a view to their being useful in terms of schools, we would have to make some major changes. We could not, for example, support 10 regions to the level that we thought was the most educationally efficient way to do it, nor indeed the most cost efficient way to do it. We would end up with a disproportionate amount of resource allocation into administration, compared with the amount going into education support and advice.

As a result of that, the reorganisation has reduced to five the number of areas. I do not have the exact figures, but I believe that the outcome (when the reorganisation is fully implemented) of the number of positions that are useful in the direct educational sense to teachers in the classroom will be increased relative to the positions that are there for

the administration of the system; and to that extent I think it becomes cost efficient in its own right. In any event, notwithstanding that, when the reorganisation proposal was put before Cabinet, it was indicated at the time that, within the medium term, there will be cost savings as a result of it.

Those cost savings consist of two elements: a quite real element in terms of actual reduction in the number of administrative positions required within the department (and there is a medium term plan for that to happen) and also a less visible component that concerns the levels at which positions exist, a kind of promotion position that you have in place. There was a very clear feeling by the department and the Government that the reorganised structure would be less likely to have a top-heavy effect in terms of positions compared to what may have happened subsequently under the former departmental structure.

Mr Steinle: The other quite considerable saving will be the cost of travel. The travel of officers working out of Adelaide is enormous, and that cost is not simply a financial cost: it is also a cost in terms of nervous energy and time, and probably the most valuable asset we have is time. By having officers, advisory staff and out-of-school personnel closer to the schools, they spend less time sitting in motor cars, which is not reproductive from the point of view of young people. Therefore, we also make a saving with regard to travel in terms of both time and energy.

Mr KLUNDER: Has there been an improvement in teacher librarian allocations to junior primary and primary schools? What has been the Statewide result of federal cuts in that area?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have a number of things to say about what has happened and what will happen in this area. We indicated that there would be an improvement to the tune of 25 positions in 1984-85. That did two things: first, it allowed us to reorganise the formula for primary school librarian staffing; secondly, it allowed us to introduce a formula for the staffing element of junior primary schools. Until that time junior primary schools may have had negotiable library staffing, but did not have any more than that. As a result of last year's budget, they finished up with a 0.2 minimum. A number maintained their negotiable staffing in addition to that.

The situation existing last year in primary schools was that half the total salaries allocated to libraries was allocated by formula: the other half was by negotiable positions. There was great anxiety in the primary school community that the negotiable sector of the staffing was the soft underbelly that was able to be reduced if ever there were some salaries wanted. We agreed to formula-ise almost the total amount of primary school effective librarian staffing and introduced a new formula. That formula, for example, started off with 100 to 135 enrolments achieving 0.2, up to 400 achieving 1.0 positions and that was the ceiling.

That total for junior primary and the reformulation and significant improvement in the formula cost 25 salaries. We plan to continue that program in this year's budget. We propose from the start of term 2 next year to allocate to the primary school librarian area a further 25 salaries. The purpose of those salaries will be to target in on four areas. First, we received a submission from the junior primary schools asking why they should have a formula different from that of primary schools. Last year we gave them a formula that they did not have before. The question was quite legitimate: why should they have a formula different from that of the primary schools? In 1986 we will correct that and from the start of term 2 junior primary schools will have the same formula as have primary schools.

The second point raised by primary schools was: why should the large primary schools, once they top 400 stu-

dents, get just one librarian when high schools have further incremental steps? We have accepted that proposition, too, at the outset. What we are proposing from term 2 next year is that any schools with an enrolment greater than 550 will have 1.5 librarians; so they get an extra 0.5 librarian when they have 150 enrolments above 400.

We also received submissions from other areas. One was with respect to small schools, which said that they needed librarian support, too. Libraries are an important part of education, and up until last year no school had a formula allocation if its enrolment was below 100. We cannot take it down to the smaller school, but we will be introducing a formula change from term 2 next year, so that schools with from 70 to 99 students will have 0.2 librarian staff.

One or two top-up situations required within an area and special rural schools will be addressed by those 25 salaries, which represent a significant cost figure—in fact, nearly \$600 000 in real money terms. This will achieve some quite significant changes in the formula for primary schools. I acknowledge that we need to do more in the future, but this is the second year now in which we have done something which I say is quite significant.

As to Commonwealth cuts in the library grant in the recurrent area, we had a cut effective in 1985-86 of \$300 000, which is a full year cut equivalent of \$600 000. I advise the Committee that the State Government has fully reinstated the cut made by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr KLUNDER: In light of recent media reporting of the level of advisory teachers, can the Minister detail what services will be available? Perhaps I can refer him to data at page 37 of the yellow book which shows that there has been a drop from 308.6 to 303.9 in the subprogram of curriculum development and advisory services.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have previously canvassed this in a question in the House, when I indicated that at the Estimates Committee I hoped to provide fuller details for members, which details I will table shortly. It may be considered too long for incorporation in *Hansard*, although I would be happy for it to be so inserted. However, I will arrange for members to be given copies.

A few essential points need to be made. A decision was made to change certain seconded teacher positions out of seconded teacher service into the Public Service nature of positions. These are not curriculum support positions: they are positions that quite frankly deal with administrative matters. For a number of years we have had seconded teachers working in the facilities and planning areas and publications arena in the more mechanical aspect, rather than the educational aspect of it.

It seemed to the department, and I concurred with that, quite appropriate that those kinds of positions should be considered for conversion into Public Service positions. So, that has happened. However, with respect to the number of seconded teachers whose function is the support of subjects and teachers within schools, there has been no real reduction in that arena. We are maintaining that. In fact, I believe that the final figures will show a minor increase in that situation.

That is quite different from the situation that applied between 1979 and 1982, when there was a reduction of some 92 in those positions. I indicated in answer to a question in the House earlier that I would table a statement showing, first, what positions existed in 1985, and what positions it is proposed should exist in 1986, and I would do that on a central and area basis so that people would know what has happened. We have quite consciously had a policy of moving advisers from the central area to area offices, believing again that it would provide better support within schools.

There is some legitimate debate about whether that is an appropriate way to do it. I advise that at the end of next year I propose to evaluate the success of that move so that we can determine whether or not teachers in the field believe they are better served by this restructuring of the advisory services. I am confident that they will and that it must improve services if advisory support is much closer to one's school and one is more able to get there quickly.

However, I also acknowledge that there is a genuine concern in the field and we must, therefore, promise an evaluation which will involve teachers in the field giving comments on how they feel the system has worked. On the table which I will circulate appears '1984-5' but it should read '1985-6'. Members will see that it shows allocation by subject area for 1985 and 1986. It would also, in the case of one area, not show that delineation because they have not yet finalised their subject allocation. I regret that we do not have that specific information before the Committee.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: As the Minister has just canvassed a question I was keen to follow through, I will take the first of my colleague from Todd's series of questions relating to advisory teachers. When the matter was canvassed in the House some time ago, the Minister took me to task for apparently being confused over the issue. I warned the Minister at the time that, whatever the Minister has said about advisory positions or reduction in those positions, my mail was still quite full of letters from advisory staff associations or from subject associations complaining about the Minister's actions in this regard.

Only this morning I received two more. I point out to the Minister that the matter is little understood out in the education community. I have received this morning, through my colleague from Mallee, a petition from the science teachers in the eastern area. Also, I have received a long letter from the Geography Teachers Association. I will not read that out, but I will read the letter from the Science Teachers Association, addressed to my colleague the member for Mallee. Although I have not had time to study the letter from the Geography Teachers Association, it is much along the same lines, complaining about the reduction of central support services. I now read the letter from the science teachers in the eastern area:

Dear Sir,

We the undersigned key teachers of science from schools in the Eastern Area wish to express our concern about the projected withdrawal of advisory services in our curriculum area. In particular we believe—

then it mentions three names—
will no longer be at WPTC—

which I assume is Wattle Park Teachers College—

but will be placed in teaching positions in schools. We believe that during past years the science consultants have provided a very valuable statewide overview, services and advice, and organised useful in service conferences, and we are concerned that these services will no longer be available. Consequently the learning activities of our students are likely to be adversely affected.

We invite you to consider and perhaps respond to two specific questions:

1. Who will provide these essential services and coordination of activities for science teachers? This is particularly necessary for teachers in small schools who often feel isolated.

2. Do the declining enrolments and consequent displacements from many schools mean that at least some staff and salaries should continue to be available for these valuable support services?

That letter is signed by what appears to be about 15 or 20 science teachers. I ask the Minister to respond. How does he believe that the dynamics of the curriculum area will be maintained when this policy is little understood and if central support services are to be reduced?

I have another instance of that, of which I would like to inform the Committee. How does the Minister see that the dynamics of those services will be retained? For instance,

if, as I believe is to happen, the ELIC (Early Literacy In-service Course) central coordinating structure is to be disbanded, where will the initiative and expansion of this important scheme come from? If, for instance, the scheme is to expand into preschool and senior primary, where will the impetus come from?

If the scheme is eventually to expand into numeracy, where will the impetus come from? Where will schools be able to obtain information on school management systems if Mr Curtis's unit is to be disbanded? Can the Minister respond to where this central direction will come from? These concerns have been made known to me in the last few days—not weeks ago.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In my answers on this matter previously I indicated that, notwithstanding the firm commitment which I gave and which I am able to indicate is being adhered to that there would be no reduction in the advisory services, indeed there would be a marginal increase, and that is absolutely correct. I also indicated that, notwithstanding that, there would be, from year to year, changes within the profile of how those services were offered and what subjects were being supported. That has happened over time; it is certainly not unique to now.

I recall that every year I have been associated with education there has been a concern by specific subject associations for whose subject it is not proposed to maintain support in that coming year, and I acknowledge that that has therefore meant that they have been legitimately concerned. I would expect that to be the case. I said that would be no different this year. Notwithstanding our keeping the commitment that we at least maintain numbers, there would still be different subject areas that would be concerned that they were not going to get a position in 1986 because some other area would get one that did not have one before.

Indeed, that is the way we must look at it, as a kind of rotation of support for specific subject areas over time, because, if we were to have one position for every subject in every area and centrally we would end up with a total figure much greater than we are able to allocate to advisory services, much greater than this system has ever had, even in the peak days of the late 1970s. So, to hear that the Geography Teachers Association and the Science Teachers Association have raised concern about lost positions, I can accept and I understand their concern as I have had it and understood it from other associations also. With each one of these issues that have come to me I have looked at it and determined whether or not it is appropriate for that to be changed in the light of new evidence that they may give me and we see if any later adjustments need to be made. In previous years I have been flexible and there have been such adjustments, although not in every case, but in some cases we have made later adjustments.

With respect to science teachers, I note the concern that they have identified that in the R to 7 and R to 8 science areas, both central positions will not be continuing next year. The total science and technology set of advisers works out as follows: the central area will see a reduction from seven to six, which means that the science R to 7 and 8 to 12 positions have gone, but a new position in technology has been created. The other positions of physics, chemistry, computing and technical studies remain. The position with area officers is that most remain constant for next year, with Adelaide staying at 1, the southern area at 2.5 and the western area at 2. The eastern area will certainly be remaining at 2, but there may be some additional support in the technology and R to 7 area as a result of job advertisements that they have presently put out for the filling of their positions. I am unable to give final advice on that. The northern area has gone from 0.5 to 2.5—an increase of 2. So, overall, taking the science and technology area of advisers,

there is a net increase in 1986 over the central and area officers. I cannot say the same for the geography positions.

It is true that the geography position, in the environmental education package as listed in the table that I have tabled, shows a reduction and elimination of that position in 1986, and the only other advisory service available there is in the northern region which is being reduced from one position to a half-time position. I note therefore that that concern needs to be looked at and I will undertake to further look at that situation.

Another matter raised by the honourable member was that of ELIC. ELIC is now being supported in the areas and that has been the intention. As I have visited schools I have picked up a great deal of enthusiasm and excitement about that program. For that reason it has become a national program as it well deserves for all who have worked in the area. It is clear that ELIC is really about in-servicing, support and curriculum development within the schools and the way in which the program can support that. We believe that that can best be done by resource and staff allocation at the area level providing support. So, ELIC is not being abandoned as a program. It is quite consciously being maintained in the different form, no longer by central support but by area support. There will be coordination between all involved in each of the areas, so they are not operating in isolation, but will maintain the coherence of the ELIC program. That will offer better support for what is happening in schools.

Having visited recently a quite remote school involved in the ELIC program, I found they were very happy with the kind of support they are receiving from the western area, which is their support. They believe that that is the kind of support that they need for ELIC to run and be of support to them. I come back to the point I made earlier that at the end of next year, when we do a proper evaluation of this system, if we find that things are not happening perfectly in every area, we will certainly relook at what is happening. We are confident that ELIC will not only be maintained in its efforts but will improve as a result of the new kind of support mechanisms being offered for it.

School management was the other area mentioned. The unit under Kingsley Curtis is no longer within the structure. Again, this is something that will be 'area-ised' (a word I do not like using) as well in the belief that that will offer much closer support for individual schools within the system. I also advise that I queried whether somebody with the talents of Mr Curtis who has been involved in this area over a long period of time, can pick up automatically and be able to know questions to be asked and answers to be given. As with many other areas of reorganisation, Mr Curtis will be giving professional support and informal in-service training to those officers at the area level whose job it will be to pick up the school management services support within schools, so that when schools ring up area offices asking questions which they formerly rang Flinders Street to ask they will know that the answers they are getting are from people well briefed and well versed by the person who handled it for a long period of time.

Mr ASHENDEN: I will follow on from a question asked by the member for Torrens. I too, raised in Parliament not too long ago problems that have been put to me in regard to various advisory positions. I forwarded my question and the Minister's answer to the constituent who raised the matter with me, and he has come back to me and said that he does not believe that the Minister has addressed the nub of the question asked on his behalf.

The question was in relation to the adviser at the Wattle Park Teachers Centre who is there to advise the school counsellors. I have been contacted by one (and I have a number of school counsellors in my electorate) who has indicated that he is acting on behalf of other school coun-

sellors within the area who are extremely concerned that the adviser at WPTC on school counselling has been told that his position will not be continued. I am informed that this is in stark contrast to an assurance given only a month or two earlier that not only will his position continue for this year but also for 1986.

There is extreme concern being expressed by school counsellors that that person's appointment has now been terminated. They have pointed out to me that the value of that person to them was very real indeed (and I must take their advice, obviously) that because that person will no longer be available to them to coordinate advice and training programs and other works these organisations do. I note the comment that there is to be no reduction—and I accept the point made to the member for Torrens that, if science has an adviser one year, perhaps geography should have one the next year. However, school counselling is an issue of growing importance, with the problems that young people have today. They are staying at school longer, are not sure of what they want to do or what they can do, and also face the fear of unemployment and other social pressures, of which the Minister will be aware.

As I have said, the school counsellor who has approached me on behalf of his colleagues has asked me to push this matter further to determine whether the Government will ensure that funding is made available so that the central adviser can continue at WPTC.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The honourable member has asked me a question in the House before about this matter, and I indicated the needs of school counsellors. They operate singly in most cases, and there are very few examples of where there is more than one school counsellor in a school. They have need of the opportunity to communicate with others in the field of school counselling and also with a central person, as previously. That is why in 1981 I vehemently opposed the proposal to cull these positions.

I also indicated previously in my answer to the honourable member that what we are proposing in 1986 in terms of area-ising the system is for this to be picked up by the new Assistant Director (Positions)—called school and community services—in each one of the areas (that is an ED4 position). We believe that this very exciting job brief given to these school and community service people in each of the areas gives them the responsibility for picking up support and advice for school counsellors and that general area of school community liaison and the integration of human services support with respect to what is happening within our school systems. Some critical issues in this area have not previously been addressed.

I might have mentioned previously that I had attended a seminar with the various people involved in this Sax area, and it was exciting to see the kind of enthusiasm building up for tying together not only these important threads, such as school community support, but also other areas not previously tied together at all. So, I believe that this offers some very good opportunities for quite significant improvements not just in direct support for school communities but in the sort of work they are doing in their schools every day, and they will find better support as a result of this new wave approach.

In addition to that, each one of the areas involved has another Assistant Director (Administration), an AO4 level position, which is there for administrative matters that may need to be answered with respect to school counsellors. That position is there for the technical and mechanical matters, whereas that other area is more for the wider human services and education delivery support.

In addition, some of the other areas we are improving include the support positions in the department for teachers

who are having difficulties within the system—very often, of course, that has been part of the work load of school counsellors. So, there are people centrally on whom the school counsellors can call for support. I ask the Director General to add some further comments.

Mr Steinle: We, too, have heard the concerns as outlined by Mr Ashenden. This is a matter of great significance, particularly in relation to some young people in our schools experiencing difficulties other than those associated with the problems of learning, and so I have asked Mr Anderson, currently seconded to the office in the place of Mr Giles, who is on leave, to look at this matter and to see if in fact there is a short-term difficulty; and, if so, what steps we can take to ensure that these people are getting the support which they feel they need and which indeed I accept that they must have.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Finally, the honourable member mentioned that he has been advised that the person previously holding the position was given an assurance that the position would continue in 1986. We will certainly examine that matter and provide an answer later as to what may have been the case in that regard.

Mr ASHENDEN: I can assure the Minister that that is the advice that I have been given. I ask my next question on behalf of one of the school councils in the area that I represent. The council has raised with me a concern it has in relation to the formulation of curricula within schools. The school council raised this concern at a meeting and addressed itself to the advisory committees being set up to determine curriculum direction. Those on the council indicated to me that they were very concerned that in at least one instance of which they were aware (and they cited two or three instances) they felt that the curriculum committee should comprise professionally trained educationalists.

Although it is many years since I was in a classroom, I would very much agree with that. I feel that people who are shaping curriculum matters should be trained in education, not only having had a lot of experience as classroom teachers but also having obtained specific qualifications, either graduate or post graduate.

The school council involved pointed out to me that at least one committee of which it was aware comprised a number of people who had no experience in education at all, and they felt that in some instances this could result in a curriculum being designed that would meet neither the professional criteria nor the needs of the children in the school. They felt that if a curriculum advisory committee wanted to obtain outside information, perhaps from professional bodies, trade unions, and so on, a curriculum committee could call on people in those areas to appear before the committee, and that the committee could utilise the information provided by those specialists in shaping its own curriculum.

The council has asked me to raise this matter because of its concern that a curriculum could be so structured, particularly in some social areas, as to have a bias. That is a matter that the school community is not happy about. Those in that community felt that, if all curriculum committees were set up in the education system comprising people with specific training, this danger would be very much reduced. Will the Minister comment on the concerns that the school council has raised?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Is the honourable member asking about the general ways that advisory committees are structured, rather than implying that there has been a change recently in their structure?

Mr ASHENDEN: The council that raised the matter with me indicated that it felt that the curriculum advisory committee structure comprised more people who were non-educationalists than was previously the case. To be honest,

it was an expression of concern at the direction that has occurred under the present Government.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In answer to the last comment made by the honourable member, implying that maybe some governmental policy has been involved, I point out that that is certainly not the case. In fact, curriculum matters are not under my control: by legislation, they are under the control of the Director-General. I can assure the honourable member that there has been no policy directive from the Government indicating what an advisory committee should do one way or the other. As to whether there has been a change in the recent makeup of these committees, I indicate that we will look at this matter and examine the 1985 advisory committees, comparing them perhaps with the 1982 situation. We will make other spot checks as well, just to see what those in the field say. Something may show up—I do not know.

As to the general issue of advisory committees, notwithstanding that this matter is under the control of the Director-General, my personal view is that a curriculum advisory committee should consist of a mix of people. It must include not only professional educators but also those who have direct classroom experience. It must include people with other perspectives on the issues involved. I have had personal experience of these matters, being a former advisory teacher in the health education arena, at which time I came in close contact with the health education advisory committee. At all times I was very impressed with how that committee worked. It seemed to me that the committee's success was stemmed from the mix of people on it.

There were some people there from the community who were not educators beyond having been parents of children—and that is an educating role—or beyond having been to school or further education themselves: who were not in fact professional educators in the sense that the honourable member meant, and I think they were a critically important part of that committee. That committee also comprised professional educators, and they were critically important. Some of them did not have classroom experience—they were tertiary educators—but they brought an important perspective to it. Others were present classroom teachers. I would argue very strongly for the mix between those situations. That is my personal viewpoint, and we will get some spot checks done to see if there has been a change. If there has been, it certainly has not been as a result of Government policy direction.

Mr Steinle: I believe that is a very fundamental matter. The question of the reorganisation of the Education Department in terms of logistics has been discussed, and the comment was made by the Minister at the time that fundamentally the move has been based on educational premises: that indeed is the case. However, it is part of a much wider move in education in this State from, I believe, the ownership, as it were, of the professional group towards the wider community. I believe that increasingly we are opening up our schools to advice from all those people who have legitimate concerns about what schools are doing. Those parties comprise the students within them, the teachers, the parents, but also business groups and people concerned with learning and with the development of social skills.

Accordingly, over the years we have most certainly endeavoured to seek advice from and give information to those people who have a legitimate interest in what schools are doing, and I believe that our schools are healthier for that. I believe that there was a time when we lost touch with, for example, industry and commerce and groups of those kinds, which should have an opportunity to voice their views on what happens in schools. Therefore, our curriculum committees are, and have been for quite some time, comprised of not only people who are actually classroom

teachers but people who are knowledgeable about child development; people from universities and CAEs who have the subject knowledge which is necessary, plus our own subject expert and, in addition, people from outside schools who bring to the curriculum work their own perceptions and priorities.

I suppose that a classic example of that would be in areas such as health education. It would be unfortunate if school teachers, for example, were to produce courses in health education, which encompasses sex education, without canvassing the views, in a very direct way, of parents. Indeed, the supreme advisory curriculum board in this State is a board which comprises not only practising teachers but members of the community, including representatives from commerce and industry. So, the Minister has undertaken that we shall get those comparative analyses made, and we shall do it and get back to the honourable member.

Mr GROOM: I want to ask three questions on topics dealing with school furniture, school groundpersons hours and the professional development inservice training of teachers. Is the Minister aware that some schools are experiencing problems with the provision of school furniture and would like to see an alteration in the system? Briefly, the problem at present is that they are asked each year to put in a list of what school furniture and equipment they believe they may need.

Invariably, the schools will accelerate the level of needed equipment, at least to try to get the best deal that they can ultimately, because invariably they are cut back. A number of the schools would like to see an alteration whereby something similar to a per capita grant or a minimum base level is provided to the school for the purposes of purchasing school furniture. Some of the schools believe that this would enable the school to plan much better for future years in that they would know that they have a certain amount of money to spend, and then they can develop what they feel they require within their schools. Is the Minister aware of this problem?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I can certainly advise that there have been problems with furniture. I have identified that in previous years; and, while on the one hand I am able to point to quite significant improvements in terms of percentage increases—in terms of the recurrent moneys and capital moneys allocated for school furniture under this Government—I am not for one moment suggesting that they have thrown away the problem. They have not; the problem is still there. However, we have reversed the trend that existed for a number of years previously which saw annual reductions in real terms in the amount of money allocated for furniture. We have gone back the other way, with quite significant percentage increases.

But there are problems. If we were to keep spending money at this annual rate forever, the turnaround rate for desks in our schools would be very slow indeed. I am not sure of the latest figure, but the figure had been something like 139 years during the time of the former Government. We may have got that figure down to something like 69 years—I am not sure—but that is still too long. There are some practical aspects that the honourable member raises. How do schools get furniture, and how do they replace furniture? Each of those problems has been the subject of continuous examination by the department. We keep on having to look at how we can do the job the best way.

In the budget papers, members may have wondered why it is that the actual money spent in 1984-85 on furniture, on the recurrent side, is only something like \$201 when the vote was \$404 000. In fact, it was spent: all of it was spent by the area officers. The area directorate figure shows a significant increase from about \$2 million to \$3.9 million, which among other things incorporates that furniture money

being allocated by the area officers. We believe that we will see improvements on how we deliver the system. The area officers have greater responsibility for the expenditure of those recurrent funds and we hope that that will result in improvement.

Another thing that has been put to me on a number of occasions, and indeed most recently by the High Schools Council Association, involves the repair of furniture: why could we not look at some packages to support the repair of furniture? Over the years a number of experiments have been done in this arena, and some have been for a time successful but not necessarily continuously so. Marion High School, which did some excellent work in this arena as part of its work experience program, has regrettably but understandably had to stop that aspect of its program because they were not in fact able to make it a financial operation. They made a sound business decision, which is part of the operation of Marion High School, to terminate that activity and concentrate on other activities.

Why should it be so difficult? The reason is very often that the cost of repairing broken furniture is greater than the cost of buying new items. Sometimes what is involved is the repair of furniture that we believe is no longer suitable. Some furniture that we think is not ergonomically suitable we would rather see replaced totally. One question was: why can't spare parts be purchased, which would be cheaper and schools could do their own repairs? Again, the cost economics have not been worked out. It is not necessarily cheaper at all to effect repairs but, in fact, more economic to purchase new items, which have a longer life and result in that investment being recouped much better.

It may be difficult to determine whether or not schools should have an individual per capita amount allocated for furniture. When we open a new school, a basic furniture allocation is given to it done by a formula. If we were to start this next year, a school that opened three years ago with furniture that is three years old will have quite different furniture needs from a school that is 15 years old. More complex than that, there would not be a school that would have all furniture of one age: there would be a variety of ages. Then how do we go about determining what the *per capita* formula is?

Mr GROOM: Or a minimum.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will examine what more we can do in that area. I am thinking aloud some of the problems that I am certain will be found.

Mr GROOM: My second question deals with the school groundspersons' hours. I understand that these are geared to the ancillary staffing formula and, as the Minister is aware, what I am concerned about here with primary schools is that, when there is an enrolment drop, the groundspersons' hours, because they are geared to the ancillary staffing formula, will likewise drop, and yet the area remains the same. I know that the Minister set up a committee to examine these problems. Could the Minister provide some sort of a report on the current status?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Certainly. Just reverting to the previous question, as to furniture, in the document which I have tabled you will see the area payments for furniture listed, so if one wants to know what was actually spent by the areas, it is there. Secondly, we will provide for that supplementary edition of *Hansard* a table of statement of expenditure on furniture from recurrent and capital votes over recent years.

As to the school groundspersons, very strong propositions have been put to me ever since I have been the Minister: the propositions have come from both sides of the proverbial fence. Propositions coming from one side are: 'Minister, we have large grounds here and we believe that we need a separate groundsperson allocation that takes account

of that, regardless of what is happening to our enrolment trends and, as a result of enrolment trends, what is happening to our general ancillary staffing allocation.' On the other side of the fence, we have schools saying: 'Please, whatever you do, do not separate the groundsperson allocation from the general ancillary formula, because our grounds are not particularly large and we would prefer to have management control over that to the extent of being able to transfer hours from the groundsperson area to other areas of ancillary support.' I guess it is in the nature of being Minister that one is in the position of being asked by both sides to do different things.

The school assistants review, which I give an undertaking will be released publicly within the next few weeks, does in fact address that matter. It makes a series of recommendations on that arena and they are being considered at the moment in the light of that kind of dilemma that I have mentioned: how do you determine what you do, where you draw a fence or line to take account of both the very real problems that are raised by both those kinds of schools? How do you cope with the grey area between the two of them? I certainly acknowledge that it is a real problem.

In relation to ancillary staffing generally, one of the areas that is a matter of concern is where a school may not be able to obtain access to its full ancillary staffing load because of administrative arrangements, and yet it may be facing a problem in relation to the maintenance of its grounds. I can think of a couple of examples where the department, with my full endorsement, has approved the allocation of extra hours even though it has meant that we have had to budget over on that matter, but it has been important from a safety point of view. For example, one school could cite quite clearly a bushfire potential if the grounds were not properly maintained and they needed the hours to do that, so that the department is well aware (as I am) of the importance of that arena. Within the next few weeks we will make some statements on the school assistants review and we will address, but I cannot promise to the satisfaction of all, the matter of school groundspersons.

Mr GROOM: In relation to the professional development of teachers, at the moment I believe that the TRT days for teachers for in-service training are included in an allocation (again I am dealing with primary schools), which include a number of days for sick leave, funeral leave, and other sorts of leave. As a consequence of being embodied in the one sort of grant of days per year, an individual school can get an expansion or contraction of the days available for in-service training in the professional development of teachers, depending on what happens individually at the schools. Some of the teachers have expressed to me some concern about the lack of stability in that formula and would prefer the number of in-service days for teachers to be dissected out and set at a base minimum. In the light of that, could the Minister outline the future directions in relation to professional development of teachers?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In relation to TRT allocations, we are already moving in the direction of having two formulae to address that matter. Up until now there has been one formula for the allocation of TRT support to schools. That formula was improved in real terms by this Government in 1983, having effect in the 1984 school year, and we propose that, when these two new formulae come out from the present one formula, they would represent a cumulative improvement on the present formulae. That is possible, because in real terms we have improved expenditure on temporary relief teacher days in every year that we have been in government, but this will acknowledge that there are some needs of relieving teacher support that is directed at relieving for sickness, and there are others that are targeted at relieving for professional development needs, so

that is certainly going to happen. The implementation of the new formulae will be for 1986.

We are also looking at another matter that I believe will involve quite a significant change. I do not quite know what the final outcome will be, but it is certainly an important area that we want to be able to address. Up until now the TRT allocation as given by the formula to a school is determined on a 1 July to 30 June basis. That really may not be the best management way to handle it and we are examining whether or not we can introduce a formula that will be on a school year basis from February to December, so that if in fact there is to be a running out situation to apply, as I suppose very often happens, it will occur not in the middle of winter, when there is the greatest pressure because of illness occurring, but rather, at the end of a school year when the school is just generally winding down its activities ready for closing. I think that will be a significant improvement in how we manage the funds. I think it will be greeted with a great deal of enthusiasm by schools.

As to professional development generally, I suppose TRT expenditure amounts to one of the significant areas of State money that goes into professional development, but there are also other expenditures and this year, in addition to what is already done through other areas, we propose to add a further \$150 000 for the retraining of staff and the extension of staff professional development. There will be also other related matters in terms of increasing the number of release time scholarships. We have been running at the rate of 12 release time scholarships full-time equivalent for some years now. We will increase that in term 1 next year by 15 positions and then, effective from term 2, we will increase it by a further 10 positions. They then become annual figures from the following year, so it means that the full annual equivalent, say, from 1987 of the decisions we have taken in this budget will be 37 full-time release scholarship equivalents, although they may not be deployed as full-time release scholarships; they may go as fractional time release scholarships.

Again, that is a statement that is being added to the professional development program and I think that is a very significant figure. Twenty-five full-time salary positions amounts to in excess of \$600 000 of State money going into that arena. I suppose that should answer concerns that the Commonwealth and bodies like the ATF have expressed about declining State effort.

I have a correction to make to a statement that I made earlier. I indicated that the TRT budget ran from 1 July to 30 June: in fact, it runs from September to August. This actually compounds the problem that I was talking about, because it runs from term 3 of one year to term 2 of the next year. It is term 2 fully that is often the problem time. Therefore, my comments do not change in their emphasis—they increase.

Mr MEIER: My first question relates to inspection of school buses. I have a letter from a transport officer (I believe a Mr Davis) dated June of this year, and headed 'Inspection service, Education Department buses'. In that letter he points out that the responsibility for examinations will now rest with the Central Inspection Authority but that, at the same time, the Education Department will continue to employ school bus examiners who will be inspecting and ordering on behalf of the Minister.

The letter also indicates that the Education Department has revised the service routine for departmental buses to coincide, where possible, with inspections. It has been brought to my attention that we now have a dual inspection system. When I arrived at one school there were two lots of inspectors around the area for the better part of the day—one from the Education Department and one, I assume, from the Central Inspection Authority.

One contractor has said to me that he feels that it is a waste of money to have two lots of people inspecting buses. A second person contacted me indicating that an Education Department inspector had looked at his buses and found them basically satisfactory, but pointed out one or two things that needed to be attended to. The Central Inspection Authority, I believe (he received a letter from the Division of Road Safety, Motor Transport Vehicle Structures Department, so perhaps the Minister can clarify whether that is the same authority), then sent up an inspector some time later.

The inspector found several faults in the bus. He asked the proprietor to have them corrected, and that was done. A second inspector was sent up and started a complete inspection of the bus again. The proprietor said that the first inspector had inspected the bus, and the second inspector had only to reinspect the work done. The second inspector said, 'No, I am going through the bus again,' which he did, detailing a further 23 faults. The person who gave me this information believes that only one fault should have been pointed out.

The person then contacted the Division of Road Safety, Motor Transport Vehicle Structures Department and voiced his objection. A third inspector who was sent up tended to agree that the second inspector had been, to use his words, 'a little too enthusiastic'. Some of the work that had been pointed out did not then have to be done; things such as spring bushes did not have to be replaced. I think even work such as the replacement of airline hoses that were chafed but in no way worn did not have to be carried out, either. As those hoses cost about \$50 to \$60 each, and as there are six of them on the bus, that resulted in a saving of \$360. Why are two lots of inspectors inspecting buses? Things had been going along relatively smoothly for many years, but since June of this year we have started to get objections about the current system.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Certainly, the example raised by the honourable member cannot be excused as a rational way for the system to operate. It has not at any stage been planned as part of the principle of any changes that two groups of inspectors should be going out to the school on the same day looking at the buses. I would proffer that to the Committee as a hiccup in the system—an accident—that needs to be corrected in terms of future bus inspections.

I am advised that central inspectors (or, as the honourable member referred to them in his speech in the House, CIA) examine only once a year, whereas Education Department inspections are more frequent, particularly in more distant country situations. The two groups are supposed to be coordinated so that there are no overlaps. Clearly, the honourable member identified an overlap, and I do not suggest for one minute that it did not happen. However, it should not have happened. But it reflects the fact that as with any new policy there have been teething problems. Whenever there are such problems one needs to ask whether they are just teething problems or whether they are fundamental of something wrong in the policies followed. In other words, does there need to be a fundamental change in the direction in which we are going? I am not able to answer that at this stage with respect to the examples such as the member raises.

However, they are being examined, and a report on the whole issue and on the impact of reducing Education Department inspections is presently in preparation by the department. There are two positions involved in the Education Department, and the outcome of that review will determine whether those positions in the department will be maintained or whether we will simply have the central inspection authority doing the annual inspections. We will look at whether or not the example raised by the honourable

member needs to result in a fundamental change in how we do things or whether they are merely teething problems.

Mr MEIER: My second question relates to maintenance work on schools. It was interesting to hear the Premier say in the financial statement he gave to the House on 29 August:

The Government is also aware of the concern that is developing in the community regarding the standard of maintenance of Government assets, especially school buildings. It has therefore decided to increase its efforts in this area through the creation of a special Jubilee 150 maintenance program, which will be run over three years commencing this financial year. The program will involve expenditure exceeding \$90 million over those three years to cover maintenance, minor repair of buildings and replacement of equipment.

Certainly, at the outset I welcomed that announcement. In my district of Goyder many schools need maintenance, and the Minister has seen some of those. That matter will need to be dealt with in the future, but I was a little depressed to read a press comment by Matthew Abraham, who pointed out that that \$90 million was not really new at all; in fact it was only a 5 per cent increase on what the funds would have been, whether this program took place or not.

I would be interested to hear the Minister's comments on whether that is actually a brand new program or whether we have had it for some time. In that connection, can the Minister throw any light on the possibility of rationalising expenditure of redevelopment or maintenance money? I cite two examples, and perhaps I should not mention the names of the schools concerned, although I do not think it really matters and I would be happy to do so later, but one school was given the go-ahead for redevelopment of its administration area at a cost of about \$150 000. That was certainly much needed, but that same school is also considering possibly combining its secondary and primary areas to become a community school.

Certainly, a redevelopment program is envisaged, and the Minister may well know to which school I refer. When that \$150 000 was announced for redevelopment of the administration centre a couple of parents contacted me virtually asking me to stop the allocation of that money. They said that they wanted to hold on to that money and use it for redevelopment of the school. They did not want to spend it in that small area when it could be used for total redevelopment of the building, and they were concerned that it might be pushed to one side. I answered by saying, 'Look, you would be very foolish to reject that money. Certainly, it would be put to some good use, and we do not know what time we are talking about for redevelopment of the school,' so that matter was taken no further. I believe that redevelopment of the administration block is now complete.

That is one example where it would have been good to have had the opportunity to say, 'Put that \$150 000 aside; you will not use it. If in 12 months, two or three years time we decide we cannot go ahead with redevelopment of the school, you will get it plus interest to do with what you want.' Of course, not all members of the school might have agreed to that. I have another example of a primary school which those concerned would like to see redeveloped and which has received the go-ahead for replacement of the shelter shed roof. People have approached me about that and said that it was a waste of money and that basically the roof was still satisfactory. They would rather not spend the money on that project when they hope that the shed will be pulled down, anyway, in a few years time; then they would redevelop.

My advice was similar: 'I am afraid we are not talking about a lot of money; you might as well accept the offer while it is there.' I can think back to a school in which I served—Yorketown Area School. Just before we were due to shift to a new school in about four months' time the

tennis courts at the old school site were resurfaced. A teacher ran over and said, 'Stop, we are shifting school.' That example happened some years ago. The people doing the work said, 'Don't worry about it, we have to do it. We cannot reverse it. These courts will be of use to the community generally.' Has the Minister given any thought to acceding to schools' wishes and to guaranteeing a trust fund, ensuring that this money might be used in a better way in future years?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: A number of points were raised by the honourable member. First, for the most part, the general area of maintenance comes within the portfolio of my colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction. Some of my answers relate more specifically to his area and are being given in his absence. However, some money within my budget line is allocated for school maintenance.

The system should work and, indeed, does work most of the time. Priorities for maintenance are decided within the areas in discussion with schools, and facilities managers in each area have responsibility for that. Again, we believe this will lead to improved resource allocation as a result of reorganisation; it will be of real benefit. Therefore, as to the kind of example that the honourable member quoted at Yorketown, I am sure that everyone in this Chamber could give similar examples which are sad and funny—sad because they are a misallocation of resources. We believe that that sort of thing will be less likely, if not completely unlikely, to happen in the future. It is important that schools discuss their maintenance needs with their facilities managers. We are now providing follow up for that to happen much more than in the past.

Another situation that I come across quite often is that schools themselves may not be aware of the appropriate way in which to put their point of view about what needs to be done. On a number of occasions, as Minister, I recall being approached by individual schools saying, 'We want this, this and this.' They take me around and show me, and I make decisions as to whether the requests are valid. However, I end up with a report from the department saying, 'We know nothing about points A, B, E and F.' The school is concerned and well meaning about problems it wants to bring to me so that I can do something about them, but perhaps that has delayed matters a little, because there might have been a quicker understanding of individual matters had the area been approached directly. I often say that one needs to get in touch with an area so that matters can be considered on a priority with other maintenance needs.

I record that now, but am not saying that it is relevant to member's schools. However, there are a number of situations where that does happen and that needs to be brought to the attention of other members. As to the J150 program, the member asked whether it is a new program or an old one. It brings together the funds that were allocated previously to housing and construction, to the Minister of Education and indeed other funds that have been made available from special one-off sources. Last year additional money was made available under the Treasurer's lines which amounted to about \$1.4 million. It is a bringing together of those three.

The key to the J150 program is resources generally: more significantly, it is precisely that—a three-year program. We have faced over time a number of difficulties in terms of knowing what all the priority needs are in maintenance (and there are a number of priority needs) and making sure that we address them equitably as they are from the funds available. I see an opportunity now to have a three-year program of priority assessment where we can plan ahead knowing that these funds are committed from three years at a minimum. That means that maybe we will bypass some of the problems that have taken place in previous years

when somebody discovered that there was \$50 000 unspent at 1 June and decided to spend it quickly. As it could not be spent on the first priority within that time they found a priority on which the money could be quit by 30 June: that may have been priority number 20.

I hope that one of the outcomes of this program will be to avoid that situation by a more efficient use of the community's money in terms of meeting real priorities. The first job of those involved in this will be to obtain a maintenance map with respect to what needs to be done with respect to school maintenance in the initial instance so that we can know what are the resource implications of that. I am not for one minute about to suggest that we can automatically give a guarantee that, in the second and third years of that program the necessary funds will be made available. I cannot give such a guarantee, but at least when the resource decisions are being made we will be in a much better position to know not only what are the maintenance needs here and now but what they will be next year and the year after. The key to this matter is the three-year element.

Secondly, the J150 program offers better opportunities for integration and planning of expenditure undertaken, and we have already been moving in that direction. The officers of the Education Department and the former Public Buildings Department—now the Department of Housing and Construction—are meeting regularly to discuss what they see as the relevant priorities. So, the kind of Yorketown example quoted should not recur. I recall in my first year as Minister a situation coming to my attention where there was to be a new electrical installation in a school that we were closing in 12 months. With better discussions between officers of both departments that can be picked up and should happen less frequently in the future.

The honourable member asked whether money can be allocated to a school and not be lost if they do not want to spend it. First, it is difficult to give a commitment that money for this year will be available three years from now. It has to be understood that, unless one has a proper maintenance map in front of one, it is difficult to know what the likely other priorities will be. Previous systems did not allow that to happen, but the ones coming up will not necessarily guarantee that, either: it is not that simple.

As an example, we may have promised certain schools capital expenditure to redevelop within a given time on the basis of population growth and demographic change as we understood it. Then suddenly it changed with the housing boom and we found that we had to build schools this year that we did not think we would have to build for another six years. Suddenly, schools given what seemed to be a rock hard guarantee are pushed down the line: so, there are such difficulties.

One of the important issues (and officers of the department agree on this) is that where money is to be spent on a school we should ensure that it will be useful for the long-term plans of that school. It is possible for money to be spent on a school now that may be subject to a major redevelopment later because it can be built into what will happen. A concept plan for a school can incorporate 1985 expenditure as being a relevant part of the long-term redevelopment of that school I cannot comment on the school in question, but I will look at it. If the honourable member does not wish to name the school publicly, he can advise me privately: we will then ascertain whether the same thing applies there. When I advise other schools that ask not to be given their money now as they want the full package later I say that maybe we can build it into the full package.

Mr MEIER: My third question relates to the Aboriginal education program. I refer to the yellow book, page 27. It disturbs me to see the excessive emphasis on looking at

Aboriginal culture contained in the curriculum for Aborigines because the Aboriginal community at Point Pearce is in my electorate of Goyder, I am aware of two schools in the town in which I live that have Aboriginal students. We have a primary school in Maitland with Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students and a primary school at Point Pearce for Aboriginal students. I dare say that the Minister is aware of moves by some Aborigines towards what they call 'black power'. It worries some members living in the Aboriginal community to which I have referred that perhaps this is being emphasised too much. It is a minority group that promotes this view. However, I have serious reservations, having looked at the details of page 27 of the program, as so much seems to be oriented towards Aboriginal culture and promoting the Aboriginal way of life.

Will this help Aborigines become part and parcel of our everyday community, or are we trying to educate them in a way very different from the way in which the average citizen is educated? Does the Minister really think that this will help their future employment prospects? So often when I speak to Aborigines in central Yorke Peninsula and ask them what are the key things that they would like they say that they are security and a home. That is exactly what I want, yet I wonder whether this program will ensure that that will be the primary aim for the future.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I guess that the broad statement for all education we offer is that it is to ensure that each individual person has the opportunity to best fulfil his or her capacity in life and to reach their maximum attainment accordingly. That clearly involves aspects of economic reality: they can take part in the economy. It also involves being able to participate fully and equally on social terms. To that extent the teaching of Aboriginal culture in schools is important. If, in fact, there is a problem, it is that we do not have enough teaching of Aboriginal culture in our schools so that all Australians have the opportunity to learn about the culture that existed for a long time before European settlement.

I would be critical of anything that required the teaching of Aboriginal culture just within the Aboriginal schools and not within other schools. I made representations to the South Australian college asking that all teachers who are trained have, as part of their preservice training, some training on Aboriginal culture so that it becomes part of the knowledge that they implicitly incorporate when they are teaching out in the field. I acknowledge the reality that we want to provide graduates in schools the capacity to compete, take part in life and to enjoy the benefits of life. That is quite consistent with the teaching of Aboriginal culture in our schools, as it is consistent with any other subject that is more to do with the social aspect of education as opposed to that aspect of education that might more specifically be seen as skills delivery.

If we were simply to take a very hard line that the only form of education we should give our schools is the provision of basic skills to allow a person to get a job, many subjects may of course go under the hammer and be cut out—as well as Aboriginal culture. So, what is happening in our Aboriginal schools is in principle no different from what is happening in other schools.

In fact, I have visited most of the Aboriginal schools in South Australia, and I am confident that the teaching we are doing in those schools is in fact giving the capacity to the students involved to take part in the wider society. It does not matter whether the school involved is, for instance, at Pipalyaptjara, close to the Western Australia/Northern Territory border or much closer to a provincial city. One of the things that has concerned me is that previously we have failed somewhat to meet the needs of Aboriginal students who are enrolled in schools where they are in a

minority. As a result, over the past three years I have made available 40 salaries (which amounts to about \$1 million in recurrent costs) for the provision of Aboriginal resource teachers to be allocated to those schools where there is a significant enrolment of Aboriginal students but where they are still in a minority. They have special education needs in their own right—quite different from the education needs of Aboriginals in traditional non-Aboriginal schools.

The next point of concern is with respect to who controls what is taught in local schools. All schools have a similar set of controls in the sense that there is a core curriculum approach, that we expect to be taught in all our schools, but we encourage local involvement in what is happening in terms of the day to day operation of schools, in terms of padding out the curriculum. We want that to happen in all schools in the State, be they Aboriginal or in downtown Adelaide.

I can assure the honourable member that parents in the communities involved are encouraged to be involved in what is happening, but we are still insisting that there are basic things that we want taught to all our children, no matter where they may live. Indeed, we are doing what we can to provide educational opportunities to those who presently may not have them.

As a result of the traditional life style in the North-West, a number of potential students are physically removed, by quite a long way, from schools. Therefore, we have been giving support to outstation schools, and have been allocating salaries to provide teaching support for one or two days a week, where a teacher goes out to a community, with perhaps only six, seven or eight students, and which is quite removed. I think Cave Hill and No. 12 Bore are two of the places involved, and there is a third one as well.

Ms LENEHAN: I have three questions, and as time is limited I shall be as brief as possible. First, I refer to page 114 of the Estimates of Payments, and the salaries for teaching staff line. This relates to the question of contract teaching. Recently I visited nearly all the schools in my electorate and met with the staff. An issue that they are still raising is the question of contract teaching, and depending on the number of contract teachers in each of the schools various concerns have been expressed to me. I would like it on the public record that I believe that the Minister and the department have done a most commendable job in converting a number of contract positions to permanent positions in the last couple of years.

However, will the Minister indicate to the Committee the direction that he intends to take in the forthcoming year with respect that the conversion of contract positions to permanent positions? I am not asking the Minister to give us exact figures or numbers, but I believe that this is important, particularly to members such as myself who have a close working relationship with the schools in the areas that they represent, because we would like to be able to give

some indication of what is proposed with respect to contract positions.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: With the concurrence of the Committee, I shall incorporate in *Hansard* a set of figures on contract teaching positions, going from December 1980 through to 5 September this year. The table identifies the number of contract positions that we have had in a number of situations: for example, one location for the whole year; more than one location, full time; one location for less than one year; and more than one location for less than a year. So, there are various categories, and the figures indicate the position. I can assure the honourable member that the figures prove that, while there was an increase in the first year of the present Government of the number of contract positions, the number certainly fell, as expected in 1985.

For example, the number of total full year appointments either in one location or more than one location was 446 in December 1982, and that fell to 509 in December 1983. The number rose in December 1984 to 536; and it is now down to 463. These kinds of figures are shown in the table. The grand total for December 1982 was 1 228; for December 1983, 1 269; for December 1984, 1 379; and as at 5 September 1985 the number was down to 1 117.

So, the initial increase in the first two years was less than the growth in long service leave demand—which is quite significant, because under the former Government the contract positions increased by the same or more than the rate of long service leave demands—they are a function of each other. However, under the present Government the number has increased less initially, and now there has been a real decline.

I have approved discussions between the department and the Institute of Teachers in relation to what will be feasible next year in converting positions from contract to permanent—which the Government wants to do. In the process of those discussions we have been looking at some, I think, creative alternatives. As well, this year for example in the Elizabeth and Salisbury schools use has been made of some permanent teacher positions to fill in the TRT vacancies, or short term contract vacancies—a number of kinds of vacancies have occurred in those schools that were not met because of the lack of available teachers.

That has been a very exciting situation this year, and we are approaching that with the possibility of expanding those arrangements to other areas of the State, and that has been part of the discussions between the Institute and the Department.

Likewise, we are looking at increasing (as we promised) from three to six the number of permanent relieving teachers in Whyalla, which will bring the number from 56 to 59, I think. The outcome of those discussions on this matter will be available shortly. The table shows that there has been an improvement, as we promised there would be.

Contract Teaching Positions

	12.80	12.81	12.82	12.83	12.84	27.5.85	5.9.85
1 Location, Full year	24	275	378	424	445	380	378
>1 Location, Full-time	4	57	68	85	91	75	85
Total full year	28	332	446	509	536	455	463
1 Location, <1 year	550	485	465	452	540	305	480
>1 Location, <1 year	326	296	317	308	303	60	174
Total part year	876	781	782	760	843	365	654
Grand total	904	1 113	1 228	1 269	1 379	820	1 117

Ms LENEHAN: I thank the Minister for that answer. I know that the appointment of permanent relieving teachers is a step forward and is something that has been welcomed.

I refer to page 6 of the yellow book, and in relation to the agency overview at the bottom of the first column reference is made to further provision for alarms in schools in high

risk areas. I have recently had in-depth discussions with the school council and the staff of one of the schools in the area that I represent, namely, the Hackham East Primary School.

Members of the Committee may be aware that there has been some discussion in the media about this school. The school established a small zoo, which I have seen and which I believe is a commendable effort on the part of the school. Unfortunately, this zoo has been vandalised on several occasions, causing great distress not only to the animals that were killed but also to the children who have looked after the animals with care and concern.

The school council, in concert with the staff, has actually taken some very enlightened steps. It has distributed 5 000 pamphlets to all surrounding districts highlighting the need for, if you like, a community kind of awareness and surveillance, the fact that the school is community property and that these things should be a community responsibility. They have taken several steps themselves. I wondered what sort of funding would be available and whether there has been an increase in funding for the provision of alarms for high-risk schools. I believe that it is important that Hackham East be considered as one such school. Will the Minister briefly tell us whether he believes that the provision of these alarms has reduced the incidence of vandalism and in particular the sort of vandalism to which I have referred?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have noted the representation made by the honourable member about the Hackham East situation. I will look at that, but I will not make public whether or not it will be fitted with alarms—we just do not do that, as it would work against the efficiency of the system. It may or it may not be done, depending upon competing priorities. This Government was the one that started the program of providing silent alarms for schools. We maintained that in our previous two budgets and in this budget we have increased the installation program amount by a further \$100 000. In 1984-85 a total of \$376 000 was expended for the installation and maintenance of security systems (because they cost money to run), security controls, monitoring response to alarms and associated costs.

The security budget figure this year will come close to \$500 000, so that is an increase. We will keep on with our program because it is an important one. That is not to say, however, that every school is made most secure by silent alarms, which are not appropriate for every situation. We analyse which schools they are appropriate for. I am asked, has it reduced the level of break-ins or arson. Certainly it appears to us that it has reduced the incidence of that. It will never eliminate it. I do not have the exact figures, and will provide them subsequently for *Hansard*, but I can advise that the number of individual incidents has decreased over the past three years. Individual incidents multiplied by the loss or damage in each one may vary quite widely: a school of \$1 million may next year become a school of \$10 000. I am reporting the number of incidents rather than the value lost. That incidence has gone down. We can identify a school which has sustained a fire recently and which has a silent security alarm. The loss figure there was much less than we would ordinarily expect. We continue to appreciate the support of the media and the community generally in helping us share the community's concern about community assets.

Ms LENEHAN: My last question relates to remarks passed in the Parliament, particularly by members of the Opposition, about the time that they have had to wait for replies to come from the department. I guess that this really has cast some sort of aspersion on the efficiency of the department in terms of handling and processing inquiries. Has there been a dramatic increase in incoming mail, or have there been some new forms and processes through

which the incoming mail has had to go which would in any way validate the comments made by the members of the Opposition? Will the Minister explain the process?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will incorporate in *Hansard* a tabular statement from 1981 to 1985, month by month of the incoming letters so that people can see that there has been a significant increase in the volume of letters coming in. Secondly, in the reorganising of the department, it is true that systems have changed. There have been some teething problems and I apologise to members who have had lengthy delays. I can assure them that recent statistical analyses show that the average time taken to reply to members' letters is going down and is back to a level that I would argue is acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Works and Services—Education Department, \$4 704 000
—Examination declared completed.

[Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2 p.m.]

Technical and Further Education, \$97 750 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr E.S. Ashenden
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr E.J. Meier
The Hon. Michael Wilson

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Children's Services, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr L.P. Fricker, Director-General, Department of Technical and Further Education.

Mr B.J. Grear, Deputy Director-General, Department of Technical and Further Education.

Mr D.R. Carter, Director, Administration and Finance, Department of Technical and Further Education.

Mr P.W.I. Fleming, Director, College Operations, Department of Technical and Further Education.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The recurrent budget for TAFE shows a small reduction in real terms if provision for superannuation is allowed for: I believe about a half per cent. However, when introducing the budget, the Premier said that 115 additional positions would be provided in the Department of Labour and TAFE to institute the Government's youth training programs. How many of these additional positions will go into TAFE and how will they be paid for in a budget that is reduced in real terms?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Regarding the first part of the shadow Minister's statement, he has done calculations that would indicate that there has been a decrease of 0.5 per

cent in real terms as compared to the 1984-85 allocation, but that is not correct: a significant real increase has been achieved. The shadow Minister has based his calculations on the comparison of the initial allocation for 1984-85 with the proposed allocation for 1985-86 and then related it to an estimated inflation factor for a full year. However, it is not valid to compare the two provisions in that way because, while they include an inflation allowance for non-salary items and the full year effect of salary increases in the previous year, they do not include an allowance for the cost of any salary increases incurred in the current financial year.

The latter will be met from round sum allowances as was the case in 1984-85 when the TAFE budget provision was supplemented by about \$600 000. A meaningful way of comparing the two years is to match the actual 1984-85 to the provision for 1985-86 after adjusting the provision for inflation allowances. This is different from what is often said to be the best way of comparing figures. I will give the honourable member the memo which I have so that he may ask supplementary questions, if he wishes to do so.

This analysis reveals that in 1985-86 the provision is \$97 750 000 with adjustments in respect of superannuation: to get a proper comparison one reduces by \$6 635 000. For price level changes and inflation on non-salary items there is a reduction by \$845 000. One also has a reduction in carry-over costs of salary increases incurred in 1984-85 (\$1 351 000) to bring the adjusted 1985-86 figure for purposes of comparison to \$89 189 000.

The outcome for 1984-85 was an initial provision of \$85 118 000 plus the cost of salary increases (\$600 000), which gives a figure for the outcome for 1984-85 of \$85 718 000. So, in other words, the comparison of 30 June with 1 July indicates a real increase in the TAFE Commission of \$3 471 000, or 4 per cent. After adjusting for the Commonwealth Government component of the TAFE budget State effort is increased in 1985-86 by \$3 348 000 on a State effort of \$66 497 000, or 5 per cent. Again, the total budget and Commonwealth contribution will increase significantly when the cost of traineeships is determined and subsequently added to the department's allocation.

As to the significant matter of the impact of the YES scheme and related training programs, there will be staff appointments of 195 that are relevant to the area. Regarding student places, apprenticeships are proposed to be 610 up on what was planned and there will be an increase of 182 in pre-vocational places. There will be 1 600 trainee places (they are new places: they did not previously exist) and 570 in the equity area.

That is, again, the State translation of the cutback in the programs involved here. We have targeted a new kind of area and picked up the same essential principles that were embodied as well as an increase of 50 positions in the NOW program.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I thank the Minister for his answer. I accept that with the decrease in Commonwealth funding there has been an increase in State effort. However, I have trouble with the figures in front of me. I will study them later, although there will be little time to ask questions concerning them. I have been used to comparing proposed expenditure with proposed expenditure, where we discount the application of the round sum allowance additions contained in the actual expenditure. That is the basis on which I made my calculations for last year, the year before, and this year, and I think that was the basis used by the Minister when he was in Opposition. I will study the Minister's figures and have a close look at them.

At page 90 of his report, the Auditor-General has once again drawn to the attention of the public and especially Parliament the matter of lecturing hours. I do not intend

to read the whole section of the report because it would take up too much of the Committee's time, but the Auditor-General refers to the development of the Distributed Management Information System (DMIS), which stems from the Keeves review of four years ago. The Auditor-General has implied criticism of the department for its lack of performance in getting this area into gear. How long does the Minister expect it will be before the full benefits of DMIS come to fruition and when will the review of lecturers' hours be completed?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In the last few comments made by the honourable member he acknowledged that the department had been working on this matter. The criticism is not that no work has been done but rather regarding the pace of the work. It is not absolutely such a simple area to deal with in an organisation such as TAFE with its wide diversity of offerings and mechanisms to offer in educational services. It is different from the Education Department, which has a much narrower range of formal ways of delivering educational services. In TAFE there are not only six streams: different circumstances in each stream may be offered in accordance with the type of course offered or the clientele to whom the course is offered. These circumstances make it less simple to have a quick implementation of new systems.

Later, I will ask one of my officers to comment on this matter. There have been improvements in the area. I know that the department has been collecting data that is relevant to this area. I do not remember the exact month of the departmental bulletin that was issued, but a recent departmental bulletin gave data on hours per course, student loading and like aspects.

Mr Fleming: There are a number of aspects relating to the matter referred to by the Auditor-General. I would add that the concept of student hours which we have adopted in South Australia was pre-Keeves. Keeves found that a very suitable way to go: it is quite different from the other States, which tend to work on class contact hours with teaching staff and which are now looking at our approach.

Two years ago one of the elements we introduced was to establish benchmarks in each program. These benchmarks are established on recommendation of a program operations group and then verified by the department, so we have a clear target in each area to aim towards and they are public targets—there is no secret about them. Performance has improved markedly on those benchmarks. We will again revise them next year. We hope that DMIS will begin to feed accurate information to us towards the end of next year. One college has completely adopted it and it is working successfully: that is the Regency Park College, which piloted DMIS. It now remains to get the hardware, software and management expertise for all the other colleges to put that together. I would not like to put a time on it: suffice to say that we are able at any stage to manually derive student hours and examine the performance of any particular area.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The department has advised the Auditor-General that by 30 September this year at the latest it will have given him a time as to the implementation of the system.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am pleased to hear the Minister volunteer that information. I think that the Committee would appreciate being notified of that and it could be incorporated in *Hansard*.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Has the Minister entered into negotiations with the South Australian Institute of Teachers on the employment conditions within the Department of Technical and Further Education and did the Minister set up a working party which recommended increased hours of attendance for officers, a reduction from 49 to 20

days annual leave for heads of school and from 49 to 30 days for lecturers?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, am I having discussions with the Institute, the answer is 'No'. As to the question: did the Minister set up a working party, the answer is 'No', but in fairness to the Committee, as to the questions relating to are there discussions taking place and has a working party been looking at some propositions, the answer is 'Yes'. In fact, the department, with my concurrence, has entered into discussions with the Institute of Teachers about certain matters relating to employment conditions canvassing, amongst other things, the sorts of areas mentioned by the honourable member. I do not believe there is a definitive progress report at this stage, because clearly, a lot of discussion has to take place on those areas mentioned and a lot of other areas.

Because the matters have been raised for discussion is not necessarily an implication that original propositions put for consideration of the institute may be accepted. There is a lot of water to go under those bridges yet, but yes, there are discussions taking place. Propositions have been put and I might ask the Director-General to comment further on that.

Mr Fricker: A working party looked at the whole question of employment conditions of TAFE lecturers and has made a series of recommendations. The point that I would like to make is that they are not departmental recommendations: there is a set of recommendations from a working party which seeks to repackage the employment conditions of TAFE lecturers. In my view, those recommendations do not represent a reduction in the conditions which lecturers presently enjoy, but are directed at a revised approach which might provide, for example, for offsetting advantages, possibly in the way of study leave, etc., if there were to be perceived disadvantages by way of increased hours of attendance. Let me repeat that the recommendations of that working party have no status other than recommendations of a working party.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Does the Minister have any idea when some finality may be reached? Would it be within 12 months?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: My guess is that substantial discussions still have to take place between departmental officers and the institute. There is then the matter of the Government considering those propositions, so I would say that it would be a long time and that 12 months would be a reasonable time.

Mr KLUNDER: Has the Government provided appropriate levels of recurrent funds to commission the recently completed facilities at the Adelaide and Port Pirie Colleges?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It has been the policy of this Government to in fact provide appropriate extra current resourcing for commissioning of new facilities and, with respect to the facilities that have come on stream, at Adelaide the staff resources that are being put in there to that college is \$168 000; the fuel and power plant commissioning costs of \$194 000 are being put in there, also. In relation to Port Pirie, the figure is \$116 000, which is all for staff allocation. That includes such things as an upgrading of a deputy head, provision of a lecturer in clothing and textiles, provision of one lecturer in the access area, provision of a library technician, one storesperson, one finance officer and a 0.2 librarian appointment. In the Adelaide College it is one head of school, two senior lecturers in the tourism and hospitality area, two clerical officers, one purchasing officer, three stores officers, and two cleaners, in addition to the fuel and power, so they are the specific answers to the questions.

With respect to this Government's policy, we have had a policy of providing the extra resources needed to meet the

commissioning of new facilities, and that was not necessarily a practice that has been followed in previous years. On a number of occasions new commissioned facilities were a drain on existing facilities.

Mr KLUNDER: Referring to page 121 of the Estimates of Payments, there is a figure under 'Lecturing, Administrative and Ancillary Staff' of \$61.6 million for 1984-5 and \$60.9 million in actual payments and the proposed expenditure for 1985-86 is \$65.5 million. Can the Minister indicate what major programs are going to take up that extra money?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The increase in real terms is in anticipation of the YES program and the major aspects relating to that.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In relation to the effect of the Commonwealth 50 per cent cutback in the participation and equity scheme (and the Minister may have answered some of this question before), what are the actual effects on the TAFE budget; how much State money has had to be installed (and I have not had a chance to look at the Minister's figures) and how many potential students will be affected by Commonwealth cutbacks in the PEP program?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I mentioned before, with respect to the TAFE aspect of PEP funding, that we are picking it up but not again by means of grants for the PEP committee to distribute as they have done with other grants. So, effectively from the purposes of the PEP committee's point of view, it does have a reduction in funds available to it.

However, I advise members that the State has provided funds to the Department of TAFE for 1986 to ensure that the equivalent amount of money has been put into issues that address participation and equity questions. The funds have been allocated to the department under the new State-Commonwealth equity program, which is an integral part of the YES scheme announced quite recently. An amount of \$1.3 million has been allocated to that department to conduct the State Youth Program in 1986.

As a result, the Department of TAFE, through the combined SYEP plus the remaining PEP funding (because 50 per cent still remains), will offer a special youth program comparable to the 1985 PEP program. The new SYEP program will promote courses in TAFE colleges throughout the State. The emphasis will be on courses more likely to lead young people directly to employment options: for example, foundation, vocational preparation and industrial skills bridging courses.

At this stage, we have plans to operate 83 courses for 1 234 students under SYEP in 1986. These are State funded courses which complement the 1986 PEP offerings of 41 courses for 1 035 students. Thus, a total of 2 269 student places will be provided in the department under a combined SYEP and Participation and Equity Program provision, which is a slight increase apparently on 1985.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Can the Minister give a guarantee that during this coming TAFE year the funding of colleges is so arranged that no college will be forced to cut adult literacy or access courses as occurred last year? In other words, is the Minister maintaining the extra \$600 000 installed into the budget last year to make up for that?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Answering the second question first, we are maintaining the extra money put into the TAFE budget later in the 1984-85 financial year, so the answer is 'Yes'. The answer to the honourable member's question whether we would maintain the total effort to adult literacy and related courses is 'Yes'. He also asked whether the profile or provision of adult literacy courses would be identically the same: I do not yet know, because there may well be changes within or between colleges.

Certainly the overall provision will be no less than it was last year; in fact, I guess confidently it will be greater than

it was last year. I make that qualification about its profile with respect to the types of courses we are offering. With other members of Parliament, I am starting to be concerned that we legitimately spend resources on providing literacy opportunities to people who need them. Indeed, we should do more. We spend significant resources on the education of those who are already literate and participating in the education systems. But what we may not be doing sufficiently is addressing the transition of those who want to go into mainstream education courses. In recent years, TAFE has been designing courses in that respect. Part of the literacy program has been quite specifically targeted at helping people to enter into mainstream TAFE courses, and I want to see that kind of provision continued in the years to come.

It is a matter of what the actual balance ends up being. I cannot specifically comment at this stage, but there will be no fewer courses: in fact, there will be somewhat more. I cannot give a final figure at this stage on learning opportunities in adult literacy for 1986. With respect to the report I had commissioned on adult literacy and how we formalise its involvement in the department so that it is no longer the 'soft underbelly' when resources are needed, that report has been considered by the department and the Government, and we will announce its outcome. However, I certainly do want access programs generally in adult literacy, in particular, to be formalised—dare I say (and I mean this in the most positive of senses) institutionalised within the TAFE structure so that it is there, recognised to be there and not especially vulnerable to changes in economic circumstances.

Mr ASHENDEN: Can the Minister provide information in relation to the proposed new building for Tea Tree Gully TAFE? I am sure that the Minister is well aware that there have been so many 'Yes, it is on; no, it is off' situations in the past that many of the local residents of Tea Tree Gully are concerned that, although they have heard the development is going ahead, they have heard it before. So, I have told a number of my constituents that I would ask the Minister in this Committee whether he would indicate the likely commencement and completion date and when students will first be utilising the new premises.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: With respect to the 'on again, off again' point made by the honourable member, all I can say is that we have adhered to commitments I have given in the TAFE capital works area. This Government (in Opposition) promised before the last election that we would build Port Pirie college, which I will open in October. We adhered to that commitment. We also promised that the next major college redevelopment after that was Eyre Peninsula college. We have been proceeding during the life of this Parliament on that project.

We have been purchasing extra land, and we have made submissions to the Commonwealth for funding. Indeed, I believe that is running to schedule as we promised. Therefore, I have given commitments to Tea Tree Gully, and the track record of my giving commitments in the TAFE capital works area is credible and applies as much to Tea Tree Gully as to any other area. The State Government is committed to the development of facilities at Tea Tree Gully. I have never had any personal doubts about that. Of course, I visited the college and both the members for Todd and Newland were present at that time. I actually had the opportunity to look at the site where it is to be built.

We have submitted it—not just as one of a grab bag of claims—to the Commonwealth for funding. We have not just said, 'Okay, we will pass the buck. We will put our "Yes" stamp on these things.' We did not do that. At the State level we do a filtering process of our own in terms of what we think are legitimate projects to go forward to the

Commonwealth. So, everything that is put forward to the department is not necessarily accepted by the department, nor necessarily by the Government.

Tea Tree Gully was, however, not only accepted but very positively accepted by the State Government and submitted to the Commonwealth Government. Because there were some doubts in the early stages as to how the Commonwealth might react to it, we have backed that up with subsequent indications of our belief that it is a very important project which should go ahead. As a result, I am advised that it is on schedule, as previously announced, and that the commencing date is anticipated in 1988. Anything we can do to keep things on schedule we will.

Mr ASHENDEN: When does the Minister think it will be available for student use?

Mr Fricker: If I could add a little to what the Minister said before answering the member's question: there is a belief in Tea Tree Gully, which is strongly shared and endorsed by the department, that a college is needed there. However, the Commonwealth authorities did take a lot of convincing because they looked at the map of the Adelaide metropolitan area and saw a college at Gilles Plains. They said, 'There is a college at Gilles Plains; you do not need another one at Tea Tree Gully.'

If I could reinforce what the Minister said I, together with one of my officers, had to make a very impassioned plea, if you like, to the Commonwealth TAFE Council in order even to have the name added to a schedule of Commonwealth capital projects. It was only within the last couple of days that we had the advice that it has now been accepted as a concept proposal. It is on that basis that I believe the likely commencement date will be 1988. If that is so, we would expect the first students to be moving in, say, in 1989, even though the construction might be staged. That would be my best guess at present.

Ms LENEHAN: My first question relates to page 92 of the yellow book. The second column refers to intra-agency support services and gives 1984-85 specific targets and objectives, one of which is to increase student services, including child-care facilities and services, and that has been achieved. Under the 1985-86 specific targets and objectives, it goes on also to suggest that one of the objectives is to increase student services. First, can the Minister tell the Committee whether the commitment to the provision of child-care services (and I note that in recurrent expenditure the proposed figure is significantly increased on the outcome of 1984-85, as indicated on page 93) will be maintained in the future and in fact whether, where the yellow book refers to an increase in student services, that applies to colleges which do not presently have child-care facilities? I specifically refer to a college with which I am intimately involved, namely, the Noarlunga College of TAFE, which has a branch college on the South Coast. As the Minister would be aware, I have raised the matter of the provision of accommodation and money for the payment of staffing for the provision of child-care facilities in the southern Fleurieu Peninsula region serviced by that part of the college.

Secondly, I understand that there is an ongoing commitment for the funding of placements in child-care courses. It is an interesting position where the colleges are training child-care workers, and this is a most valuable and important aspect of the college's work. Is that commitment to be maintained along with the commitment for the provision of child-care facilities at all colleges in the State?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will first refer to child-care facilities and give figures for the information of the Committee. In 1984-85 we provided 20 staff in various locations at an annual cost of \$238 000. The proposals, as a result of the 1985-86 budget, are, first, the full year carry-on effect of those new initiatives introduced in 1984-85 mid year,

which means an additional annual cost of some \$50 000. Additional casual staff will be provided to a further \$50 000 and the additional provision, in hours per week, for the various colleges is as follows: Elizabeth, 20 hours; Gilles Plains, 16 hours; Tea Tree Gully, 20 hours; Kensington Park, 24 hours; South-East, 20 hours; Hills, 30 hours; Regency Park, 40 hours; Port Adelaide, 6 hours; Noarlunga, 24 hours; and, Whyalla, 40 hours. Some of those figures are additional on a zero basis, as they did not have any hours previously.

I am not able to advise whether the Noarlunga figure is entirely for the Noarlunga campus of Noarlunga TAFE or whether anything is available for the South Coast, but I will get back to the honourable member on that point. The additional provisions are provided during the running of various length courses in semester II in 1985. There has been an increase in real terms of \$100 000 in addition to the figure we already have, which is quite a significant figure.

Earlier, in answer to a question by the member for Mawson, I indicated that the Government would be announcing its program for the next four years on the installation of child-care facilities in all our colleges, because it is not only Government policy but also departmental policy to provide child-care facilities in all TAFE colleges. That information will be coming down soon, I would hope. We have recently announced that extra funds are available for child-care courses and some \$97 000 is being added into the 1985-86 budget. That is in addition to the fact that the department has for several years annually catered for 20 full-time students and over 100 part-time students in the child-care certificate course. The 1985 initiative, for which we have announced \$97 000, will enable us to cater for an intake of 50 full-time students at Elizabeth and Noarlunga colleges and for the upgrading of educational and administrative support programs. Additional funds will be made available in 1986-87 to enable the department to maintain the initiative and, on an on-going basis, offer a balanced comprehensive program for the child-care industry.

So, as a result of the figures we have there, in 1985 we have had 80 full-time positions at Elizabeth and Noarlunga colleges made available and in 1986 we will have further positions made available as a result of extra funds that have been put into that by the State Government.

Ms LENEHAN: My second question refers to page 82 of the yellow book and to hourly-paid instructors for personal enrichment courses as shown on page 121 of the Estimates of Payments. I note under the heading, 'Issues/Trends' on page 82 there have been falling enrolments caused by a number of factors including the level of fees, social and economic conditions. I question the Minister on the level of fees. I have raised the matter in the Parliament fairly recently, but it is significantly important to raise again in this Committee.

I have with me several letters sent to me by people in my electorate who are very concerned about the fact that some stream 6 courses, because of the formula that seems to exist with respect to the number of concession students who can be taken on in certain courses so that those courses become economically viable, although advertised, have been cancelled even though people have gone along and enrolled for them. Because the college has exceeded its budget in terms of the provision of hourly-paid lecturers for enrichment courses, these courses have subsequently been cancelled, causing distress to the people affected.

I ask the Minister to re-examine the criteria used because it has been put to me that many pensioners and people entitled to concessions would be more than happy to pay even half the full fee being charged. It has been put to me in writing and personally by my constituents that this would

mean that more courses could be offered that would be economically viable for the colleges.

It is my suggestion that, as well as moving to a more flexible system, the colleges could be given some power to have flexibility within their own structure, so that they may move to charging 50 per cent of the full fee but at their discretion in order to meet special circumstances. I make the point as a member of the Noarlunga TAFE College council, where currently the principal does have discretion in certain areas to provide some support for students, we have a small fund and the principal does this with great humanity and compassion. It is not advertised, nor is the council advised that extra money is given to a certain student. We are made aware of the circumstances. That has worked very effectively. Would the department consider re-examining the whole question of concessions and the way in which they operate?

A gentleman came into my office and put forward a very strong case. He was enrolled in a pottery class and is a mature-age unemployed gentleman. He was doing the course with a view to future employment and the scheme he put forward to me had a lot of merit. However, the course he was doing had to be cancelled as there were too many concession students. Subsequently, many of those students decided to pay the full fee and that course has been offered. There is a fine line between determining what is an enrichment course and what for some people is a vocational or future vocational course. Will the Minister consider and note the points I have raised?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will certainly consider that matter. The honourable member raised some very important points which need further examination. As a result of ongoing discussions about these matters, the area of concessions and the general matter of stream 6 are presently under review by the department. I am anticipating some recommendations in the near future as a result of the review being undertaken. The review will target many of the questions raised by the honourable member and they are indeed important questions.

I want to pick up a couple of other points raised by the honourable member in her question. First, I refer to the matter of enrolment trends. It is true that enrolments have been falling over a number of years. In 1982, student enrolments were 42 000, and in 1984 that figure was down to 37 250—so, there has been a fall. We do not have the 1985 figures yet because we are not yet at the end of the year. Actual student hours fell, percentage-wise, more than that: from 1 049 466 in 1982 to 899 468. There is a relatively greater fall there, because in fact a number of courses have shortened in their length over the intervening period. Courses which may have been of 12 weeks duration might now be 10-week courses, and this automatically means a reduction in student hours.

As to the effect of fees on this matter, certainly I believe that there is some relationship, but it is true to say that the Government has adhered to its commitment that it would not increase by more than the rate of inflation the cost of the fees. For the three-year period to 1985, fees for stream 6, including the general service fee component (not exclusive of that) have increased by 32 per cent. It is interesting to note that between 1981 and 1982, the period of the former Government's Administration, in one year the fees increased by 36 per cent. So, percentage-wise, our increase over a three-year period has been less than the one-year increase of the former Government.

I also point out that it is true that social and economic conditions do have an effect on enrolments, but it is interesting to note that other providers in the enrichment area very often charge more for their equivalent to enrichment courses than does the Government. So, I do not believe

that fees are the absolute determiner of whether or not enrolments go up or down.

The Government has already reviewed the concession situation because of the anomalies that were occurring before we came to office. In that regard, one could meet three pensioners doing the same course and find that they were paying three different rates, with one paying nothing, another paying half and the third paying full fees, in order to keep the courses going. We realised that changes had to be made. Accordingly, we introduced a concessional rate, requiring all people, unless they have a special dispensation from the principal, to pay 25 per cent of the fee. In making that decision Cabinet firmly believed that there should be no net increase in revenue to the Government. It was not a tax measure but simply an equity measure to ensure that everyone had the same fair go.

With respect to the amount of money made available from Government by way of contribution to individual colleges to help various problems, in 1985 Noarlunga college received \$6 000 more under the program, up from \$28 000 for this year; Kingston college received \$9 000 more, up to \$32 000 from \$23 000; Pirie college received \$4 000 more, up to \$25 500; the Light college received \$16 500 more; and the Tea Tree Gully college allocation was up \$1 500; and the Hills college was up \$2 000. In each case those decisions were made to try to accommodate the special circumstances involved, as referred to by the member for Mawson. I accept that more needs to be done to improve the access opportunities, and that is happening. I shall report on that matter later.

Ms LENEHAN: I thank the Minister for his answer. I am sure that it will be very acceptable to my local community. In relation to staff development, does the allocation for this purpose include things such as air travel and, if so,

has there been an increase or a decrease in the amount of money spent on air travel for staff who are attending courses that could be described as providing staff development?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will provide for the supplementary edition of *Hansard* the information on staff development expenditure in total. Not all the funds for air travel are relevant to staff development as such. Funds are allocated for administration matters, job interviews, perhaps involving someone going to Whyalla to interview an applicant, and so from the information provided we can find out what proportion of air travel is relevant to staff development.

With respect to the actual amount spent on air travel, for whatever purpose, be it staff development or administration, or for any other necessary purpose in the Department of TAFE, I have some figures, which I shall incorporate in *Hansard*, showing a monthly summary of air travel from 1981 to July 1985. To give an idea of the trend, in 1981 the total annual figure was \$86 000 approximately; in 1982, it was \$119 000; in 1983, \$161 000; and in 1984 it fell to \$133 000. So, in 1984 there was a cut-back in that area. The figures for 1985 also show trends quite comparable to the 1984 trend. The figure for 1985 will be greater than that for 1984, but so too have the cost of air fares increased.

I must also point out that a number of these costs are not State funded, but Commonwealth funded. That information is not included in the table, and I guess at some greater effort we could get that information. It is true to say that the department has soundly managed this area. It has monitored what is going on, and as I have said, in 1984 there was a real reduction involved—and I believe that that was without any decline in the service that was offered. The figures relating to air travel are as follows:

MONTHLY SUMMARY OF AIR TRAVEL FROM 1981 TO 1985

	1981 \$	1982 \$	1983 \$	1984 \$	1985 \$
January	1 221.40	1 651.80	3 947.20	3 248.00	3 908.00
February	4 740.10	5 176.50	11 161.10	9 254.40	20 017.80
March	8 674.90	13 810.00	12 727.60	14 211.00	4 867.20
April	9 895.35	15 812.90	23 051.10	13 020.80	6 338.20
May	7 335.55	8 457.30	17 680.95	13 179.80	19 719.30
June	5 657.90	9 693.70	17 944.35	18 154.40	17 208.70
July	10 891.70	13 722.60	15 637.40	10 252.20	12 797.00
August	11 469.30	11 398.80	15 091.10	11 890.70	
September	7 211.60	9 087.90	17 880.80	16 326.70	
October	9 955.95	12 658.60	13 466.50	11 506.60	
November	7 300.30	14 100.60	10 554.30	8 907.30	
December	1 729.80	3 523.00	2 527.40	3 535.40	
Approximate Total	86 077	119 087	161 720	133 484	

Mr MEIER: In the Program Estimates at page 76, under the heading '1985-86 specific targets/objectives (significant initiatives/improvements/results sought)' the following statement is made:

As part of the South Australian Government's initiatives concerning youth training and employment opportunities, the Department will significantly increase the training opportunities for apprentices and pre-vocational students.

A further objective given is:

To develop and implement new traineeship programs for 1 600 students in 1986.

The Minister replied to a question asked earlier by the member for Torrens about those 1 600 students. In his Financial Statement, presented to the House on 29 August, the Premier said:

The second key initiative involves direct action by the Government to establish a three-year program which will significantly increase employment and training opportunities for South Aus-

tralians. In this year the program will provide approximately 6 300 additional employment and training opportunities, of which approximately 70 per cent will be for young people.

The figure of 1 600 multiplied by three gives 4 800, so I can understand that TAFE hopes to cater for 4 800 students, if things continue along the same lines for three years. Is TAFE responsible for the total 6 300 people that the Premier referred to in his budget speech?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In a moment I shall ask Barry Grear to comment on this. He was a member of the employment and training task force which made to the Government recommendations which were actually picked up and formed the YES program. I mentioned before the increase of 610 apprenticeships, 182 pre-vocational, and 1 600 traineeships, 570 in the equity area of SYEP, and 50 in a NOW program relevant to TAFE. But there are other programs, specifically within the Department of Labour but within this arena. That is where extra positions are available. As

Minister of Employment I shall be addressing these questions this evening. I have responsibility for the oversight of programs relevant to the employment and training package in whichever portfolio or department they rest. I now ask Barry Grear to comment.

Mr Grear: In considering the long-term—the three-year—review, the apprenticeships are expected to increase with the encouragement that is being given in both 1986 and the carryover into 1987, but not with the same growth that we expect this year. Pre-vocational training will increase by approximately 300 places in each of the next two years. The traineeships are expected to increase from 1 600 places that will commence during 1986 to approximately 6 500 places by 1988, and that total is the area to which the Premier is referring, but as the Minister mentioned, not all those places are within TAFE: they are particular programs that the Department of Labour will be reporting on as well.

Mr MEIER: My next question basically relates to the following comment made under the heading, 'Corporate/management objectives':

To provide a wide range of TAFE programs, relevant curricula and learning strategies which offer individuals opportunities to pursue interests, develop talents, establish vocational competencies, advance careers and progress towards the achievement of their aspirations.

I wonder to what extent TAFE courses may be duplicated in other areas: I think particularly of the CYSS program which, I assume, receives basically Commonwealth funding for unemployed persons. I am aware that they are offering courses for unemployed people.

Some of the courses—and I cannot recall to mind this instant the names of them—seem very similar to the courses that the Department of TAFE was offering. If CYSS has to provide instructors and accommodation and has to set up a program, duplicates may be involved. For example, in the northern part of Yorke Peninsula the Yorke Peninsula Campus of the Pirie College of TAFE is offering certain courses, and yet within the same location there is the CYSS program offering courses. Have any discussions occurred or has any thought been given to perhaps rationalising what I see is a duplication of courses?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The honourable member may be able to identify a particular case where there has been some obvious duplication and overlap. From my personal experience, both as a local member where TAFE and CYSS operate together in the area and as Minister overseeing the Department of TAFE (although not the CYSS programs), I have not come across evidence of duplication or overlap. In fact, in my experience, they have worked together. Individual CYSS programs and TAFE colleges have coordinated what they are doing, and they provide different targeted areas or different offerings for similar target areas. It is not a case of overlap. They know what each other is doing and cooperate in the provision of those services.

In a number of cases, the CYSS program is operating either totally or partially from TAFE facilities, using TAFE equipment and TAFE buildings. The honourable member may be able to identify an area where there has been a duplication or overlap, and I will look into that. To my knowledge, I know of none, and I do not believe that my departmental officers can target any.

Mr MEIER: My third question concerns the new Pirie College of TAFE. Can the Minister or any of his officers indicate whether, after six months of operation, it has become evident that there are cost savings in amalgamating the three colleges into one?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There are occasions when it is quite appropriate for colleges to be amalgamated to provide a better education service with the resources available. I also acknowledge that it is not necessarily with total wisdom

of all possible eventualities that any decisions are made. We cannot know what may happen in certain circumstances. Therefore, I think there is some merit in the proposition to say, whenever an amalgamation has been made, that we take stock of it down the track, evaluate what has happened and determine whether or not we are happy with what is going on and whether there needs to be a change of direction.

I do not believe that you can think about disamalgamations at all, but it would be appropriate for every amalgamation to be analysed on its own merits to see whether or not the expectations have been fulfilled. That will happen in any case where there has been an amalgamation in recent times, such as the amalgamations leading to Light, Kingston or Pirie. There is certainly a *prima facie* case that in every instance there would be the liberation of administration resources to be targeted towards course provision. I will ask my officers in a minute to comment on that. The Pirie college is shortly to be opened, and I believe that, given the extra commissioning of facilities of resources to be put in there, that in itself will provide an increased effort from the Pirie college through its various campuses.

Mr Fricker: Just as a small example, by the process of amalgamating three separate colleges into one as we have, we have now dispensed with the salaries of two principals. One immediate result that the honourable member may be aware of is that we have been able to put that saving into an additional teaching staff member at Kadina, a lecturer in business studies. Although there may not have been a reduction in total costs, the savings that we have made in top level administration have been reinvested into actual teacher resources. This is actually the object of the exercise, to provide a better teaching service to those communities than we had with three separate colleges.

Mr Fleming: We have actually had a look at the costing and at this stage, taking an average cost per student hour when the three colleges were separate compared with the three colleges together, the indications are that the cost per student hour has come down. This time next year will be a better indication time to see whether that is sustained or improved. The indication is that it has certainly come down. The advantage of a stronger base will enable quite a substantial expansion in the on-farm program throughout the Mid-North, because the Pirie Campus has, and will have even more so, a very strong engineering base which will now be able to distribute more widely across the Mid-North, whereas those separate colleges would have had to go elsewhere to obtain some elements of the on-farm program. We will now staff Pirie with that program in mind and contain the costs a bit more.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The cost per student hour has declined, which indicates what has happened: in fact, there has been an increase in the number of student hours offered in the amalgamated college, and that could be said regarding the other amalgamated college at Kingston.

Mr MEIER: When Mr Fleming referred to the strong engineering base at the college, did he refer to welding, for instance?

Mr Fleming: Yorke Peninsula had no engineering course; it had no workshops or teaching staff. There was a small program at Peterborough (Northern College) that was based on a multi-purpose workshop where we had one lecturer. Traditionally, the establishment at Port Pirie has been associated with the town of Port Pirie. Therefore, the bias in the courses and in the workshop, in electrical and mechanical engineering and in apprentice and automotive types of program, was always evident there. On-farm rural programs do not deal with seeds, wheat and cattle: they are very much about farm machinery, motors, and the like: so the facilities at the Pirie TAFE campus are more widely distributed

across the Mid-North, and the strong engineering bias that exists at Pirie will be spread over the area.

Mr GROOM: I have written to the Minister several times concerning real estate courses. Some of my constituents have been waiting several years to get on to such a course. What is the extent of such courses in 1985, and has TAFE plans to extend their number to meet the heavy demand?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There has been a heavy demand for real estate courses over the years. In 1985, our enrolments in real estate courses are as follows: first year, 776; second year, 494; third year, 191; total, 1 461. That has not met all the demand, but we have to apportion the resources available to us between competing areas. Recently, short-term courses have been provided jointly by TAFE and private funding sources. In fact, I believe that the Real Estate Institute of Australia and L.J. Hooker have financed short-term courses and that two such courses started on Monday. That has been one way of trying to overcome part of the bottleneck in real estate courses.

We have to take account of other important areas in the department. I will provide for the *Hansard* supplement information as to the changes in courses offering in real estate in all our colleges, because it is important to consider that. Some people have asked why it seems that there is an increase in enrolments at one college but not at another. In fact, there has been some feeding in from the first year course to the second year course at Kensington: so there would appear to be an increase there relative to other colleges. That information will be provided as supplementary information.

Regarding planned expansion, it is estimated that there will be six additional classes in 1985-86 to cater for those students entering Law II after completing the salesperson course, which will require an extra staff commitment of about one-third salary. In addition, there are intensive courses to accelerate the qualification of salespersons being planned at Kensington Park College: two courses in 1985 and five in 1986, with 25 in each course. So, about 175 people will be involved in that program. Those intensive courses will involve TAFE in no extra cost: we provide the back-up support, but they are funded by the private sector.

Mr GUNN: Has TAFE considered providing courses to train more technical studies teachers? I understand that there is a chronic shortage in South Australia, and indeed throughout Australia, of suitably qualified technical studies teachers to go into the Education Department. At Milburra, the department has not been able to fill the vacancy. Only a few weeks ago such a position was filled at Leigh Creek. I understand that in South Australia we have TAFE courses in this area and that our graduates are highly regarded throughout Australia. However, when principals interview applicants for positions, they are competing with the education authorities in Queensland and other States who wish to attract the same people. This has led to a chronic shortage of qualified teachers in technical studies in this State. Will extra courses be provided so that more technical studies teachers will be available for country areas, where they play such an important role?

In my district, I have been most concerned, not only with the conditions at such places as Coober Pedy, but with the terrible frustration suffered by teachers and staff generally if technical studies teachers, including home economics teachers, are not available. Is TAFE considering special courses to reduce the backlog in this area? I do not know how such people are to be prevented from going interstate.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There is a shortage of technical studies teachers in our departmental schools. The Education Department is aware of the shortage and is trying to solve the problem. The department has advised the colleges of advanced education of the intense shortages in this area so

that more teachers may be trained. In the Education Department, this Government has provided for a significant increase in release time scholarships, and that should help provide teachers in the various areas where there is a shortage.

The honourable member's question concerns the capacity of TAFE to respond to that shortage. However, TAFE has not a formal capacity to respond to that, because Education Department teachers must be registered under the terms of the Education Act, which provides for the registration of teachers. This requires a diploma in teaching or an equivalent certificate which is available only from the South Australian College of Advanced Education or from a university.

No certification available from TAFE as such would enable a person to be registered as a teacher, so it is not within the province of TAFE to do that. Notwithstanding that, there have been good examples of cooperation between TAFE facilities and Education Department facilities over the years. In recent years, we have tried to formalise such cooperation by having some TAFE-Ed interface, and exciting things have been happening in that area. A major inter-departmental committee is considering an extension of that. For example, at Peterborough cooperation has existed for years between the department and TAFE. The same has also applied in the South-East and other places around the State. That is where there is a more useful capacity on the part of TAFE to support an area within the Education Department. However, with respect to teacher training it is not legally possible for that to happen.

Mr GUNN: Can the Minister say what plans TAFE has to upgrade the technical facilities at Coober Pedy? Some time ago I raised this matter with the Minister, as concern has been expressed to me about it. As I understand the position, some people from Port Augusta did voluntary work to put the Coober Pedy building in a reasonable condition, but much still remains to be done.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask the Director-General to give a brief answer to that question and he will provide any subsequent information that may be required by the honourable member.

Mr Fricker: As mentioned by the honourable member, quite a lot of work has been done at Coober Pedy. It essentially involved cosmetic work; painting, cleaning, some erection of partitions and so on. In the immediate future we will move on to installation of air-conditioning and some more substantial work in that direction. I am not quite sure what the honourable member has in mind, but if he is contemplating a new college or something like that, that would certainly be a long way down the track.

Mr GUNN: I was interested in air-conditioning, partitions and those sorts of things.

Mr Fricker: The quick answer is within the next few months.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am concerned, as no doubt the Minister and his officers are, about the reduction in the capital funds available to TAFE this year. Approximately \$9 million less will be spent in this coming year than was spent last year. Obviously, reasons are given for that in the fact that the Adelaide college is now almost complete, as is Port Pirie, but in my travels around the TAFE sector I have seen a number of colleges that are in urgent need of redevelopment. One that comes to mind is the Hills, and several country colleges that I have seen need redevelopment. Of course, the member for Todd has raised the question of Tea Tree Gully.

I am puzzled as to how there is a vastly reduced capital budget this year when in fact there is an obvious need for the things which I have mentioned to be done. I suppose one could say that it may be that we have received more

than our fair share of Commonwealth funds in the past year or two, but I would like the Minister to say exactly where we stand as far as the Commonwealth funds are concerned and was the reason for the large reduction that we received an unduly large share as a State in the past two or three years.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The matter of the Commonwealth cutbacks in capital funds certainly has been a matter of concern to us, because clearly there are things that we still want to do and do them more rapidly than would otherwise be the case. The cutback in Commonwealth funding means delays in timing of programs, but even so a delay in timing is significant in its own right.

With respect to the State effort, it is true that there are variations within a financial year compared to another financial year, although I believe that the record of this Government again has been very credible, that we have actually put real increases in State money into that arena. In relation to comparing 1985-86 with 1984-85, there has been a reduction in the State funds that have gone in there. That is not actually a reduction in State commitment: it is a case of cash flow requirements of the money that is actually required. Some of the money that was spent on Adelaide and Port Pirie was spent in 1984-85 in advance of 1985-86, so there has been that kind of bringing forward of expenditure. We actually spent the money more rapidly than we had planned to spend it over a longer period of time. I suppose that is the reverse situation to the Commonwealth funding where it is proposing to spend its money more slowly over a longer period of time.

Given the fact that TAFE projects, by their very nature, are larger lump items, there can be a much wider variation between one financial year and another than may be the case, say, with Education Department buildings or other systems with a large number of smaller projects that may be contained within them. I will ask the Director-General to make some further comments on this.

Mr Fricker: In relation to Port Pirie college, a point worth emphasising is that, by virtue of bringing forward expenditure which would have been incurred in 1985-86 enabling us to build the Port Pirie college when we did, we were able to take advantage of a very favourable tendering climate and that was done quite deliberately. Some of our own senior officers, who have their pulses pretty well on the building business, drew attention to the fact that, if we could go to tender at that time, get contracts signed and the college built, then we would probably save several hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars. That has in fact proved to be correct: the cost of the Port Pirie college that is being incurred by the State Government is far less than it would otherwise have been if we signed a contract in, say, 1985.

In relation to Commonwealth funding, the Commonwealth decided to reduce its capital expenditure nationally. Of course, the way in which it could reduce its cash expenditure was to simply not fund any new starts. Those projects that were already under construction had to be continued, because men were on site and there were purchases and so on. Because we had put the vast bulk of our funds of 1984-85 into the completion of the Adelaide college (and I do not think that anybody disagrees with that strategy) we had very few continuing projects in 1986 and, therefore, this State, to some extent, may have suffered disproportionately. We believe that we are getting special consideration from the Commonwealth for the second half of 1986: it has recognised the difficulty faced by South Australia as a result of this situation.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: When we refer to those training programs which are now much under discussion, the Kirby traineeships, the Government's program and

prevocational training and we receive comments from such reports as the QERC inquiry where it talks about relevance in education, it is obvious that TAFE has to play a very large role. I am obviously now talking about the 70 per cent of secondary school students who do not go into what we call higher education. This is the area where the question of relevance is quite often brought forward, especially by the general community.

As I say, TAFE must play a very strong role, because of the type of course that it provides, which is very much an applied-type course. However, it is quite obvious that TAFE of itself is unable to cope with a large percentage of all these students and, therefore, the secondary school system must be used to act in a supportive role in this area. This means that there must be a very strong cooperation between the TAFE sector and the secondary system. I believe that it is very necessary that secondary courses be evolved which will be accredited by TAFE, for instance, because I do not think that there is any other way that we can get the training for the vast number of students who will require it.

On previous occasions the Minister has said that he has had senior level committees set up between TAFE and the secondary education section to bring this sort of thing about. I believe that it is absolutely vital and pivotal to the success of any of these training schemes. I ask the Minister to report to the Committee on how negotiations are going between the two sectors and what are the likely results.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: As an initial answer, in relation to the statement that I made regarding the committee that was initially established, what was known colloquially as the 'GG' Committee, and the subsequent committee, did not in fact start the process of this happening. It has in fact been happening at the grassroots level, ED and TAFE for some time. What was essential was that the work being done in the field be added to and become part of the formal relationship of the two departments.

For that reason, I made a major statement in Mount Gambier on that matter back in 1983. That led to the Gear-Giles committee. As a result of their work, they recommended to me a significant upgrading of that interface between the two departments. Hence, there is a larger committee now about which I will ask the Director-General to comment. However, I can make a couple of comments: first, as a matter of correction, I understood the member to say that some 70 per cent of senior secondary age cohorts do not go on to secondary level.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: No, higher tertiary.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am sorry. The figure was not correct at senior secondary, but is correct for the other area. We believe that there is relevance to various forms of education that we offer. Unlike the other States, when we accepted in principle the Kirby traineeships we said it should be done not solely to target the year 12 or below level, in terms of that age cohort, but all young people including those who finish year 12. For many there is merit in completing year 12 in the secondary system before going into traineeship activities. That has not been the universal reaction right around Australia.

The other thing worth mentioning is that the Education Department is discussing with TAFE and the Ministry of Employment ways in which they can offer traineeships in particular areas where it is most appropriate for them to look into it. In some circumstances, particularly in more isolated country areas, they may be providers of such services. That is still being examined.

The member is correct: I believe that it is important for the TAFE-ED relationship to be a strong one and would like to see the community's resources made available to both these major departments in Government so that they are meeting all needs, rather than leaving gaps between the

two. There is a quite clear commitment on the part of all officers in both departments for that to happen. I ask the Director-General to comment on present developments.

Mr Fricker: First, I address the question to which the Minister referred in his opening sentences. Within the past few months there has been established a Director-General's liaison committee. Mr John Steinle and I, together with our deputies, representatives of high school principals, area school principals and principals from our own TAFE colleges, constitute this fairly new liaison committee which is getting down to the nuts and bolts of what are the problems at the interface between high schools and TAFE colleges and how we address them.

A number of things have already been done. To answer one of the questions raised earlier, some courses provided in high schools which are now accredited by SSABSA have been the subject of a formal statement that they will carry status towards TAFE awards. There is an experimental program running out at Elizabeth whereby students spend two or three days a week at high school and the other two or three days a week in a TAFE college. They work towards a statement of attainment or certification by TAFE, which covers their total program. Some of our other colleges are also working with our curriculum development people on a similar style of activity.

To come right up to date, just before coming to this Committee this afternoon we had a policy committee meeting at which we spent 75 per cent of our time looking at ways in which this department could cooperate more closely with schools. We ran through a whole series of options which might be called joint programs on the one hand, or joint provision of programs. However, the thrust of that whole discussion was to try to pick up the young person who might simply disappear down the crack between high school and TAFE colleges. We intend to produce a fairly detailed policy statement, together with the appropriate administrative backup.

Once we have our act together in that regard we will refer it across to the liaison committee with the Education Department in the hope that that department will be able to make a corresponding administrative adjustment so that our two programs come together. It is certainly our firm intention to make sure that young people who wish to take advantage of the type of education that we offer in TAFE are able to do so without necessarily having to let go of the high school system, which is offering an educational provision for them at present.

Mr KLUNDER: I draw the Minister's attention to page 77 of the yellow book and in the second to last line under

'Resource Allocation, Music', appears a figure of \$687 000 proposed for current expenditure for 1984-85 and an average employment level of 19. Both those items are marked as being a statistical error. I note that the same has happened on the following page under the subprogram, 'Rural and Horticultural'. Since I have never met someone who is a statistical error—certainly not in the sense that I suspect the Minister means—can he explain what those figures mean and why there is such a large divergence between proposed expenditure and outcome?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will call on Mr Carter to explain this, shortly. I believe that the actual figure should have been closer to the 1984-85 outcome and that the 1984-85 outcome compared with the 1985-86 proposed in terms of employment equivalents in music; there is no difference proposed. However, there is an improvement proposed for horticultural. In fact, there has been some industry expectation of improvements in that area. I believe it probably is as a result of increased demand that has taken place, perhaps particularly at Lochiel Park.

Mr Carter: A statistical error was identified, because we did pick it up. It is a clear error, as the result of the report that came out of the computer system the previous year, which was then reflected in the proposed figure. The Minister was correct—the 1984-85 outcome was almost the same as what should have been in the 1984-85 proposed. There was very little change over the years. I apologise for blaming the computer, but it is probably something to do with the people who put in the information, rather than the computer itself.

Mr MEIER: As TAFE numbers have been decreasing and, at the same time, the secondary schools program has been diversified, do you think that we are heading towards a situation where, hopefully, secondary schools are catering more and more for the needs of young people so that they will not seek TAFE courses quite as much as they have in the past, or do you think that things will continue very much as they are and that perhaps TAFE will continue to grow?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I cannot agree that TAFE numbers are decreasing; they are not.

Mr MEIER: I am sorry, I thought the Minister announced that earlier.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: No, this relates to stream 6, which is one of the six streams of TAFE activity, particularly the enrichment area. I have a statistical table for insertion in *Hansard*. I will also circulate copies to members.

STUDENT HOURS
INDIVIDUALS, NOMINAL AND ACTUAL STUDENT HOURS BY STREAM FOR 1982-84

INDIVIDUALS

Stream	1982	1983	1984
1	232	229	35
2	31 659	23 506	26 416
3	9 555	10 297	9 318
4	24 972	40 983	30 547
5	38 033	39 098	40 428
6	39 676	39 056	37 251
1-6	144 127	153 059	143 995

NOMINAL STUDENT HOURS

Stream	1982	1983	1984
1	16 829	1 297	495
2	3 953 548	2 556 695	3 059 384
3	2 507 455	2 354 663	2 305 043
4	1 754 454	3 119 762	3 082 898
5	3 068 452	3 498 099	3 718 466
6	1 356 656	1 164 523	1 086 786
1-6	12 657 395	12 695 042	13 253 072

STUDENT HOURS
INDIVIDUALS, NOMINAL AND ACTUAL STUDENT HOURS BY STREAM FOR 1982-84
ACTUAL STUDENT HOURS

Stream	1982	1983	1984			
1	15 385	1 201	488			
2	3 441 845	2 229 815	2 623 335			
3	2 426 245	2 221 170	2 237 008			
4	1 479 736	2 663 233	2 621 753	7 115 409	7 482 584	+5.2%
5	2 937 612	2 826 742	2 872 745			+1.6%
6	1 049 466	963 756	899 468			
1-6	10 810 292	10 905 919	11 254 797			

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This table shows that the opposite is happening. In a number of significant areas there have been increases, particularly in respect to student hours, both nominal and actual, as opposed to individual student enrolments. What do I prefer to see? I believe that we have in South Australia two very competent departments providing for needs of people within the 15-18 age range: TAFE provides for older people and ED for younger people.

I will be very sad if either one or the other was seen as being a third provider because it is quite essential that the two of them have particular educational offerings to give and those offerings will be drawn upon by individual students as best suits their needs. It is not necessarily the case that you either totally accept one or totally accept the other, but we are looking at experimentation as to where we can have a bit of both. We will see more of that in years to come. I would actively support that happening. As a result, I would estimate that we would have increasing participation in education and training by young people in that age cohort and it will result in increases in student hours in both TAFE and ED.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed.

Works and Services—Department of Technical and Further Education, \$1 629 000—Examination declared completed.

Works and Services—South Australian Teacher Housing Authority, \$2 000 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
Mr E.S. Ashenden
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr E.J. Meier
The Hon. Michael Wilson

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Children's Services, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr K. Gilding, Chairman, Tertiary Education Authority.
Mr K.N. Burrowes, General Manager, South Australian Teacher Housing Authority.
Mr L.R. Drew, Accountant, South Australian Teacher Housing Authority.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Rentals for teacher housing are set at some 20 per cent of Housing Trust rentals which, I understand, are set at about 20 per cent less than commercial rentals. That means that teachers receive a fairly large rent subsidy compared with what applies in the marketplace. I make plain that I believe teachers need this incentive for country service. I am a great believer in getting our very good teachers out into the country, as country areas in education have enough problems without difficulty in getting quality and quantity of teachers.

However, with the Federal Government's tax package we are now going to find that taxation on fringe benefits will be in the hands of the employer, in this case the Teacher Housing Authority. I imagine that the Minister would have asked the General Manager to do an exercise on how much it will cost the Teacher Housing Authority to pay the Federal Government's fringe benefits tax on behalf of teachers who are receiving these subsidies, and it is vitally important that the Committee be aware of the additional cost to the authority that will accrue because of the Federal Government's tax package. I know that the Premier has announced that he will fight the Federal Government on this issue: I commend him for that and will be one of the first to get behind him to support him in that fight. Nevertheless, the chances of the Premier's being successful are fairly doubtful, and it is necessary that we know what the additional cost will be to the authority for paying taxation on behalf of teachers for rent subsidies.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The short answer is that there is no cost to the authority, because the authority is not the employer. The arrangements as announced by the Federal Government are that the employer shall pay tax on it which, in the case of THA tenants, will be an impost on the Education Department, TAFE and the Children's Services Office. That is something on which we must obtain detailed financial analysis and I will be instructing those departments to do that work, but not the THA. I certainly agree that this is something about which we should be concerned and we must argue strongly against it, as the Premier has indicated he will do.

The honourable member used the term 'incentive'. He would acknowledge that the THA is often compensating for a disincentive: there is an important difference. People are not attracted by the financial profit they would make in having a cheaper house through the THA compared with what the market rental would suggest, but rather it is making up for the financial dislocation they undergo when they move to a country area. They may have left in either the metropolitan or another country area a home which they are renting out and which may be returning less in rent than they are paying out in mortgage payments on the house. There are a number of aspects like that. The term 'fringe benefit' is a dubious one when applied to teacher housing. It is, in fact, helping to make up for the inconvenience of their fulfilling obligations of their employment to serve anywhere in the State, so that we can give what is a

legitimate obligation upon us, namely a reasonable spread of teacher quality for students in all parts of the State.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I hope that when the Minister obtains that costing he will make it available to the Parliament, as it is vitally important in budgetary terms. I accept the Minister's description of the difference between incentive and disincentive, but suggest to him that the Commonwealth Government may not be all that willing to accept his definition for taxation purposes.

Is it the intention of the Government to go ahead with the Government Housing Corporation? The question was asked in the Estimates Committee last year and the Minister spoke about a working party set up on the amalgamation of various Government housing authorities. It is important as far as the future of the THA is concerned. What is the present situation?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have just been consulting with Mr Burrowes, who is a member of the working party examining this area. It is a complex area and it has taken a long time to do, as indeed the original Government Employee Housing Authority report took a long time, both in gestation and consideration. I understand that the financial implications have been examined and the report is shortly to be made available to the Government on that matter, presumably in a couple of months or so.

My guess would be that since this matter has been handled within the Economic and Expenditure Committee of Cabinet it will report to that committee. So, the matter will go there first and then other issues of process will have to be addressed by this implementation committee. I have indicated previously that policy decisions will be dealt with by Cabinet and not by the working party. In other words, the essential points of policy to do with the access to housing, rent setting, and other issues will be dealt with by Cabinet.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I understood the Minister to say that a policy decision to form a Government Housing Authority had in fact been taken by Cabinet, subject to the working party's report.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The former Government commissioned a report into the Government employees housing authority. That body then reported to the former Government. The report was still under consideration when the change of government occurred. I resurrected that matter because it seemed to have been sidetracked somewhat. I asked for the matter to be reconsidered as I felt it was important to have it re-examined. Subsequently the matter was examined by various officers who reported to a sub-committee of Cabinet. They recommended that there was something there that we should proceed with. Clearly, there are many basic questions that need to be answered before one can absolutely determine the structure of a Government employee housing authority. The present working party is looking at those questions. While we have indicated quite clearly that that is the street that we are going down, we are unable to say what the structure of such a body would be until that working party has reported.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I understand that the cost of maintaining a Teacher Housing Authority house is some \$9 000 a year. I understand that it is a considerable sum—perhaps the Minister can give the correct figure when he answers. Next, it is with some reluctance that I bring up the question of privatisation, because the Minister may get me wrong on this. However, it has been put to me that it would be quite possible to offer for sale Teacher Housing Authority houses to teachers, with a considerable subsidy from the Government, bearing in mind the cost of maintaining each Teacher Housing Authority house per year. Has that type of initiative been considered by the Government?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, I have some difficulty in knowing where the honourable member has got that figure in relation to a cost of \$9 000 per house. The amount we spend on maintenance is about \$1 400 per house.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am referring to the all up cost, including interest payments—all costs in relation to the actual asset.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I see. Those figures could be looked at, but at this stage I will not refer to a specific figure, although it would be sizable. As to the matter of the sale of houses, the Teacher Housing Authority does sell houses and it has had a program of doing so. In 1983, 32 houses were sold; in 1984, 40; and in 1985, 49 houses were sold—so the program has been increasing. Over the past three years 121 houses have been sold for a total value of \$3.271 million. Indeed, since the whole program of initiating the selling of surplus assets was initiated, funds of the order of \$5.5 million have been obtained up to 30 June 1985. So, at current interest rates that represents an annual saving of about \$700 000, which is a significant sum of money.

The difficulty with opening up a general program for the sale of THA houses that are surplus to requirements is that those houses may be needed in the future. A house presently occupied by a teacher may be sold to that teacher but for entirely valid personal reasons that person may leave the teaching force. In those circumstances another teacher must be appointed to the area, and if there is no surplus accommodation available the Government would then have to build a house at today's prices, when previously we may have sold a house that was relatively much cheaper because of its having been purchased some years ago. So that is the difficulty involved there. However, we have a program of selling these houses where they are genuinely surplus, and we will maintain that program. We can prove by the figures that it has expanded over recent years.

We are also presently examining whether or not other alternatives are available for the provision of accommodation or support in the cost of accommodation. Members may know that Cabinet approved, as a result of the reorganisation, a package being available to assist in the relocation of public servants to the Whyalla area office, whereby certain financial arrangements are entered into, where there is a buy-back arrangement for any houses that are purchased. The net cost of that is less to the Government than would have been the case in providing housing under the auspices of the THA. We are presently examining whether that kind of package can be expanded to the cost benefit of the authority—and consequently the Government and the community—as well as the individual teachers concerned. At this stage we cannot report any further on that, but the matter is under active consideration.

Mr GUNN: I want to raise with the Minister the difficulties that the Teacher Housing Authority has had at Woomera. It would be fair to say that this matter is a hardy annual and that it has caused considerable concern to the teachers at Woomera. The matter has taken up a lot of the time of the Teacher Housing Authority as well as a lot of my time. It appears to me that in the long term there is only one way to overcome the problem, and that is for the department, through the Teacher Housing Authority (or the Government housing authority, which may be set up) to actually purchase some blocks of land and build some permanent residences which can be made available to teachers.

Of course we will need teachers at Woomera for a long time, so this would be feasible. We are talking about a lot of money, but perhaps there might be an opportunity to purchase from the Commonwealth some of the flats that are there, converting two into one and upgrading them. I am aware that a mobile home has been put there recently.

Have the Teacher Housing Authority and the Minister addressed this problem? As Woomera becomes a more open town, and in the long term most of the facilities there are put on a completely different basis, which I understand is the aim of the Commonwealth, to me it appears that there is a long-term need for some permanent houses. Can the Minister address this matter? I would like to see the matter resolved once and for all, as I think would all people who have been associated with this problem.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I understand the honourable member's concern, and I know that he has been concerned about this matter for a long time. I have visited Woomera and I am aware of the ramifications of this issue, which is indeed very complex. I can advise that the General Manager of the Teacher Housing Authority, Kevin Burrowes, will be travelling to Woomera with a member of the executive of SAIT next Monday to look at the present situation and to determine the best course of action. My personal view is that the best course of action would be to commence discussions with the Commonwealth with a view to having the housing facilities transferred from the Commonwealth to the State, for which we could pick up the responsibility, and have full control of those assets.

Part of the problem in relation to accommodation facilities at Woomera is that we do not have full governance of them, and neither does the authority. Some of the problems have occurred because there are two sets of rules that seem to apply. The rules applied by the local Commonwealth authorities are different from the standard policy of THA and what the State Government is attempting to provide. My opening bid in discussions with the Commonwealth would simply be that, since those assets are already there, it would make sense to have them transferred to us at no cost. That is the line on which we would open discussions with the Commonwealth, indicating that we will be happy to see our tenants in those houses. But I shall await a report that should come to me after next Monday from the Teacher Housing Authority, and at the earliest possible opportunity I will seek to institute the necessary discussions with the Commonwealth.

Mr GUNN: When might the Minister be in a position to advise the House, and particularly the local member concerned, of the broad outlines of what is taking place?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I cannot guarantee that it will be done in time for the *Hansard* supplement to the Estimates Committee. However, we will incorporate it in a later *Hansard* volume or, if necessary, I will provide a written copy of the appropriate report for the honourable member.

Mr MEIER: The current issue of the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal (dated 18 September) contains an article headed 'SAIT opposes displacement'. Although it is perhaps out of order for the Minister to comment on the Government's view on displacement, I believe that, with respect to THA houses and the fact that so many have been sold, displacement will have to occur if numbers decrease significantly in some schools. Therefore, the department should be responsible for at least seeing that teachers are given every incentive to go to another school, maybe in a country area.

I have seen the case of a teacher who came to a country town where there were no THA houses available and the teacher changed houses three times during the year, from private accommodation to other premises and then finally to a farm house. The net result was that the teacher was so disillusioned that he managed to seek special permission to leave that area at the end of the year rather than complete his three-year contract. As THA houses are rather deficient in country areas, perhaps too many having been sold off, has any thought been given to providing appropriate incentives for teachers who may be displaced?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: If the honourable member would supply details of the case that he referred to, I would appreciate it so that we can follow up what happened in that case. It is exceedingly rare for such a situation to occur. The authority is quite assiduous in trying to follow through any request by the relevant department for housing for staff. I think that this is evidenced by the regard that teachers in the field have for the officers of the authority. I acknowledge that from time to time they may have views about other people in the whole teacher housing process, but they appreciate the way in which a lot of effort is put into meeting the housing needs. So, there may be some special circumstances preventing any reasonable solution in the example that the member cited. However, I would like to know the details. I can cite a lot of cases where considerable effort has been gone into making arrangements.

Mr Burrowes: Any proceeds that the authority gains from the sale of assets are used to provide housing where it is needed. We direct those proceeds back into capital programs to upgrade existing housing stock or to provide additional assets that are required. If the authority was not able to use the \$5 500 000 that it has been able to gain through the sale of assets, we would have \$5 500 000 of capital works and housing less than the facilities we have at present. Because the authority is a statutory authority and is responsible for its own operations, any proceeds from the sale of assets held in the authority do not go into Treasury funds, unlike the case with a normal Government department. If we sell a house for \$30 000, we retain that money and can use it elsewhere in programs, whereas in a normal Government department the money goes to the Treasury.

Mr MEIER: I know of a school in a country town where the principal bought the principal's residence six or seven years ago intending to stay until retirement, but unfortunately something has occurred now where it seems the principal will have to move on. I take it, therefore, that those circumstances probably would be accommodated and, if it appeared that none of the existing houses were suitable as a principal's residence, THA would be able to go in and buy a new residence or build one for a principal?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Every house that we sell to a tenant has an encumbrance registered on the title giving the authority first option to purchase that house back or lease it back if the purchasing tenant vacates. It is an option only; we do not have to take it up. When a situation arises such as the one the honourable member has mentioned, we would examine other houses and their availability, and if it was necessary we would enter into negotiations with the principal to buy the residence back from him.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Has the Minister given any consideration to tying teacher housing rents to teacher salaries rather than the CPI? On figures that have been given to me, from 1976 to September 1984 the CPI increased by some 90 per cent. Teacher Housing Authority rentals have gone up 120 per cent, whereas teachers' salaries have gone up just over 70 per cent. Has the Minister considered that matter?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Certainly it is a matter that needs to be considered in any change to rent setting policies. That would have to be considered by the Government either when a Government employee housing authority was established or prior to that if it was to make changes. It would require a policy change. As Minister, I have the capacity to determine rents for the Teacher Housing Authority, and that is different from other Government employee housing, where it is determined by Cabinet. The tradition has been that we try to relate rent charges to those applying elsewhere, even though they have not exactly followed suit over the last three years. They have been marginally less than would apply to other Government employee housing. It would be

a major Government policy change to do that, and the Government at large would have to consider it.

The 4.9 per cent rent increase we recently announced, to take effect I think as from 1 October, compares with the CPI increase from the March 1984 quarter to the March 1985 quarter of 4.9 per cent; but, when one considers the housing component of the CPI, the increase for the same period was 9.7 per cent. So, it is nowhere near the cost increase in housing for the same period. The other matter that needs to be taken into account is the rent increases that we have had in the first two years to bring THA rents up to policy rent: in other words, up to the accepted position of what THA rents should be, namely 80 per cent of Housing Trust rents, which as mentioned should be 80 per cent of market rents. It is in fact reducing the size of the subsidy paid in terms of bringing rents back up to that benchmark figure.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Works and Services—South Australian College of
Advanced Education, \$600 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr E.S. Ashenden
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenchan
Mr E.J. Meier
The Hon. Michael Wilson

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Children's Services, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development.

Departmental Adviser:

Mr L.P. Fricker, Director-General, Department of Technical and Further Education.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: This relates to the provision of funds for nurse education. Can the Minister lay down what the actual Commonwealth subsidy is *vis-a-vis* the State contribution per student? I understand that it is somewhere about a third. What are the proposals for bringing about college based nurse training in specific areas? For instance, I understand that the first additional intake is to take place in Salisbury. There are then plans for others. It has been whispered to me that there will probably be one at the South Australian Institute of Technology, close to the Adelaide Hospital, and maybe one at Underdale, close to QEH. What are the college's plans for college based nurse training over the next two or three years, bearing in mind the shortage of nurses and the winding down of the hospital training system? Are the additional funds required coming from the Health Commission allocation, or do they have to come out of State education funds?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The broader question about the shortage of nurses must be addressed to the Minister of Health, who has other programs, but certain programs are trying to pick that up, for example, the retraining program for 90 migrant nurses, which is being handled through

TAFE, and the like, and the immigration program of bringing in nurses on short-term hours of duty. Regarding the cost, the Commonwealth Government is paying \$1 500, we estimate the overall annual cost at \$6 000; and the difference of \$4 500 is being provided from State funds by an addition of funds to the miscellaneous lines in my recurrent budget, not by redirection from other areas of the miscellaneous lines.

Next year, 110 places will come on stream at the South Australian college: namely, at the Salisbury campus of the college. Mention was made of the Institute of Technology, but at this stage the Government has not firmly decided what will happen at the institute, because significant discussions must take place between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government regarding the Committee funding available for this. We are really awaiting those discussions before making a definite statement about State Government funding for a course at the institute.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development, Miscellaneous, \$43 118 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr E.S. Ashenden
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenchan
Mr E.J. Meier
The Hon. Michael Wilson

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr K. Gilding, Chairman, Tertiary Education Authority.
Mr T.M. Barr, Director, Office of the Minister.
Ms S. Chee, Senior Administrative Officer, Office of the Minister of Education.
Mr B.R. March, Acting Executive Officer, Advisory Committee on Non-Government Schools.
Dr V.G. Evers, Director, Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Regarding *per capita* grants for non-government schools, the Minister has instituted (quite correctly, I believe) a cushioning arrangement for categories C, D, and E schools, which were to receive no less than 90 per cent of their total 1984 grant. Does the Minister intend to extend this cushioning grant to 1986? I understand that some non-government schools have been fairly hard hit by the change in the formula.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I do not intend to extend the cushioning grant. We have made a policy modification to the funding arrangement which in itself has a modification element built into it. Initially, funding of non-government schools was on the basis of effective *per capita* grants plus a needs based component. The needs based component,

which was a small element and which was based entirely on the needs of the school, was determined by the Potts formula. How much a school got depended where it was on the continuum.

We extended the proportion of the money paid according to needs as one issue but, as a separate issue, the advisory committee examined the figures and made recommendations to me, which I accepted, that we should change the basis for deciding need away from the needs of the school towards the extent to which individual schools were catering to individual students with needs. As a result, last November's announcement changed the needs based formula entirely to that extent, so that at that stage the needs based component measured the number of Government-assisted students for whom the schools was providing education, the number of Aboriginal students, the number of ethnic students within the definition of 'ethnic', the number of itinerant students, and the number of students for whom board was provided (that was the first time that that had ever happened). The one aspect that was built in to meet the needs of schools was the interest bill of schools. That was then modified to the extent that a cushioning effect was established for C, D, and E category schools in 1985.

Subsequently, the South Australian Catholic Schools Commission made reports to me that there should still be some element built into the needs formula accounting for the relevant needs of schools. I put that to the advisory committee, and I received its advice on that matter. Cabinet considered the matter and, as a result, we have determined that as part of the needs based component there will be some element dedicated to the needs of schools. In 1986, 93 per cent of the needs based component will be on the needs of schools and 67 per cent on the needs of students as determined by the set of student needs that I have listed.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Is the interest factor part of the student needs rather than the school needs?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes, part of the student needs. So, we argue that that will provide extra cushioning for some schools in the years to come. In fact, it will provide a permanent cushioning, because there is a change in the needs based factor of the formula, and we believe that this is a final factor that polishes up what we regard as the best policy in Australia.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: As, because of his Party's policy, the Minister has maintained *per capita* grants at 1985 dollar values, will he say what is the percentage of the total allocation in 1986 for the *per capita* section? Do we just deduct the CPI factor?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It will be roughly the CPI factor. We cannot give definite figures on this matter at this stage, because final figures will not be known until August next year, depending on total enrolments. I am informed that it involves average enrolment at 1 July multiplied by the *per capita* grant that is fixed now: \$227 for primary and \$339.50 for secondary. So that remains the *per capita* figure for the triennium. I cannot say at this stage what percentage that forms of the total sum paid. Discounting the former 90 per cent by the CPI will give a rough idea.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Regarding the Senior Secondary Assessment Board, a discussion paper released by the board on in-school assessments as opposed to the public examination system canvassed the idea that there would be a move to 50 per cent in school assessment with a 50 per cent public examination component. Has this now been determined by the board as the actual figure to apply? If it has, from what year will it apply? Did the Education Department make a submission asking for a higher in-school assessment component?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will ask Mr Eyers to comment on this matter, and I will comment subsequently.

Dr Eyers: The first part of the question concerns the increase in the school assessment weighing from 25 per cent to 50 per cent. We are awaiting replies in respect of subjects called public examination subjects in the board's terminology. The board determined earlier this year that an increase would occur to 50 per cent as from next year, so the 1986 assessment will be on that basis.

The second part of the question refers to a broad overview of the board's assessment policies for both publicly examined subjects and so-called school assessed subjects. All year 12 subjects credited by the board contain a substantial proportion of school assessment: in the case of the publicly examined ones, the 50 per cent for next year to which I referred; in the case of school assessed subjects, a 100 per cent school assessment. However, in all cases the board has no control of the State wide moderation process which is applied through examination or through an extensive series of visitation moderation activities which we have inherited from the Education Department and substantially developed.

In the Education Department's response to the curriculum and assessment policy, it urged that the proportion of all subjects which are assessed by the board be increased towards the direction of school assessments. The board is still debating the outcome from that. In fact, at a meeting at 6 p.m. tonight it will consider its actions in relation to that matter.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I was particularly impressed as to the number of submissions that were presented as a result of the board's discussion paper, which was very interesting and which generated a level of interest that I think it deserves to generate. There were important issues. It was not only the department, but also a large number of other people who made submissions in relation to this matter.

Mr GROOM: Under 'Miscellaneous', dealing with multicultural education, which is of considerable concern to me because of the nature of my electorate, I notice that there is a significant increase in that line relating to multicultural education. Can the Minister detail and explain the increases and, in his answer, could he also touch on the programs for employing language teachers for the implementation of the second language program?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Certainly. A number of aspects of multiculturalism are being advanced quite significantly in 1985-86. They are the outcome of the Smolicz report that was released last year. I think it is a benchmark report. Under the miscellaneous lines the Institute of Languages in 1985-86 will have a cost of \$36 000. That cost will increase in subsequent years. The Cabinet has committed funds in subsequent years to the institute. We have the multicultural grants that will be organised through MEC, the multicultural coordinating committee. That is listed in the miscellaneous line as \$20 000.

I can also advise the Committee that I have transferred (and it was not done in time to be printed in the budget papers) a further \$20 000 from the Education Department, so that in fact means there will be \$40 000 of State money in the grants area for MEC. Whilst that does not meet the full expectations of the Smolicz report, we will look to expand that in subsequent budgets, but we must start at some point. Next is the overseas scholarship program for community language teachers of \$18 000. The Smolicz report made recommendations in this area. This is to provide for up to nine scholarships of \$2 000 each to enable people, in addition to the pay they receive when they are away over holiday periods, for example, to get some further experience in languages and language teaching.

There are then the tertiary multicultural education grants of \$20 000 that will be available to TMEC. The actual recurrent cost of TMEC will be met from within TEASA's budget allocation. That does not appear as a separate line

here. There is then the ongoing commitment to index grants to ethnic schools, which is costing an extra \$31 000 this year. We have done that in every budget since we have been in Government. There is the establishment of the Ethnic Schools Advisory Committee, which was addressed in the Smolicz report and which was also the subject of a separate report. I suppose the final model upon which we decided is not necessarily what was recommended in the Smolicz report, but it is closer to what was recommended in the Ethnic Schools Advisory Committee Report. That has a cost this year of \$27 000.

In addition to that, there is the LOTE program, or the Languages other than English program, in the primary area, where we have committed ourselves to the provision of a language other than English to all primary students for 1995. In the 1985-86 year it requires the commitment of resources of \$500 000 for teacher salaries in a full year equivalent, because 20 salaries are being added to that program and that is nearly a 50 per cent increase in the number of primary language teachers in our schools. It is constrained only by the fact of the availability of people to add into that program.

There is the addition of two advisory positions in language teaching. That is a full year equivalent cost of in excess of \$50 000. There are establishment grants to each of the primary schools coming on stream in the language program and that is at the rate of \$1 000 per school, so that is another sum of money that has to be added there. In total, the 1985-86 commitment for multicultural education is very significant indeed. We appreciate that there are other further cost implications in subsequent budgets.

Mr ASHENDEN: In relation to concessional transport passes for scholars, can the Minister take the following matter up with his interstate counterparts? One of my constituents has a son who is undertaking a tertiary level of education in Victoria, because the course that he wishes to undertake is not available in South Australia: it relates to dancing. When that student has returned to South Australia during the vacation breaks in the year, he has boarded STA buses, but the student pass that he has for the college that he attends in Victoria is not recognised, so he has therefore been asked to pay full fare. I have taken this matter up with the Minister of Transport, who has acknowledged that there is a problem, but has also indicated that the STA will not reimburse my constituent's son for the additional fares that he has been required to pay. I realise that the Education Department pays the STA an amount of money to cover the costs that the STA would otherwise have to bear, but can an arrangement be entered into between States so that, when a student has a concessional pass that is obviously his own and is current, it can be recognised in each other State as well as the State in which it is issued?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I think that there is something in that question that we could investigate. It raises an interesting point. I suppose that it must all come out in the wash, because there must be other students who come to study in South Australia because we have courses here that are not available elsewhere. The best way of bringing that to ministerial attention is at a Ministerial Council. It is too late for it to be placed on the agenda of the next Ministerial Council, which is imminent, but it is perhaps something that we could look at further down the track. We could otherwise examine what alternatives may be available in the intervening period in terms of discussion with other Ministers, the next Ministerial Council not being until June next year and the agenda already having closed for the imminent council meeting. We will look into that matter.

Mr ASHENDEN: In relation to one of the lines in the budget relating to the Ministerial Consultative Committee, I notice that the actual payments in the year concluded were

a little under \$28 000, but there is an estimate this year of \$49 000 for that same line. Can the Minister explain to the Committee why that rather large increase is anticipated?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The increase is predominantly because of an increase in the time of the executive officer supporting that committee. The committee had a 0.5 executive officer appointment, but it will now have a full-time officer. The reason for that is that the committee is generating significant community interest in that it is receiving community approaches in its own right because people wish to express their views to that committee knowing that that information also very often comes to me. There has been an increase in the workload of that committee. I refer a lot of matters to it for advice. It was quite clear that a half-time appointment was not able to deal with the workload.

I think that there are also some minor cost increases to deal with sitting fees and the increased number of meetings that it has had, because very often I require advice earlier than its next scheduled meeting. This year it has also had a country meeting which I believe was very successful and I have encouraged the committee to continue with that program of meeting in country areas in order to give people in the country access to a very wide range of people as are contained on that committee so that they can put their views to it, knowing that the people on the committee will give consideration to those issues and present them to myself as Minister.

Mr ASHENDEN: My third question is about the line relating to the Come Out Festival, where there is a reduction. Actual payments for the year 1984-85 were \$50 000, yet only \$35 000 is proposed for the coming year. I point out that many schools in my electorate make very great use of the Come Out Festival. I certainly hope that that reduction does not in any way indicate a reduction in availability of programs at that festival for children attending our schools. I look forward to the Minister's answer, because the Come Out Festival has been utilised by virtually all schools in my electorate and is one of the real pluses as far as education is concerned.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I can certainly give an undertaking that there is no cutback in effort on the Come Out program, because it is a very exciting program in which schools get very involved. It offers great opportunities. It is a biennial program, so this financial year is an off year for it. If one goes through previous budget papers one finds that in the off years the figure has been less than for the following year.

Mr ASHENDEN: I have the figures for previous years. Perhaps I could come back to them, because I understand that that is not necessarily the case.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: If I recall rightly, in the first budget after I became Minister there was a reduced allocation because of the off-year principle. Indeed, on that one occasion it was not appropriate for there to be a reduced allocation because there was a significant amount of ongoing work that needed to be done in preparation for the subsequent year. A supplementary allocation was made by means of reallocation of resources from the Education Department, but in most cases I am advised—and I believe this to be correct—that the off years are less than the on years.

Mr MEIER: My first two questions relate to two lines of the miscellaneous columns: first, the South Australian Aboriginal Education Consultative Committee has received a reasonable increase from a vote of \$65 000, which finished up as \$95 000 for last year, through to \$134 000 for this coming year. Can the Minister explain those increases?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The provision for that committee in last year's budget papers was discovered to be inadequate. It was increased, with my approval, during the financial year because the proposed figures should have been higher.

It was not increased by an extra draw on Treasury, but by reallocation of resources within the Minister Miscellaneous line. It did not add to the expenses of the Government overall. There were savings available elsewhere that helped fund that increase and there was one other area involved in an increase which was not reflected accurately in the budget papers last year. The other point about that is that there are some Commonwealth funds available which have been given to the consultative committee and which appear in that figure, because they are for Commonwealth funded positions. There is a concomitant entry on the revenue side in the revenue papers for that area.

Mr MEIER: Is most of the increased expenditure for salaries, or is it for some special project?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Commonwealth funding is almost totally for salaries. The State funding would be a proportional increase on all areas, which includes the salary of the full-time chairperson and clerical support, plus sitting fees and incidental costs.

Mr MEIER: My second question relates to the next line, the amount for the South Australian College of Advanced Education, which has risen from \$54 000 to \$747 000—a slight increase!

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Basically, that relates to the nurse training agreement, which I mentioned in an answer to the member for Torrens and which is to fund an increased intake of 50 students for 1985 and a further 110 students in 1986. In addition, that sum also includes the ongoing funding for the Institute of Learning Difficulties, which was a policy commitment of this Government. The figure this year is \$58 000 for that very exciting institute. I also indicate that I have circulated a list of minor grants under the miscellaneous lines. Members may want to ask questions about that.

Mr MEIER: My third question relates to the last line, 'Workers Educational Association'. First, why has there been a \$5 000 decrease for the coming year? Secondly, I assume that the Workers Educational Association is the WEA, which offers various courses. I should perhaps have mentioned it when I dealt with TAFE this afternoon. The WEA also offers courses, and I am interested to hear from the Minister what the money is used for.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is a Government grant to help the WEA to provide its activities. The member is precisely right: it is actively involved in enrichment education. Much of the cost would go towards that. On occasions, there have been some one-off payments to support special programs run in country areas. I recall that the WEA ran a program in the South-East for which special funds were allocated. Last year's figure was somewhat higher than the norm.

This year's figure brings it back into line with normal increases for the year. It was higher than normal because there was a special long service leave payment incorporated in it that was not a commonly recurring amount. I believe that that figure was \$12 000. I also recall, and will have this checked, that another amount was incorporated in last year's figure to do with commissioning of the new building: so, that appears in the Premier's line. I am almost certain that that does not reappear because it was a one-off cost. That \$145 000 is consistent in terms of maintaining real growth over previous years. The figure is effectively a 5 per cent real increase on the comparable figure for last year.

Ms LENEHAN: My first question relates to allocation for Downs Children Incorporated, a line about three from the bottom. I note that there has been a budgetary allocation of about \$3 000 more for the coming year over actual payments for 1984-5. I am also very aware of the excellent work which Downs Children Incorporated fulfils in the community. Can the Minister say on what it is proposed to spend the \$32 000?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This figure is a grant made to Downs Children Incorporated which was used for various purposes that I will describe. As to the increase in funding, one notices that last year the vote was \$23 000. There is a reason for that. There was an arrangement whereby the Commonwealth Government picked up significant funding for that body. There appeared to be a major problem earlier this year when it was not prepared to pick up that funding any more. The Commonwealth required the State Government to enter into a three to one relationship picking up 25 per cent of the total grant given to the Downs syndrome organisation. If that did not happen it would significantly reduce, if not cut out, its funding.

In the following year, the Commonwealth indicated that the Schools Commission would pick up the funding responsibility for Downs Children Incorporated. The State Government put extra money in and that is why the actual expenditure is higher than the voted expenditure. This year the \$32 000 is really keeping pace with that commitment. Of course, the Commonwealth has changed the way in which it is now funding this area. We are still awaiting advice from the Schools Commission as to what funds it will make available and whether those funds will equal three times what we are giving. I cannot give advice on that at the moment because we have not heard.

The other matter for which the money is used is that extra funds made available by the State Government this year helped fund an early learning intervention program run by Downs Children. I believe that these early intervention programs are very useful and very important in terms of helping to encounter the specific needs of children not only with Down's syndrome but similar early intervention programs in other areas prove helpful in the later remediation of problems.

Ms LENEHAN: Secondly, I refer to the line 'Non-government schools'. I presume it would now come under 'Secretariat'. Could the Minister outline for the Committee what requirements there are for a school to be registered as a non-government school? I note that the Leader of the Opposition, in an interview with Festival Focus, was asked whether he believed that if a school refused Government funding it should be exempt from registration. He said in his answer that he believed that arguments as to the number of students a school has should not deny the school the right to exist. A subsequent question asked whether, if the school accepts Government funding, registration requirements should cover only health and safety. The Leader of the Opposition said that, while each registration should be treated on its merit, as long as basic standards are met and teachers have the capacity to impart knowledge, there should be no problems, but that there should be an avenue of appeal to the Minister of Education to hear specific cases. That is relevant to that line because, as a Committee, we need to know the requirements for the registration of a non-government school in terms of numbers and requirements. What has the Minister to say?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There is an obligation on the part of Government to give an assurance to the community at large that any facility offering education for children under compulsion to attend school is so doing in ways that are not only healthy or safe but, indeed, educationally sound. It is to that end that the registration of non-government schools was introduced in fact by the former Government and supported by us, with amendments which we proposed at the time, which were accepted and then not accepted and subsequently have been introduced in substance by this Government. That obligation exists.

Whether or not the non-government school accepts funding from the State is irrelevant. We have to be able to give that assurance to parents anywhere in the State that, should

they choose to send their child to any school, they can do so with confidence that the school has met certain basic standards. As to the question of whether an appeal should or should not be made to the Minister, the present situation is that appeals are made through the legal system so that a school that is not happy with what happens to its registration takes the matter to court. That is a much more appropriate way to go, rather than coming to the Minister for him to arbitrate on those decisions. There would be something rather wrong in appealing to the Minister who is in charge of the Registration Board, that being the appeal mechanism. There would be real problems with that.

Indeed, one of the amendments we introduced to the Registration Board was to try to separate the mechanism of appealing in terms of assessing applications for registration from the body that makes the decision on the application. That previously was not in there. We do not have details here of specific requirements, but I will have them inserted in the supplement to *Hansard*.

Ms LENEHAN: I thank the Minister, and I would appreciate that information being incorporated.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I refer to the grant to SPELD of \$30 000. Is that grant connected with recent developments for dyslectic children as far as light spectrum glasses are concerned? I believe that SPELD is undertaking a study in this area. It has had some publicity over recent months and I understand, from what I have been told recently, that a student in one of our country high schools has shown a remarkable improvement after being fitted with light spectrum glasses. Does that have any connection with that study?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In that it will be offering support to that and other programs, yes it does. The grant was offered to SPELD because of the general work it does and the recognition the Government places on the importance and significance of it. So, it is provided in order that all programs of SPELD can be carried out at least at the level they have been, if not more. We believe the programs are of a high quality and cover a wide range of areas. The honourable member has mentioned one such area.

It is for that reason that the grants to SPELD have increased way in excess of the CPI since we have been in government. The figure for 1984-85 was \$19 000. That has been increased for 1985-86 to \$30 000—an increase of \$11 000. The figure for 1983-84 was some \$15 000, so there has been an increase of about \$4 000 again out of order, disproportionate to the CPI increase. It has been our attempt to meet the extra costs they face in terms of providing for the needs of the children they are serving.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I return now to SSABSA. When the board was first formed it applied for a grant for research which, as I understand it, the Government refused. The amount was some \$600 000. In the amount we see here of \$2 761 000, is there any allocation for research, bearing in mind the important and vital role that the board must now play as it has the responsibility for many of that 70 per cent of children mentioned in an earlier question who are not going on to higher education?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Government did not accept the proposition for research funds for SSABSA in the 1985-86 budget. The Government has put significant extra money into this whole arena. I cannot remember the exact figure, but I believe the equivalent figure for the Public Examinations Board back in 1982-83 would have been of the order of \$700 000. It is not fair to say that that \$700 000 has grown to \$2 700 000. One must take account of the Education Department effort, which amounted to some 20 salaries equivalent, and needs to be added on to that. Even when that is taken into account there has been a significant

increase in real terms in the amount of money allocated from State resources to senior secondary assessment.

It is also true that the Act passed by this Parliament and introduced by this Government put in a requirement that research should be done into the areas relating to senior secondary assessment. We did that quite consciously, and I am sure that all of us believe that it is an important arena. Given the context of significant extra funds having been made available for the whole area, there is a finite ceiling on how much extra could be done. As a result, the Senior Secondary Assessment Board has examined its budget and the funds made available and has considered the fact that it has a surplus from 1984-85 which, with my concurrence, it proposes to devote to research programs. It is also examining what other opportunities may exist within its funding by reallocation within its budget for research programs. I will ask Dr Eyers to comment.

Dr Eyers: We have a full-time research officer and, together with computing overheads associated with that, expenditure would be of the order of \$50 000. We have reallocated the budget provisions that have been made for us in the light suggested by the Minister and have allocated a further \$60 000, so we expect to be spending \$110 000 to \$120 000 this year on research.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I refer again to the South Australian college. Can the Minister say what has been the college's response to the working party report on early childhood education at the college?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We have not yet received a response. The college is in the midst of working out its responses. I did circulate it, as the honourable member knows, because he received a copy of the report. I also circulated it to all relevant agencies—the CSO, TAFE and SACAE. I have received a response from TAFE, and a preliminary response from the Children's Services Office, although not a detailed response. That matter can be canvassed with officers of the CSO when they are here. SACAE has not yet given me its considered response.

Mr KLUNDER: My question is subsequent to questions asked by the member for Torrens, although perhaps from a different perspective. I can assure the honourable member that the spectre of my following in his footsteps will be a short lived one. As far as I know the non-government schools sector is pegged to 23 per cent of the model school costs, and yet it would seem from estimates that a significant increase in at least one aspect of that has occurred. Has there been a shift of money within the 23 per cent from school needs based to student needs based funding?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: No, the 23 per cent still remains the arbitrary percentage figure. What has changed is the total bucket from which the 23 per cent comes. The original proposition was that this percentage funding should be a percentage of how much it costs the Government to educate a student within a Government school. In 1981-82 the then Government (with the Opposition's full support) determined that rather than having windfall effects from declines in enrolments, that were not really built into formula funding, flowing on in terms of massive funding increases in the non-government school sector, there should be a model school formula indicating what an average size Government primary or secondary school should have, and that therefore it would be 23 per cent or 22 per cent—whatever the percentage—of the relevant figure. It was agreed at that time that that would be the situation for the next three years.

When the present Government came to office we maintained teacher numbers against a massive decline in enrolments. That has meant a significant betterment in the standard and amount of resources allocated *per capita* in Government schools. That was not reflected in the model

school formula, because that formula reflects the resource allocation that existed when it was devised. I agreed that there should be a re-examination of the formula to determine whether it needed to be changed, so that there could be a change in what the formula reflected, and if it could pick up all the increases that Government schools have benefited from.

In the 1985-86 budget funds have been allocated accordingly, so that it is 23 per cent of the new model school formula, taking account of the betterments that have been given to Government schools in the past three years. While the increase in one year appears to be large percentagewise, that is really picking up the improvements that Government schools have had progressively over the past three years. The other factor involved is that there has been an increase in enrolments in the non-government sector, which in itself has generated further costs, in excess of the CPI.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In relation to the South Australian college, I understand that the Minister has announced that the hearing impairment course of the special education section at the Sturt campus will be reinstated in 1987. Can the Minister confirm that that is the case and, if so, is it intended that the position of lecturer or staff for that course will be advertised nationally, or will it be within South Australia?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: To put things in their proper perspective, I point out that we have made recommendations to the South Australian college in relation to the importance of this matter, stating that we believe there will be significant difficulties in the education system meeting the needs of students with hearing impairment if we do not have access to trained teachers coming through the college. That is where the line finishes in terms of the authority that we have over the college in relation to insisting that the college does something about the matter.

As a result of the recommendations that I have made to the college, it has agreed to reconsider its position, and has advised me that in 1987 the course will recommence. I put the question to them as to whether the vacant position will be advertised nationally, but of course it will be for the college to determine that. I accept that there may be sound reasons why it should favourably consider such a thing.

Although the college is reinstating that course (and I am pleased that it is doing that) I acknowledge that the Education Department has an obligation to investigate what is being done in the matter of release time training opportunities available to teachers. Parents of hearing impaired children in South Australia have put to me that we do not have enough trained teachers in our schools. It is not simply a matter of blaming the college for not producing enough teachers: it may be that we have not provided sufficient in-service or release time scholarship opportunities. Accordingly, the Government will provide three full-time equivalent release time scholarships from term 1 of next year for teachers to obtain further education in this area. This will be done with State funds.

From 1986 teachers will be unable to do this in South Australia. They will have to go either to short-term courses (which may be available in South Australia—we do not know what the college may have to offer, and I cannot comment on that) or interstate, to Victoria, to do a course. I am really saying that the Government is committing funds to this area.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I make the point that some of the State qualifications are not registrable in South Australia in that area. I was very glad to see the recommendation in the Smolicz Report that an institute of languages is to be set up. I assume that that will be sited at the Underdale campus of the South Australian college, although that is for the college to decide, no doubt. An

amount of \$36 000 is involved. Will the Minister set up this institute in the same manner as the Institute of Learning Difficulties was set up at the Sturt campus, that is, as a skeletal operation to begin with which is expanded as it gains momentum?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Funds have been provided. We will make an approach to the South Australian college with State Government money, allocated not just from the present budget but from the two budgets following that. I might point out that it will be a greater amount than \$36 000. There will be some increase in subsequent budgets. I think an amount of \$50 000 is proposed for the following year. Certainly, the figure will be increasing. The honourable member said that presumably it would be sited at Underdale, although it would be for the college to decide. I do not know whether it will be at Underdale, as the city campus may be more appropriate.

As to the second matter, since this involves a joint relationship between the Government and the college, it is something for both parties to consider, if the college is prepared to enter into discussions. I presume that discussions will be required about the structure of the institute and about the kind of work that it is doing, picking up the Smolicz Report recommendations and indeed such things as where it will be sited, and other arrangements. It is equally as likely to be sited at the city campus as a result of those discussions.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Is the college actually suffering from a reduction in Commonwealth funding for colleges of advanced education, and as such is it having difficulty in balancing its budget? If so, how serious is the matter?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes, it is having difficulty balancing its budget. Whether or not that is as a result of overall CAE funding, I will ask Kevin Gilding to comment on. The problem facing the South Australian colleges is certainly not relevant to very many colleges of advanced education in Australia. It is relevant to those colleges undergoing amalgamation, and that is where the nub of the problem is. Some years ago a presumption was made that there were cost savings to be had from amalgamating college campuses. I do not argue against that, but the problem has been in determining when those savings should be available.

Commonwealth funding patterns have assumed that they will be available much earlier than in reality they have been, because there are logistical and staffing problems. You have to staff on permanency in courses where you may wish to reduce effort, but you cannot do so by simply dismissing those staff. It is not as simple as that. The college has had structural problems to cope with, and the State Government put in \$250 000 to that end.

I believe that they have done some good work in trying to come to terms with their financial problems, but as the State Minister, I have seen it as my responsibility to make strong representations to the Federal Government to alert it to the nature of the financial problems that the college is facing. As to general funding in the CAE sector, I will ask Dr Eyers to comment.

Dr Eyers: Quite apart from the fact that the Commonwealth Government did not take account of the costs of amalgamation, there has been an overall reduction in Commonwealth funding over the last triennium, and therefore the college has been facing particular difficulties. Thirdly, it has had peculiar difficulties relating to teacher education numbers, where it has had to move from teacher education and diversify into other areas.

With a view to balancing its budget within the 1985-87 triennium, TEASA in association with the Tertiary Education Commission gave extra funding to the college. It requires the college to make six-monthly reports to the authority in

order to monitor the way the college is managing its budget provision, and one such report will be made in fact next Wednesday. We have expected the college to balance its budget within the present triennium. Whether it will be able to do so, of course, is still a moot point, although thus far within the triennium the college is doing better and has brought back its overspending better than expected.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Minister undertake to discuss with the South Australian college the plight of the journalism course at its Magill campus? I will just read a brief extract from, I think, the *Advertiser* on 17 July which will explain the situation:

JOURNALISM students at the South Australian College of Advanced Education claim inadequate funding of their course is denying them the right to a complete education. They are concerned that the amount of video equipment available to the journalism school will only allow half of next year's third-year class to receive television reporting training, and they have had to cancel the September edition of their suburban newspaper because of insufficient funding.

I have been approached by not only students but lecturers of the journalism course, which I am sure the Minister will agree is an important course: it is the only one available in South Australia and we, especially politicians, all want to see journalistic standards maintained and in fact rise; we do not want to denigrate the importance of their requests. As I say, I have been approached by lecturers and students, and they feel very concerned about the future of the course and the adequacy of the training they are receiving. Is the Minister prepared to use his advisory powers to ask questions or to discuss the matter with the college?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will certainly make an approach to the college. However, I cannot use my advisory powers, because they relate to those aspects of the college's work in the area of teacher training, and this is not clearly related to that area. However, I do not believe that just because this falls outside the legislative capacity I have that it stops me from making representation to them. I understand that discussions are taking place next week between TEASA and the South Australian college concerning the Institute of Languages. The School of Languages is already sited at the city campus; and, while the institute is quite different, there might be a natural relationship in both of them being at the city campus. In addition, there is no reason why the institute should involve only SACAE staff. I also see them involving Education Department staff, for example, as well as staff from other areas of education.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

Children's Services Office, \$34 131 000

Chairman:

Mr Max Brown

Members:

Mr E.S. Ashenden
Mr T.R. Groom
Mr G.M. Gunn
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenehan
The Hon. Michael Wilson

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Children's Services, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr B. Wright, Director, Children's Services Office.
Mr G. Haberfield, Assistant Director (Resources), Children's Services Office.
Ms C. Johnson, Assistant Director (Planning and Development), Children's Services Office.
Mr R. Tan, Finance Manager, Children's Services Office.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the vote open for examination.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I have some difficulty in actually matching the budgets for those programs within the Children's Services Office with what pertained last year. There are many reasons for that, one of them being the formation of the office itself and the splitting of the office into various programs. Then there is the provision of superannuation, but of course it could well be that superannuation was included in the Kindergarten Union estimates for last year. We now also have the provision of payroll tax included in this budget when in fact the Kindergarten Union was an exempt organisation for the purposes of the Payroll Tax Act. Will the Minister detail to the Committee the exact comparison of expenditure on preschool education compared with 1984-85 for the reasons that I have mentioned, and, if he cannot give us the exact figures now, I would like to have them incorporated in *Hansard* at a later stage.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have in front of me a table which is the Children's Services Office recurrent expenditure estimates 1985-86. As I understand it, these figures are trying to compare like with like, and we will get a copy for members. There are actually two relevant tables that I will have inserted in *Hansard*, as follows:

CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE
RECURRENT EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES 1985/1986

	Proposed 1984-85	Outcome 1984-85	Proposed 1985-86	Variance	Comments
SCHOOL EDUCATION (PGM 1)					
Early Childhood Education					
Salaries and Related Payments					
Salaries	15 223.0	15 803.0	16 100.7	297.7	Allowance for F/Y effects of N.W.I. and annual increase.
Payroll Tax	—	—	743.1	743.1	
Superannuation	431.0	436.0	419.0	17.0	K. U contribution to Super. Fund no longer applies.
Total Salaries and Related Payments	15 654.0	16 239.0	17 262.8	1 023.8	
Contingencies					
Operating Payments	712.0	698.0	750.7	52.7	Includes inflation allowance of 5 per cent
Other Contingencies	46.0	35.0	237.0	202.0	Includes allowance of \$120 000 for maintenance work.

	Proposed 1984-85	Outcome 1984-85	Proposed 1985-86	Variance	Comments
Total Contingencies	758.0	733.0	987.7	254.7	
Early Childhood Education	16 412.0	16 972.0	18 250.5	1 278.5	
Grants for Pre School Services					
Education Department Child Parent Centres (b)	3 585.0	3 675.0	3 841.0	166.0	Includes N.W.I. effect and increment for staff changes.
Catholic Education Pre Schools (c)	294.0	294.0	301.0	7.0	
Total Grants Provided	3 879.0	3 969.0	4 142.0	173.0	
TOTAL PRE SCHOOL EDUCATION	20 291.0	20 941.0	22 392.5	1 451.5	

(a) 1984-1985 K.U. Payroll Tax exempt
(b) 1984-1985 Education Department funded.
(c) 1984-1985 E.C.E.A.C. funded.

**CHILDREN'S SERVICES OFFICE
COMPARISON: C.S.O. ACTIVITIES WITH PRE ESTABLISHMENT**

	Proposed 1984-85	Outcome 1984-85	Proposed 1985-86
ESTIMATES as per PPB Papers	20 502.0	20 990.0	34 131.0
ADD amounts accounted for previously by Education and D.C.W.			
Child/Parent Centres	3 585.0	3 675.0	—
R.I.C.E.	225.0	141.0	—
Vacation Care	262.0	315.0	—
Out of School Hours Care	134.0	115.0	—
Family Day Care	2 071.0	4 092.0	—
Grants to Community Bsd Services	188.0	188.0	—
Play Groups	75.0	75.0	—
	6 540.0	8 601.0	—
K.U. Insurance and L.S.L. Adjustment	294.0	346.0	—
ADJUSTED ESTIMATES	27 336.0	29 937.0	34 131.0
ADD amounts relating to:			
Payroll Tax	—	975.0	—
F.D.C. activities expansion	—	1 338.0	—
Full year effect of N.W.I. (2.6 per cent)	—	549.0	—
Annual increment for teachers	—	222.0	—
R.I.C.E. unfilled vacancies	—	84.0	—
Special Services unfilled vacancies	—	118.0	—
Allowance for additional superannuation	—	100.0	—
Allowance for 5 per cent inflation on contingencies	—	145.0	—
Salary maintenance (K.U. staff)	—	58.0	—
Regional support (additional office)	—	40.0	—
	—	3 629.0	—
LESS savings relating to activities previously undertaken by Community Welfare and E.C.E.A.C.			
Community Welfare	—	—	270.0
E.C.E.A.C.	—	—	155.0
BASIS FOR COMPARISON	n/a	33 566.0	33 706.0

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: How many additional staff are now employed in the office compared with those employed last year in the Kindergarten Union, child-parent centres and the child care component of the Community Welfare Department which is now transferred across to the CSO (although I understand that child parent centre personnel have been employed in the Education Department)? I am trying to get a comparison of staffing within the various areas.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Maybe the best way I can go through it is to indicate that the outcome in 1984-1985 for those directly involved in preschool education (which I notice was just kindergarten) was 656.8. The proposed outcome at the end of this year is 663.9—an increase of 7.1. The establishment of new kindergartens is the reason for the additional staffing. The program 'Services for children with special needs', which includes clinical and remedial services, services for Aboriginal children, services for 3½ year old children, and multicultural services for children, has risen from 30.5 outcome to 40.8—an increase of 10.3.

Regarding child-care services (that is, centre based child-care services, licensed and advisory services, and family day care services), the outcome for 1984-85 is 83.5, whereas the

proposed outcome for 1985-86 is 94.5, resulting in an increase in the number of family day care schemes as a result of additional staff there. Regarding children's services not elsewhere covered, for (toy libraries), the outcome has risen from 13.2 to 16.6. This staff increase relates to transfers from other agencies and is not a net increase in effort.

Intra-agency support has risen from 52.2 to 76.8, and that includes the provision of regional managers. The regionalisation process within the establishment of the CSO has resulted in an increase in support staff in regional offices and generally increased activity in the CSO. The totals for those figures show an increase of 56.4, from 836.2 to 892.6. Adjusting for the numbers previously accounted for within the Department for Community Welfare papers means that the variation is from 769.6 last year to 892.6 this year.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: What staff-child ratio is the CSO working on for child-care for children under 12 months and for those aged between one year and three years? What are the current ratios applying in subsidised child-care centres?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will obtain those figures for the honourable member.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: What are the accepted standards and the ratios that we apply in our subsidised child-care centres?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The Commonwealth Government has the influencing say in respect of that matter, because it lays down guidelines in that area.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: But we have to train child-care workers.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will try to get those ratios within the next few minutes.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you, I appreciate that. I have detected a large requirement within the community for more occasional child-care. All members of Parliament would support that statement, especially if they had received the representations that I have. What steps does the Minister intend to take to satisfy that demand?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: As a State Government, we have made representations to the Commonwealth on this matter. I agree that there is an urgent need for occasional care to be examined as a priority area. Indeed, in a speech that I gave to local government officers involved in the area of child-care, I said that I thought that, in the Commonwealth Government's reconsideration of guidelines and funding for child-care, occasional care should have a priority rating along with the other priority areas of child-care. Those discussions are taking place, and we will continue to put that line. Discussions have already commenced concerning the three-year package from 1985-86 to 1987-88, and we will strongly contend that occasional child-care needs to be recognised in that context.

Mr KLUNDER: Regarding the Children's Services Office, the recurrent expenditure estimates for 1985-86 show that the variations, except for the Kindergarten Union super-annuation contributions, are positive and in many cases healthily so. Will the Minister, considering the background of this document, give an assurance, which some people in my district need because of rumour being heard around the place, that no existing centre for early childhood education will be disadvantaged as a result of moving to the CSO?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: They will not be disadvantaged as a result of moving to the CSO. That is a different question from what happens in the normal course of resource allocation within the CSO. We will continue the rationalisation of staff between centres: that has happened for years. In the third term we will analyse the enrolment trends in preschools and identify where the enrolments are falling, and where we really should be taking staff from such centres and allocating them to other centres where enrolments are increasing. That will continue, but that is independent of the CSO coming into existence, except in as much as the process for determining that may become more efficient.

This budget really incorporates the State Government's picking up the shortfall on funding from the Federal Government. That has been a major problem for us. It has meant a massive investment of funds just to maintain the line. Every cent that we have put in to make up the cutback has not gone into new initiatives. It is just simply holding the line. If we had had that money for new initiatives, there are so many important areas of need that we could have picked up in the preschool arena.

Ms LENEHAN: My question is an extension of that asked by the member for Torrens about the provision of occasional child-care. I refer to the line on family day care, fee relief, at page 126 of the white book. A substantial sum is proposed for 1985-86. I also note on the hand-out from the Minister that there seems to be a large difference between what is proposed for 1984-85 and the outcome. What directions and support do the proposals of the CSO contain for the provision of family day care? I pick up the point made by the member for Torrens, because that is another way of

providing occasional care for people near their homes. It is also a way, if such a program exists in country areas, of providing occasional care as well as full-time care for country people with young children. That is an extremely valuable and important part of this whole area of children's services. Will the Minister comment on these points?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The honourable member has identified the movement of the figures in both tables: the family day care services have increased. I certainly support the work done in the family day care arena. It is one of the range of child-care offerings that is important in meeting the needs that may not be met so well by other areas. We need to appreciate that mix in trying to meet child-care needs. I have approved a situation where we have applied to the Commonwealth Government for the variation of the ceilings that apply in family day care, so that we can maintain some of the numbers at present in family day care, and I am looking forward to further increases in those ceilings in terms of using some of the new child-care places that are to be funded by the Commonwealth Government over the next three years in the family day care arena.

So, I have already endorsed that line of approach and the Commonwealth Government has told us, 'You want to raise the ceilings on certain areas. Will you do so in terms of acquitting them against the new child-care places?', to which we have replied, 'Yes.' In the initial context of increases in the ceilings on family day care, they are simply legitimising (although that may be too strong a word) the existing enrolments in family day care. That does not mean the provision of extra services: it means that, when someone leaves that family day care, the vacant place is taken by someone else rather than the place disappearing altogether, which was the situation until the increase in those ceilings. I should like to see the ceilings raised even further so that new opportunities are available.

Mr GUNN: I note in the yellow book that it mentions the need to invest in the provision of four sessions per week for preschooling for one year for all four-year-old children in the State in accordance with the Government's policies and priorities. It mentions that, in March 1985, 14 365 four to five-year-old children were attending kindergartens. After reading the yellow book carefully, because this is an area on which I have spent some time, I note that approximately \$39 million will be allocated for this exercise and that last year the Kindergarten Union spent some \$21 million. Obviously that figure of \$39 million picks up where some of the preschools were run by the Education Department.

At Leigh Creek it is not possible for all the four-year-olds who want to attend for the number of hours suggested in the yellow book to do so. I think that the Minister and his officers are aware of the situation. I visited Leigh Creek last Monday and it is bursting at the seams. It is a town with a young population. On a ratio basis, I would say that it would have the largest percentage of young people with small children coming on of any town in the State. The school urgently needs those preschool facilities. It also needs two buildings. I have had very good discussions with the Minister and his officers, but are they now in a position to advise whether some action will be taken to alleviate this very difficult problem, because I am not sure how the people operating it will cope if something is not done in the new year?

It is obvious that a new building has to be erected. It should be designed to meet the future needs of the area so that it can become part of a larger complex with day care facilities and other facilities that are urgently required in the area. I pose that question, because I am aware of the lack of sessions at Booleroo Centre. I suppose the problems that I am raising are similar to those of other members, but I think that the Leigh Creek situation is probably unique

in South Australia, because it is such a young town and there are so many preschool age children in the area.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The honourable member mentioned four sessions per week and a ratio of one to 10. These are still the goals of the Government and we are still committed to them. Until the Commonwealth cut in funding this year, we were achieving significant process. The pupil/teacher ratio in the Kindergarten Union, as reported in its annual report, falling from 12.5 to 11.2 indicates that progress was being made in that area.

We also saw resources going in and trying to meet extra needs in terms of sessions. It is therefore that it burns particularly that we have to put in this extra money just to make up the shortfall. The \$1.78 million in this year's budget, could, quite frankly, have taken us to the one to 10 ratio for every preschool in South Australia, plus increase the number of sessions for a number of those that were not offering four sessions per week, and it could have done other things besides, but it will not be able to do any of that. It will simply hold the line and therefore the staffing opportunities for next year in terms of preschool staffing really come from the rationalisation process. I suppose that will mean that we are not going to satisfy all the staffing needs. I regret that, but that is really what the situation will be. We will certainly address the most urgent staffing needs wherever they may be, country or city, from the rationalisation of staff available.

As to Leigh Creek, the honourable member has drawn this to our attention on a number of occasions. The CSO is in fact keeping a close watch on what can be done in relation to that. At this stage we are looking at the 1986-87 budget. I appreciate that the honourable member says that there is a matter of urgency right now which needs to be examined at the start of next year. We will continue to look at what we can do. We are presently examining priority areas in capital works. We have targeted Coomandook and Penneshaw as two preschool centres that have been burning promise for a long time and need to be picked up as a matter of urgency. They really have been the two top priorities this year. I cannot guarantee that we can pick up Leigh Creek in 1985-86, but whilst we will look at the 1986-87 capital works, it is not lost in terms of a priority in trying to see what we can do this year.

I have asked the CSO, in terms of providing new capital facilities for preschools, that we examine cost-effective ways of doing that: that we no longer consider purpose pre-built facilities as necessarily the only way of providing a new preschool. They last a long time, but they are expensive. In the medium term we may not have the sorts of funds available to meet all the needs and we would be better off with other kinds of buildings being used. It might be through that kind of approach that we will be able to meet the needs of places like Leigh Creek, which I have to say is not the only place with accommodation problems.

Mr ASHENDEN: I turn now to a proposed kindergarten, which is actually outside both my present electorate and the one for which I will be standing in the next election, but which seriously impacts upon the electorate for which I will be standing. I refer of course to Wynn Vale. I have been asked by members of two of the committees of kindergartens in the north-eastern suburbs to raise this matter with the Minister, because the lack of a kindergarten at Wynn Vale is having a very serious effect upon young children and their parents in that suburb. There is also a long waiting list for other kindergartens close to Wynn Vale.

As the Minister would be aware, a mobile kindergarten, which is serviced from Salisbury, attends Wynn Vale. Parents have indicated to me that they are very concerned indeed about the lack of preschool facilities for children in that area. With the first of the buildings in the Golden Grove

development almost ready to be erected, they are very concerned that the situation will become even worse than it is at the moment. When will funds be allocated for the Wynn Vale kindergarten to be built?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This matter has already been brought to my attention. I met with a delegation of people from the north-eastern area. That deputation was brought to me by Di Gayler, and the honourable member was also present. We discussed these matters and Wynn Vale was one of the issues that was raised on that occasion. It is a matter in my consciousness and I am giving a little background history to the situation. In the 1985-86 year we are looking to making funds available for the provision of a preschool facility in the Wynn Vale area, but I raised the matter of the deputation, because on that occasion I said that we again need to use some lateral thinking as to the kind of facility that we end up providing, as to whether or not it is a specific purpose built preschool, or whether or not some option is used as we have used in certain other situations where a very good preschool facility has been provided for less money.

That is the sort of thing we should be looking at with respect to Wynn Vale as well. When I say less money, I mean a perfectly adequate facility but one that costs less than the purpose-built facility. So, we are looking at the possibility of it happening within the 1985-6 year. It looks like funds will be available from the cash flow program of the Children's Services Office capital works area.

The honourable member also mentions Golden Grove. One of the big advantages of having the CSO is being able to coordinate provision of services over the whole State. We would be looking at planning for Wynn Vale also to take into account what we will do in Golden Grove in terms of other preschool facilities needed in that wider area within the next few years. We appreciate that they will be needed quite soon. At this stage, I say that in this financial year we will be looking to do something for Wynn Vale. As to the amount or a definite time line, that will be dependent on investigations being undertaken by the Children's Services Office at the moment.

Mr ASHENDEN: I do not want to make this a political matter, but I will take this a little further. After the deputation with yourself, Minister, the parents of the children spoke to me. I was also approached by kindergarten committees following that deputation and the forwarding of a report to them by persons who attended the meeting. I very much agree with them when they state that the problem is there now. They find it difficult to comprehend that there could be another area anywhere in South Australia facing the same pressure as those applying in the north-eastern suburbs.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: That is another rapidly growing area, but I point out that my constituents see a very real problem with a kindergarten promised for some time that has not been built. More and more young families are moving into the area and more young children require preschool facilities. I guess that while they appreciate the Minister's statement that investigations are being undertaken as to what is the best thing to do, at the moment they are saying that they do not care what happens as long as they get a kindergarten.

I suppose that they are really saying that they do not want the Taj Mahal; they would even put up with a log cabin at the moment because it would be better than what they have. They find it very difficult to understand why it is taking so long for consideration and investigation. As far as they are concerned, the need is real and desperate. They believe that the officers who have come from the Kindergarten Union and Education Department are involved with

CPCs and so must have the expertise to make a decision about this matter without a greater investigation than that presently being undertaken. I guess I would have to be honest and say that the Minister's non-commitment to a timetable will not give any assurance to the parents I will go back to. Can the Minister comment, because these parents' concerns are real?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I know that the concern parents expressed at that deputation was exacerbated by the fact that another preschool facility that they named has been built. They said that in their opinion it did not reflect a high demand area for preschool facilities. I responded by saying that that was a committed project before the recent housing boom. At that time it was a justifiable priority.

That has worried many people, such as those mentioned by the honourable member. They are asking whether the priority setting mechanism is efficient enough and whether it is really picking up their needs when they are not getting a facility, although a facility is being provided to another community that they cannot see as having the same priority need. I think I explained the history of that matter, which happened before the sudden growth explosion took place.

I assure the honourable member that Wynn Vale is high on our priority list, but it also ranks with other areas, and his own colleague, the member for Eyre, has identified one such area. The member for Mawson, by interjection, identified that there are problems in the southern area. I can identify similar problems in the northern suburbs. Those problems do exist. It is essential for us to make sure that we are spending funds available as appropriately as possible to meet these priorities. The member is worried about an investigation and says that we should surely know that the problem exists.

Mr ASHENDEN: The parents are worried.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I accept that. The difficulty is not in identifying the need; we have done that. However, it is not a simple matter for anyone in government to say, 'Okay, there it is. We turn on the tap and the money comes out.' We have to examine competing needs and funds available, match everything in an equation and hope that it adds up. It appears to us at this stage that we can say that in 1985-86 funds will be spent on a preschool for Wynn Vale.

I am trying to ensure that other needs around the place get some attention and that we spread the funds available as efficiently as possible. I can say, for example, immediately that we will spend all the funds on building a purpose-built preschool facility at point A. I entered into discussion at length before talking about a cheaper alternative to providing preschool services so that we can make better use of our dollars in a wider number of communities. That does not take away from what I said about Wynn Vale in 1985-86.

However, if we determined an alternative late tonight for Wynn Vale, there is the natural time line that has to be gone through in terms of getting it up and running, building and siting it and all of that. I am still not in a position to say now, if that decision was made tonight, where it would go or when it would be done. I have given what I think is a very strong commitment that in 1985-86 (this financial year) we will spend money on it.

Mr ASHENDEN: Does that mean that the facility will be available some time this financial year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I cannot say that, because other preschools built over the years have not been ready in the same financial year, even though they may have been started at its beginning. At Parafield West I am opening a preschool which has taken some time to build. We were not able to promise that community it would be built in one financial year. Last Friday I opened one at Flagstaff Oval. Again, for a number of absolutely legitimate reasons, frustrating though

they were to the local community, it took longer than one 12 month period to build. We have not even got 12 months left in 1985-86. If we can do it, we will, but there are imponderables that sometimes prevent that sort of thing from happening. Basic administration requirements, such as council approvals, and all sorts of things like that, can sometimes hold things up. I cannot give the honourable member a guarantee tonight that come 30 June the centre will be open. We will do what we can.

Maybe we can do what we have done in other communities. With the lateral thinking mode at Salisbury Heights a preschool facility was available much more quickly than anticipated. I hasten to add that that is not in my electorate. It can work the other way. All I am saying is that the commitment is there from the CSO to do the best it can. As Minister, I will monitor that situation to ensure that the best possible result is gained.

Ms LENEHAN: I am not sure whether this is an integral part of program 2 (page 125) but I am aware that some children are able to have five sessions of preschool education a week. Does that relate to a policy of mainstreaming children with special needs? Is that one way of giving them that sort of support or is the line relating to services for children with special needs a totally separate issue? If so, I will ask a separate question. Will the Minister explain to the Committee in what circumstances children receive five sessions a week?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: These same figures used to appear in the Kindergarten Union annual report as well where the five sessions number was recorded. I understand that that applies to those children with special needs. I also understand that under some circumstances country children take part in that. That may sound a bit of an anomaly when we very often have difficulty running four sessions a week in some country areas and one might ask why it is that some children have five sessions a week.

It is really to do with transport arrangements for those children, if I understand correctly, that they end up staying a whole day at kindergarten. Rather than going four or five days a week, they may stay three whole days, which means they end up getting two sessions more in the afternoon. Also, it is possible for preschools, if they have some capacity, to give five sessions where it is appropriate and where staffing would not be reduced if four sessions were given. In other words, there may be some flexibility in the staffing allocation to the centre which they justify in their own right on the basis of four sessions, but may enable them to give five sessions. That can happen and they can determine which children could get five sessions. The annual report of the KU and the documentation we have here require that to be recorded so that we know how many children get the benefit of that.

Ms LENEHAN: Secondly, I believe some possible problems could arise in ascertaining some standardisation of industrial conditions and therefore in the payment of directors of the children's services of particular institutions, such as child care centres. Given that there are now a large number of child-care centres open or to be opened within the next six months, has any attention been given to developing a set of guidelines which then would have to be negotiated with the Federal Government? In many cases the Federal Government is responsible for determining, particularly in new child-care centres which are joint ventures between the State and Federal Governments with the Federal Government paying the salaries, how we can have some form of standardisation for directors who come from a range of different backgrounds. They may come from a child-care area, from a teaching background or from a nursing/mothercraft background.

This is causing some problems, and to overcome any future problems what is being proposed? Are negotiations currently taking place with the Federal Government so that people performing the same duties in child-care centres are on the same rate of pay, have the same kind of conditions, and generally tidy up what has been a fairly anomalous situation dating back to the original Act of 1972 covering child-care?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Certainly we are having ongoing discussions at officer level between the State and Federal Government on a number of areas to do with funding for child-care. In the final analysis, at this stage matters are determined by the Child Care Act, which is not under our control. Indeed, it is determined by the willingness of the Commonwealth Government to make any variations to the amounts it pays with respect to these areas. So, it is not easy for us to intervene in that situation at the moment except that it is part of the ongoing discussions we have had on the broader context of agreements between the State and the Commonwealth. I understand that there are discussions going on between the unions involved and the Federal Government in terms of the possible creation of the directors award that will try to pick up the variations in directors qualifications and training and the extent to which they have teaching or nursing qualifications.

So, it is a matter over which we do not have a great deal of control. It is a matter that will need to be worked out in the years ahead because, if not, there will be serious anomalies showing up.

Ms LENEHAN: That being the case—and I am aware that anomalies exist due to the Federal Government's 1972 Act—will the Minister initiate discussions with the Federal Government to have that Act amended? I happen to know that it is Labor Party policy—and has been for some time—to call on the Federal Government to amend the Act to cover those sorts of situations, but it would probably be very important if the Minister had direct negotiations requesting that the Act be amended as a high priority.

To just exist on a form of negotiation for each individual case, and hope that the outcome is favourable to the management committee that has appointed that director, and so, on is really a fairly difficult situation. Would the Minister undertake to request amendments to the Act?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Discussions have already taken place at officer level and, indeed, there have been discussions with the Director of the Office of Child Care with respect to a three-tiered salary arrangement as the present arrangements are unsuitable and should be amended. I give the undertaking that, as the State Minister responsible for this area, when the matter reaches Ministerial level it will be addressed by us and we will be looking to the Federal Government to change its Act and make provision for funding of it from within its allocation, as that would be the appropriate way for it to be handled.

Mr ASHENDEN: Another question raised with me by a number of committees of preschools, particularly those which were previously Kindergarten Union kindergartens, is the real disparity that exists between fees paid by parents of children attending CSO preschools compared with those attending Education Department child-parent centres. I am sure the Minister would be aware that the fees are considerably higher for those parents, who find it very difficult to understand why, with the establishment of the Children's Services Office, which was supposed to bring about a complete unification of preschool child-care and education, we still have the Education Department child-parent centres having what appears to them a very real advantage.

For example, Education Department child-parent centres have water and power paid for by the Education Department, whereas a CSO kindergarten is required to pay for those

charges through its committee. There are a number of other areas. Because of this, the running costs to the parents are considerably higher when their children attend a CSO kindergarten rather than an Education Department kindergarten. They feel that this is unfair to them, as they have pointed out to me. They are at the absolute limit of the amount of money they can raise through fund-raising activities. It concerns me that there is, from the parents themselves, a feeling that justice has not been done to them with the creation of the CSO.

A number of preschool committees in my electorate have asked me to raise the matter of what the Government is going to do in relation to ensuring greater fairness in the way that funding is provided to CSO kindergartens compared to Education Department kindergartens.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: As promised at the outset the support services available for child-parent centres is the subject of a review. We promised that that would happen; it was to be completed by the end of the year. However, that was when we thought that Act would be passed by the end of last year—so there might be delays. Therefore, many of these matters must wait for the results of that review. With respect to child-parent centres, historically many of them, although admittedly not all of them, were sited in lower socio-economic areas.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is not the case in my electorate.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I appreciate that that does not apply to all child-parent centres, but originally they were set up in areas without any preschool services at all, and generally they were located in lower socio-economic areas. That does not apply to all CPCs; some are quite different. The review is being undertaken. That review was promised and it will examine all the support mechanisms.

With respect to funding made available to child-parent centres and to preschool centres, I understand that budget operating grants are determined on the same basis, that the formula is the same. So, even though one is in the Education Department and another is under the CSO, they receive a base grant, plus *per capita*, no matter where they are. So, the money that they get from us is the same.

As to the matter of standardising the fees set by individual preschools, that would require a major change of policy. Considering the ramifications of that the honourable member would understand the difficulties involved. Fees are set by individual preschool committees: they are not set by the CSO or by the Minister.

Mr ASHENDEN: With respect, CSO kindergartens have to pay water and electricity rates, and so on, whereas the Education Department kindergartens do not have to pay those costs.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I certainly accept that, and I was coming to that matter. I do not think that any move to standardise the fees would work. The child-parent centres would have to be forced to increase their fees, by fiat, or extra resources would have to be provided for them to reduce the fees. We cannot do that as we do not intend to interfere with that. Our goal is to reduce fees overall. Until this year, when we faced a major Commonwealth budgeting problem, we had in fact indexed budget operating grants to preschools—which, historically is not something that has happened every year.

As to the matter of the kind of unfair cost advantage that child-parent centres might have, this matter will be part of the child-parent centre review and the support that is available to child-parent centres, examining whether or not they do have an unfair cost advantage over kindergartens. I cannot say what the outcome of that investigation will be, because a significant proportion of CPCs are still in the lower socio-economic areas—and one must take out that need component as well. A legitimate point that one could

easily make is that so, too, are a number of kindergartens in lower socio-economic areas—and that is true.

Mr ASHENDEN: They want the costs reduced. I want to stress to the Minister that they do not want the Education Department CPCs forced to pay for water and power, but they want those costs removed.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I fully accept that, but that would require extra funds. We will examine the matter and do what we can. Secondly, we have lost some flexibility, with the extra money put in this year simply holding the line rather than being available for new initiatives, such as helping to reduce the cost burden on kindergartens.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I understand that there are some problems with the training of child-care workers. I have been told that the proposed shortfall will be 50 or 60. Will the Minister confirm these figures? I also understand that the Minister has a steering committee looking at the question of training child-care workers. I would also like the Minister to confirm that. Further, is there a problem with the drop out rate from the child-care workers course at TAFE? Is that having a significant effect on the number of graduates? What steps has the Minister taken to see that we have an adequate supply of child-care workers? Is the course of too high a standard?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: First, the Government put extra money in the TAFE budget this year of \$97 000. Secondly, there has been some Commonwealth funding available to assist in this area. Previously we had full-time and part-time courses. This year we had a hybrid course, which comprises one year full time, leading to part-time study afterwards. We believe that that is a flexible way of offering some training opportunities. It is more flexible than the previous either/or situation. Thirdly, the situation with respect to drop outs from the course has not been particularly different from the situation that has applied in previous years. That is the advice that I have on that matter. I point out that we are short of child-care workers, which is why we had to put extra money in the TAFE budget.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination completed.

Works and Services—Children's Services Office,
\$705 000—Examination declared completed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Office of the Ministry of Technology, \$1 012 000

Chairman:
Mr Max Brown

Members:
The Hon. D.C. Brown
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Ms S.M. Lenehan
Mr I.P. Lewis
Mr E.J. Meier
Mr J.P. Trainer

Witness:

The Hon. Lynn Arnold, Minister of Education, Minister for Technology, Minister of Children's Services, Minister of Employment and Minister Assisting the Minister of State Development.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr P. Ellyard, Director of the Ministry of Technology.
Mr G.H. Kelly, Principal Adviser, Data Processing Board.
Mr D.E. Mitchell, Chairman, Data Processing Board.
Mr D.L. Matters, Executive Officer, Education and Technology Task Force.
Mr G. McDonald, Chief Adviser, Minister of Technology.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Could the Minister indicate what the main thrust of the South Australian Council on Technological Change has been for the last year, what publications have been produced and what he sees as the thrust of that council for the next 12 months?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The South Australian Council on Technological Change has had a number of areas to examine including issues referred to it by the Government: for example, automated fuel system (which matter has now been returned to it from the council). Technology for the aged as an issue was referred to that council, and a report was prepared by it. It has also been asked to examine the implications of future technological change or specific new technologies that might impact on South Australia over the next 10 years. That is a matter referred to in the Technology Action Program. The other major issue in which it has been involved over the last 12 months has been the development and consultation process relating to the private sector guidelines for the introduction of new technologies. The honourable member will recall that we already have public sector guidelines in that respect, and the council has been working on the private sector version of those.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Taking up the last point in terms of guidelines for the introduction of new technology, I understand that in a recent communication with the Public Service Association there was some suggestion that a formal agreement had been or might be reached between the Government and the association on the introduction of new technology. Could the Minister indicate whether in fact there is any intention to introduce such a formal agreement? To clarify this point, in the correspondence that I saw I had the impression that it was a formal agreement to the point where it became an industrial agreement between the two parties involved. Is that the intention of the Government, or has any indication been given that they would be willing to sign such an agreement?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There is no formal industrial agreement between the Government and the relevant public sector unions involved, but the public sector guidelines are in fact a commitment on the part of the Government and the relevant public sector unions that we will have a formalised process of consultation with respect to new technologies that have an employment impact. There is within those public sector guidelines released some time ago an agreement that, if there is a disagreement, we will organise an appeal or arbitration mechanism to determine the outcome in such a matter. It is not an industrial agreement as such.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If you have formal arbitration procedures, it then becomes a formal agreement, and any agreement between the parties involved, particularly between an employer and an employee association, then becomes a formal industrial agreement.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is based upon the goodwill of the Government and the relevant public sector unions. They are guidelines, not a written agreement embodying an exchange of letters or industrial agreement before a court. We have indicated that these are the guidelines we will follow with respect to the introduction of new technology in the public sector.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If there is a dispute, the matter could go to arbitration with an independent arbitrator to resolve it, and that arbitration could include conditions of employment.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is in order to properly talk through any disagreement that may arise. In the final analysis, the decision making power rests with the Government to do what it wishes to do. We are just saying that, as an act of good faith, we are prepared to enter into a consultation mechanism with this kind of appeal mechanism behind it. There is no legal standing before an arbitration tribunal. These are the rules that the Government is playing by, but they do not have any force of law behind them.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I appreciate that but, if you sit down and reach a written agreement between two parties, it is the law of contract between the two parties. It is not a formal—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There has been no exchange of letters between the relevant public sector unions and the Government on the matter. There have been discussions between the two, leading to the final guidelines adopted by Cabinet. There has been no exchange of letters between the two groups.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is relevant that this Parliament knows what sort of agreement has been reached, and I would appreciate it if you could supply details of the basis of the agreement, whatever the understanding is between the two parties involved. If you do not have that information tonight, perhaps you could supply it in writing.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: What has been decided is a policy decision by the Government as a result of consultation between the public sector unions and the Government over a period. I will be happy to provide a report for insertion in *Hansard* on the exact nature of those consultations, detailing when they took place and the nature of those consultations.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I should like it to include not only the nature of the consultations but the substance of what has been agreed as a result of those consultations.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This will be a report of Cabinet's decision in this matter. That already is a public document but we will be happy to incorporate it in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Thank you: it is extremely relevant to know what has been agreed by our Government and Government employees. I certainly welcome a clear understanding between an employer and an employee on the introduction of new technology: I am not disputing that for a moment.

The Minister has made some feature in recent times of the fact that he is both Minister of Education and the Minister for Technology: could he indicate the extent to which computers are now used within schools? Have you figures on the exact number, or a fair approximation of the number, of computers currently in use in both primary and secondary schools throughout the State?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I do not have the figures with me at present, but I have seen them and will have them incorporated in *Hansard* for the honourable member. As I understand it, every secondary school in South Australia has at least one computer, and a significant number of them have a network or a class set of computers. Half our primary schools have at least one computer, and 100 have more than one.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: When introducing the budget, the Premier announced, as I understood it, that a capital pool would be made available to enable schools to purchase computers, using loan funds, the loan to be repayable over a period. Can the Minister give details of that arrangement? How much money has been set aside for that capital assistance scheme to purchase computers and about how many

computers does he expect will be purchased under that scheme this year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The program is based on the School Loans Assistance Scheme, which has been in place for eight years in respect of capital projects in schools, such as community halls, gymnasias, and the like. We have extended this by the allocation of new capital funds, so it is not downgrading the school loans scheme: it is an additional loan scheme to provide for the purchase of computers. Precise guidelines will be published soon in the *Government Gazette*, but I will indicate the broad principles.

The program as at minimum over the next three years will provide \$1 million purchasing power to obtain computers. Accessibility to those funds will be open to primary and secondary schools and also to schools that either have or do not have computers at present, but priority will be given to those schools that do not have computers and also to those schools that would have greater financial difficulty in raising the funds themselves to purchase computers.

At this stage, it is expected that the maximum loan available from the fund will be \$10 000, so that 100 loans of that sum may be provided over that period. That is not to say that the schools themselves could not increase the amount available from their own funds, so schools may commit themselves to an investment of \$20 000: \$10 000 from the program and \$10 000 from their own resources. On the experience of the School Loans Assistance Scheme, it is expected that two-thirds of the final cost of \$1 million will be made from Education Department funds and one-third from school community funds, so the scheme would effectively mean that, for a \$10 000 investment in computer hardware in their schools, they would have to pay only one-third of that cost over the period of the loan or as an initial cash grant. However, two-thirds of the total would be paid by the Education Department.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The sum of \$1 million is to be allocated over a minimum three-year period. Working on about \$5 000 a unit, which would be a fair average price for a computer over the next few years, 200 units could be purchased under that scheme over three years, which would be a figure of 60 or 70 computers a year. How many schools are there in the State?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: About 700. The sum of \$5 000 a unit quoted by the honourable member, according to my information, is excessive. The kind of computer purchased by schools for their programs is much smaller: the price is either \$1 500 or \$2 000 for individual units or about \$10 000 for a network system. Admittedly, such computers would be less sophisticated than those available for \$5 000 each, but schools do not believe that such costly units are necessary for their programs.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Even at \$2 500, only about 400 computers will be purchased over three years which, with 700 schools, means less than one computer for each school across the State over three years in respect of which the Government is contributing about two-thirds of the cost.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Not necessarily. A primary school which chooses to use moderately priced units costing, say, hundreds of dollars each would find that it would get much more for its money. I have visited some primary schools that have purchased such units and have obtained these networks for much less than the sum indicated by the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I appreciate the generous grant given to the Regency Park Crippled Children's Association. When I raised this matter in the House earlier this year, I criticised the Minister, but now that he has allocated \$20 000 I express my appreciation. At a meeting last Monday evening, the school council expressed its appreciation of the grant. It has worked out a program and is buying six com-

puters from the total grant of \$20 000 plus the other \$2 000. The school is buying Commodores, Apples, and BBCs. A network of computers is part of the purchase. The average cost of the network of BBC computers, one Apple and one Commodore is about \$2 500 a computer. The council has agreed to send a letter of thanks to the Minister.

Again, I stress that, based on those average costs, even if it came down to \$1 000 a unit, which it has not, we are still looking at one computer for each school across the State, and that is a very small drop in the bucket in terms of meeting the computing needs of our schools. As this is the first and only contribution from the State Government, I question whether it is adequate.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I thank the honourable member for his comments on Regency Park. In fact, that grant is part of an ongoing program that was introduced this year in addition to the \$2 000 for each special school that we introduced last year, which was a first-off for that program. That grant has been maintained, and we are also introducing a one-off project each year, recognising that we expect Regency Park to say that, in the set up stage, more than \$2 000 might be needed. We will have a special schools program where one school a year will be nominated for a grant of \$20 000. Thus, Regency Park has been nominated this year, and another special school will be nominated next year. That is in addition to the annual \$2 000 grant for each school.

Regarding the alleged small number of computers, I asked the department to provide more funds for this program, because I believed that we had the capacity to do that. However, I was told that these decisions should be left until next year because, if we overextended our \$1 million purchasing capacity, there might be a price effect that could work to the disadvantage of schools. So, we should determine what the market can bear without throwing money away in increased prices when such increases need not have taken place. Therefore, we are talking about a minimum project of \$1 million but, if it appears that we can do more without affecting the price of each unit, we will do so. I said that in the House earlier in reply to a question on the same matter.

We may disagree on the price of an individual unit (and time will tell how many units can be purchased with this sum), but, whatever the sum, it will not purchase a computer for every child or for every class. If we can improve our purchasing power in this program next year when we determine that there has not been a negative price effect from our coming into the market, we will expand the program. However, at this stage, even against my desire to have a larger sum, the advice is to hold back, and we are doing that. If we can expand the program, we will.

Mr KLUNDER: I refer to page 105 of the yellow book where, under '1985-86 Specific Targets/Objectives', there is the objective of fostering the establishment in South Australia of the National Corrosion Centre, the Microprocessor Applications Centre, the Industrial Laser Demonstration Centre, and a Design Consortium for South Australian Metal Manufacturing. Can the Minister provide the Committee with details of the progress made in establishing those centres?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I can certainly do that. The proposal to establish the headquarters of the newly formed National Corrosion Centre in South Australia at Technology Park has been referred to the Department of State Development. The idea of setting up the centre at Technology Park is attractive to the Australian Corrosion Association. I must say that the area of corrosion is very often one of the forgotten areas of technology and manufacturing and yet it is costing Australian industry billions of dollars a year, so an understanding as to controlling financial losses through corrosion offers great financial returns to all those involved.

The Microprocessor Applications Centre project is to establish a microelectronics application centre at Technology Park and is awaiting disbursement of federal funds. Again, we think that this offers great opportunities, but we are awaiting federal advice as to whether or not that will go ahead. In relation to the Industrial Laser Demonstration Centre, the CSIRO is preparing a proposal to establish this centre in South Australia and the Ministry of Technology is represented on the coordinating committee that is preparing that proposal.

As to the Design Consortium for South Australian Metal Manufacturing, this proposal will be referred to the South Australian Manufacturing Council for assessment and recommendation, so that is the progress on those matters. Just before going to the next question, the Director of the Ministry of Technology wanted to give some advice relating to school computing.

Dr Ellyard: The member for Davenport asked a number of questions relating to school computing. The education and technology task force is about to publish 'A Rationale for the Educational Use of Computers in Schools' by Professor Anderson. I am happy to make a copy of that available to the member for Davenport, because I think he would find it useful in providing an overview of why we are doing what we are doing.

Mr KLUNDER: Under the program entitled 'Preparation for the Impact of Technological Change on Employment', mention is made of the new initiative to establish an industrial relations and technology task force. Is the work of this proposed task force likely to invade areas of responsibility of the existing Industrial Relations Advisory Council and, if so, how will the conflict of interest and duplication be avoided?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is certainly not designed to compete or overlap with other existing bodies. We think that there are some essentially different questions that need to be addressed with respect to the imperatives of technological change by such a task force. The industrial relations and technology task force that has been proposed has been extensively discussed with the Department of Labour, both the former Minister of Labour and the present Minister of Labour, IRAC and the UTLC. As a result of those discussions, a major new program will be developed by the South Australian Council on Technological Change.

This program is to establish tripartite study teams operating under the aegis of the council to identify new technologies most likely to be introduced in the State over the next decade on an industry by industry basis. Industrial and social problems resulting from such technologies will be referred to appropriate agencies for action. That program will be called the 'Industry and Technology Future Study Program' and in 1985-86 it will be funded from existing MINTECH funding. There have been lengthy discussions between officers of my department and those of the Department of Labour and I can assure the honourable member that the sorts of issues that are referred to IRAC and that are dealt with here will be complementary rather than an overlap.

Mr KLUNDER: How is the proposed industrial relations and technology task force intended to be funded?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I mentioned initially that in 1985-86 it will be from MINTECH funding. I think we have to take on notice ongoing funding beyond that. I ask the Director of MINTECH to comment.

Dr Ellyard: We have to define the program first and that will require the decisions of the Council on Technological Change. Once the program is developed, we will have to look for funding resources. If they are beyond the resources of the Ministry, we will have to seek funds outside, possibly

from the technology innovation program of the State Development Fund.

Mr LEWIS: My question relates to the technology advisory unit in the first instance and to the sorts of skills which people are required to acquire these days if they are to function in a modern office. Does the Minister consider word processing skills to be superior or inferior, in terms of their complexity, to those required by an ordinary stenosecretary who is competent in typing?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: That is a difficult question to answer, because I believe that there are appropriate uses for the skills from each arena and, in fact, a competent stenosecretary is very often involved in different areas from those in which a word processor might be involved. There will be occasions when in fact a stenosecretary is required, or on other occasions a word processor is required. There may be other occasions when skills from both areas are required. It is true that I think we should be providing training opportunities in both areas. I believe that the business study courses in our schools are targeting in on that area, but I do not really want to give a priority rating as to how I, as the Minister or as an individual, want to rate a stenosecretary *vis-a-vis* a word processor.

Mr LEWIS: Does the Government pay people who lecture in word processing skills any more or less than it pays people who lecture in typing and shorthand?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In relation to Education Department teachers who are teaching stenosecretarial skills or word processing skills, there is no difference at all in the pay. Indeed, there is no difference in pay for anyone within our schools except subject to promotion that they may have achieved, or subject to length of service and their position on the pay scale. I believe that the same situation would apply with respect to the Technical and Further Education Department lecturers and I believe, although with less certainty as to the facts of the matter, that the same applies to the private sector deliverers of training in these two areas. As to that last area, I am stating a personal belief—I have no evidence to back it up.

Mr LEWIS: It seems then that the Minister is not aware or interested in the degree of complexity or difficulty relevant to the acquisition or utilisation of the skills once acquired in those two areas. I am curious about that and also as to why the Government has not attempted to make some objective appraisal about relativities in that regard. I will not pursue that matter any further.

I now want to come to the broad spectrum of Government policies. We have a Ministry of Technology and, although we are not debating technical and further education, we also have a Ministry in relation to that. Indeed, it is this Minister who is responsible for training. Is it Government policy, within its own agencies, to have diversity of hardware in the automatic data processing field, or to follow a single line by procuring hardware which is programmed with the same kinds of programs, or capable of being compatible as between brands of hardware using the same programs? I would like to understand the reasons for the decision either to be diverse, specific or narrow in these arenas—hardware, software and training.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The member asked a question, and made a statement to which I must react. He indicated that apparently my answer to previous questions implied that I am not interested in utilisation of skills once acquired. I both refute that and have a degree of amazement as to how that conclusion was drawn from my previous answers. I believe it is not within my capacity to indicate to people within the employment field what they should do or what they should have to have. If they, as employers, indicate to the education system that they have a need for stenosecretary or word processing skills it is not for me to tell them that they are wrong. They will advise me what they want

from the education system and we will do our best to provide those opportunities as resources permit.

It is not a case of me, as Minister of Education, Technology, Employment or whatever, not being interested in utilisation of skills provided to students within the education system. As to the matter of diversity of hardware, the honourable member has not mentioned whether he is referring to all forms of hardware in the data processing field or whether he is targeting in on large or small units (microcomputers). There is no Government policy indicating that one particular brand or another should be purchased. Indeed, the figures indicate that over the wide range of Government departments and statutory authorities a mix of suppliers are providing equipment right through from microcomputers to mainframes.

Clearly, we do support compatibility between machines and software where it is relevant that there should be compatibility. There are cases where within or between departments there should be compatibility. Of course, there are other occasions where there is little relevance or purpose to communication between two sections or two departments. I will ask Mr Kelly or Mr Mitchell to comment further.

Mr Mitchell: There is an important point to understand about computing in the South Australian Government, which does not necessarily apply to all States or other countries: we are needs driven rather than technology driven. We look to satisfy needs first and to buy the technology that best meets those needs in a cost effective manner. The policy of the South Australian Government is to purchase cost effective solutions, which sometimes leads to compatibility—that is the same hardware or software—and sometimes does not. In the software field we have been particularly successful in rationalisation programs. For example, we now have common payroll and ledger systems and common computer languages in certain areas. The main area of compatibility in future will not be hardware or software but communications links which link various types of hardware together. That area is of vital concern at the moment to the Data Processing Board.

Ms LENEHAN: My first question relates to the broad Australian context. Can the Minister say what the Government intends to do about using its purchasing powers to encourage development of innovative and advanced technology industries in Australia?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This is a matter of prime concern to this Government and both the Premier and I have been involved in talking about it at appropriate forums. At the Australian Industries and Technology Council meeting (of Ministers of Technology) we indicated that this should happen. In 1983 we commenced the first review by any Australian State, Territory or Federal Government to find ways and means of using Government procurement policy with a much greater innovation in Australian industry and for the development, adoption and use of advanced technology by Australian industry.

We believe that it was not appropriate for us as a State Government to take this path alone as there could be some disadvantages to any State that stood out in the field without the others being prepared to come with it. Therefore, we have attempted through the the Australian Industry and Technology Council (AITC) to convince other States and the Federal Government to adopt similar programs. We submitted the report at the last meeting of the council. Another meeting of the council will be held in Brisbane in November. We hope that the matter comes up for serious debate in terms of adopting an Australia wide approach. The South Australian report was used in addition as a basis for discussions, along with the report on the same area for the Australian Science and Technology Council (ASTEC). That report has almost been finalised and will be considered by the meeting of Ministers of Industry and Technology in Brisbane in early November.

Ms LENEHAN: I ask a question about the South Australian situation with respect to manufacturing industry, which of course was one of our primary industries and in a sense one of our fundamental industries. What is the Government doing about encouraging adoption of advanced technologies by South Australian manufacturing industry? I am on the Industries Development Committee and have had the opportunity to visit quite a number of South Australian manufacturers. I believe that there is obviously, if I might say so, some need for manufacturers in South Australia to be encouraged to implement forms of technology and certainly advanced technology.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We have been doing a number of things since we have been in government. I have mentioned some committees, but I will recapitulate briefly: first, we promoted the CAD/CAM Advisory Promotion Committee seeking to stimulate interest in computer aided design and manufacturing by South Australian industry, and indeed by South Australian Government departments, because we believed that that was an important area and that South Australia was, relative to other parts of the world, actually behind in the application of CAD and CAM and that it was not a case of getting into a new field ahead of the others, but of catching up in a number of areas.

Another area we have looked at and provided support for is the Biotechnology Promotion Committee. There are biotechnology opportunities available to industry in this State that should be looked at. Recently, that promotion committee released a publication giving information about areas of research presently being undertaken in educational institutions that could be translated into industry in terms of generating production or wealth. They are two examples that we have already looked at. We are looking further, as I recently announced, at whether there can be an aerospace technology promotion committee to promote that area of technology, given the fact that we have some nascent contributors to that within South Australia that could form a very useful base for that kind of industry and a number of other aspects that relate to that.

The other issue we are looking at relates to a manufacturing advisory council and determining the best way of promoting a centre for manufacturing here in South Australia. The general line we are working on at the moment is not so much a centre located in one spot, but a kind of multi-faceted approach to a manufacturing centre that would pick up a number of areas of contribution that we already have. I mention them for the benefit of honourable members. First, we have Regency Park and the facilities there in CAD and CAM as a result of private-public sector cooperation. There is not just the Caddsmen Bureau; there are other examples I can talk about. We have Technology Park and we have at the South Australian Institute of Technology Levels campus a proposal to develop a different kind of CAD facility.

We have the CSIRO manufacturing technology centre at Woodville and, of course, we have other aspects of support that would exist. If all these were brought together in some kind of coordinated program they could form a multi-campus manufacturing centre which would not only be very exciting but would offer very real support to manufacturing industry within this State.

Ms LENEHAN: My question is quite unashamedly parochial. It relates to the whole question already raised in some of the Estimates Committees, certainly by me and the member for Mallee, about the desirability of installing a computerised system in electorate offices. Does the Minister believe that, by introducing a system of computer linked networks, which would access to a whole range of data bases through the library, for example, by having *Hansard* on the computer base, as well as a whole range of other information, including the electoral roll, it would add to

the efficiency and effectiveness of members of Parliament in servicing the needs of their electorate? Does the Minister wish to comment on whether it would be seen by other sectors of South Australian industry and other areas of the economy as the Government giving a lead to other areas in the implementation of computerised facilities in electorate offices?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I have an awful feeling that I am being used to provide information that could well be contained in a bipartisan submission to the Government to approve the purchase of technologies referred to by the honourable member which I know would receive the concurrence of members on both sides. It would certainly add to efficiency as technology exists in the technology arena that would clearly add to the efficiency of the job required of members through their electorate offices. The question that is not appropriate for me to answer is that of cost and where the resources will be found to do that; neither matter is within the direct responsibility of my portfolio as Minister for Technology. As a Minister of Cabinet I would clearly consider that question against competing priorities and to that I cannot give an answer. Of course, it can help. There are many areas of information processing that have been significantly improved to the utility to people by the application of new information technologies.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Stop hedging—are we going to get them or are we not?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am hedging.

Ms LENEHAN: I thank the Minister for the frankness of his answer.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not a question of whether the Minister gave a frank answer or whether he did not.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is obvious—he did not.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I unashamedly admit that I answered the specific question but I have been absolutely equivocal about the implicit question. It is not appropriate for me, as Minister for Technology, to give that answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! For the record, I remind the Minister that the Chair will not allow him to give three answers.

Mr MEIER: My first question relates to page 105 of the yellow book, where it states:

In general there is a trend towards 'brain based' information industries and away from primary and secondary industries within an increasing emphasis on export orientation. New technologies are also being used widely in the public sector to improve efficiency and the level of service.

I think I know what is being hinted at in that sentence, but I wonder to what extent we are looking at projects of the type of the British Alvey project, which is very similar to the Japanese fifth generation project (although the two countries may not agree that they are very similar). However, in essence those projects are there to endeavour to put (in the first place) Britain and (in the second place) Japan ahead in computer technology. It seems, from the bit of information I have on them, that such things as artificial intelligence and intelligence knowledge based on various systems seem to be things being worked on by these countries. I wonder whether our thinking is going in that direction, or whether we are hoping to buy that information from those countries when they have done the research work.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The first comment I make is that with new technologies there is a wide range of such technologies that should be looked at and we should not tunnel vision ourselves with respect to information technologies as being the only opportunities that exist. That is why I mentioned before biotechnology and aerospace technology. With respect to microelectronics and microchip development, certainly there is potential for development in South Australia in some of these areas, and we have seen the very large

scale integrated circuit work being done at Austek, at Technology Park, which is an outgrowth of the CSIRO and into which State Government support has gone.

That, I would argue, represents not something perhaps of the same order of magnitude as the fifth generation study's work in Japan and the UK, but rather a different area of development and research. That is a specific niche in the microchip market being targeted here in South Australia. At the University of Adelaide work is being undertaken with respect to the development of expert systems. Again, this is important work in the new information technology. It is significant niche filling and niche development and again there is the possibility of State support being offered for that subject to the developments reaching the appropriate stage.

Mr MEIER: I recognise that the fifth generation project cost is \$1 000 million and the Alvey project cost is \$350 million, of which \$100 million is coming from private enterprise, while the total line in our budget is only \$1 012 000. That point is recognised. My second question, referring again to page 105, is on a statement in the right hand column under the heading '1985-86 Specific targets/objectives (significant/initiatives/improvements/results sought)', referring to survey needs of small business and proposed means of facilitating their effective use of micro-computers.

Recognising the excellent work being done by the Angle Park Computing Centre, to what extent does the Minister see an establishment such as the Angle Park Computing Centre or the development of it as being the focus for small business and similar institutions requiring help in computers? I realise that Angle Park is under the heading of the Minister of Education at present. Is there any thought of transferring it or bringing it over under the Minister's wing directly?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Certainly Angle Park has done some fascinating and leading work for Australia on computing technology and will continue to do so in the years ahead. With respect to its possible contribution to small business, a more appropriate form of support would be through the Small Business Corporation, situated on South Terrace. It has a computer advisory service, and perhaps the honourable member should take the opportunity to visit it and look at the work it is doing. It offers information to business people who come in there to talk about the appropriateness of new information technologies for their businesses.

I understand that was undertaken because of the survey data being provided in a number of places which showed that over the years the purchase rate and the 12 month down the track utility rate of microcomputing systems by many small businesses is alarmingly low. Many small businesses will buy a microcomputer believing that it will solve their problems, but no-one has spent enough time telling them how to use it to solve their problems. Within 12 months many are not used at all or are being inefficiently used in terms of the money invested in them.

The Small Business Computer Advisory Centre, set up by the Small Business Corporation, attempts to bridge some of the knowledge problems that people might have. I was talking to an officer associated with that centre last week, and I was told that the success rate has been remarkable. There is a large turnover of people coming to the centre, making inquiries, and learning about the systems that are in operation. A person making inquiries there can do so in a quite dispassionate sense, as they are not talking to a person who is keen to sell a certain brand or product. The person there answering inquiries has no barrow to push: that person merely has the job of providing information in

response to the genuine, and understandable, questions that people raise.

Another significant matter that I want to mention here concerns the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia, the body responsible for developing courses for senior secondary education. It has designed interesting courses to begin in 1986, one of which is in relation to small business; another concerns computing, and there is another one involving technology. I think that each of these courses offers great opportunities for educating school age people in relation to important issues involved in this arena.

Mr MEIER: Does the Small Business Computer Advisory Centre provide lessons similar to those provided at Angle Park?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: No, it provides advice to people who come in. It displays a range of different products. It does not actually provide courses. People wanting to undertake a course in computing can go to TAFE, for example, where courses are available. It is not designed to go that far down the track. Its purpose is to bridge some of the initial knowledge gaps that people have. People may go in and explain that they have a problem with their business in terms of processing information, for example, and ask for something to help meet their need. The job of the people offering advice at the centre is simply to help lead people down the right pathway to do that.

I might say that one other thing is taking place. There is a CEP funded project under the Ministry of Technology, designed to survey small business needs with respect to new information technologies. We hope to obtain more data from that, to help us determine what other initiatives should be taken in this area.

Mr MEIER: I can foresee a multitude of computer advisory places being set up. Already there is Angle Park (although I realise that that is for the Education Department), TAFE, which offers courses, the WEA, which I presume offers some courses, and there is the Small Business Computer Advisory Centre. Perhaps some of this needs to be streamlined.

In relation to the budgeted figure for the Ministry of Technology, page 99 of the yellow book indicates that an amount of \$87 000 is a carryover of CEP funding approved for Ministry of Technology projects in 1984-85. Can the Minister provide details of those CEP projects, referring to those undertaken and those that are envisaged?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In relation to the first point made by the honourable member, certainly we do need coordination and a general understanding of what is happening around the place with respect to computer advice. I do not really know that Angle Park can be confused with the other two centres referred to. It has quite a specific target audience to address. Perhaps I would go in a slightly different direction, in that, given a free rein in relation to what ought to happen, I would like to see the situation where schools with computing networks are actually running courses for themselves, for parents and people in the community who want to know how to use computers.

These resources have been developed by direct community funding for the most part, and built into schools, while many people in the community want to know how to use computers. We need to examine how we can get the education system to encourage that kind of course participation. It will need some encouragement and some oiling of the system for that to happen. Maybe we could get better value from these computers in this way rather than having them sitting there unused when the school closes down at 3.30 or 3.45 p.m. This would be a kind of decentralising, in offering more courses around the place. But I take the point about coordinating what is happening generally. Perhaps we ought to be educating in the same direction, if we want the same sort of message to be coming through and to be consistent.

Mr MEIER: I know of three schools in my electorate which have been offering computer courses.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes, there are examples of that, but such an initiative has been taken by relatively few schools. As to the CEP funding referred to, the projects that have been carried over include the art and technology project, which seeks to further develop the use of advanced technology in the arts and to enable artists to obtain access to new and advanced technology. Initial funding has been used to establish an art and technology centre, and an amount of \$18 000 was involved. There is the computing needs of small business projects, which I mentioned a few moments ago and which involved some \$18 000.

There are two projects arising from the Education Technology Task Force. One is a program to investigate initiatives taken overseas with respect to technology and education. An investigation has been conducted in consultation with experts who were commissioned by the task force to provide advice. An amount of \$35 000 is involved. There is another education and technology project to establish a consultative process with respect to technology and change in society. A process has been established and is being extended by the task force, with funds being made available by the State Government. The task force is extending the consultation program to negotiate with business, employers, employees, unions, and the education community about their preferred changes to the South Australian education system. An amount of \$18 000 is involved.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I refer to a program on page 99 of the yellow book in relation to which there is reference to assessing the impact of technological change on employment. Can the Minister indicate what work has been carried out to look at the impact that technological change has had on employment, particularly in manufacturing industry? Can the Minister indicate whether there has been a drop in employment through such changes and, if so, how great has that drop been?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is hard to give ballpark figures for the whole of manufacturing industry, because the situation varies in different areas of manufacturing industry. In some areas, for example the rubber and plastics industries, have actually experienced a growth in employment over a five-year period and in fact a much larger growth in terms of economic output over the same period. One would guess that other industries have had a smaller decline in employment than otherwise would have been the case, had it not been for new technologies, while it is acknowledged that other industries have faced a large decline in new employment because of new technologies. The situation varies from industry to industry.

Recently a report was prepared in relation to the bread-making industry. It is quite clear that new technology in that industry has already had a significantly deleterious effect on employment patterns, and a lot of jobs will go. However, as I have said with respect to plastics and rubber, there has been some growth in employment in those industries and a quite large growth in economic output. It is difficult to answer this generally in relation to the whole of the manufacturing industry. The technology and future studies program is designed to target the specific areas of industry to do some guesstimating in this area. I would have to say that I believe that there has been a capacity on the part of industry already to make certain adjustments with respect to employment patterns over a number of years.

That is the other question that we must address, namely, that in relation to movement between industry and industry of people who are not able to continue to work in one industry and who move into another. It is not always a case of having to look at retraining opportunities: sometimes a

change can be made without the necessity for retraining programs.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: A drop of 14 000 in manufacturing employment in South Australia has occurred in the past three years. The Minister has just indicated that there appears to be some impact from technological change and in some areas that impact has been greater than in others. We have had this drop of 14 000. It would be fair to say that there has been increased economic activity over that period, because that 14 000 took place at the end of what was an economic recession throughout the world. No-one could deny that there has been a lift in demand, both in Australia and overseas, and certainly in South Australia, over that period. Therefore, what is a fair indication of how much of that 14 000 is a drop in employment due to technological change? Can we expect, for instance, a similar drop? These are fairly significant sorts of percentages that we are referring to. They represent 10 per cent plus of our manufacturing industry, and yet it would appear that very little has been done to assess how rapidly that has occurred and whether it is going to continue to occur.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I make the point again that certain industries have been targeted for study and reports have come back on that. One was breadmaking; one was automated fuel systems; another one has been electronic funds transfer; there have also been studies in other areas both in this State and other States. In many cases they may indicate that there will be job loss as a result of technological change.

The overall more important question, however, that should be considered is what would the employment levels have been if there had not been technological change. It has been an argument that I put that, in a global sense, the job loss situation may well have been worse. The capacity of Australian industry to be competitive in the international marketplace has depended on its capacity to adopt new technologies as appropriate. Had it not done so, there may have been much larger levels of bankruptcy or retrenchments having taken place. I do not want to dispute the fact that there has been in a real sense a loss of manufacturing jobs over the last three years—that certainly is acknowledged—but there is a caveat that I want to give about comparing 1985 manufacturing sector figures with, say, 1970 or 1975 manufacturing sector figures.

There is some evidence to believe that there was masking of certain kinds of jobs in years gone by that nowadays are covered within the information sector or the quaternary sector or a subset of the tertiary sector. In other words, certain services that are now being provided separately and being identified separately—accounting services, financial services, consulting services, public relations services, advertising services, and so on—certain elements of that in the not so far distant past were in fact just lumped into the manufacturing sector because they were being done in house. When the employment figures were provided by manufacturing enterprises they were not separating those out.

I am not for one minute trying to underestimate that there have been real job losses. The point is that globally there could well have been more job losses. The other thing is that, if we fear that there is an industry where there is to be an effect, we need to target that for the subject of special study, as we have done on a number of specific industries.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I would like to come back to this point and quote figures used by the Premier in his budget papers, particularly in the paper 'The South Australian Economy'. He quotes only for two of the last three years. The drop in employment from 1981-82 to 1982-83 is 8.6 per cent. The drop then to the next year 1983-84 is 5.7 per cent. If we take that 14 000 job drop, that represents

about a 12 per cent drop in manufacturing employment over a three-year period.

I would suggest (and I think the figures suggest) that it has been the most dramatic change in manufacturing employment that has occurred in that three-year period. It is a far more dramatic change than any change in manufacturing employment in any year before this. The part that I am highlighting is that we appear to have come to a watershed in terms of the impact of technological change on manufacturing employment. Tell me if I am wrong to sum up a factor like the decline in economic activity of our manufacturing sector, but I could only assume that it is through automation, assuming that output has remained or has increased (and if we look at value added during that period, whilst it has increased, it might not have increased with inflation). It is hard to average it over the full period, but it appears to have kept pace at least with inflation.

One can only assume, therefore, that what has occurred has been a very dramatic change in employment in the last three years due to technological change. I believe that, because that change has been so dramatic, it needs more than a casual study of looking at certain industries. It has occurred so quickly. I am not arguing against the introduction of new technology. I agree entirely with your argument, that if you do not do it, you will lose the jobs at an even faster rate, but I wonder if it is not starting to occur because in fact our industry has not kept up with technology, is still not keeping up with technology, and is falling further and further behind in the race.

I think it is time for an immediate assessment. Where do we stand in terms of our technology in the manufacturing industry compared with our competitors overseas? All the evidence suggests that we fare very poorly. There has been a very dramatic change in employment due to automation. The real cold effects of that are only just starting to come through now.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I certainly agree that there are some important issues there—namely, the way in which industry has or has not adapted and suddenly needs to lift its game or the access that it may have to the capacity to lift its game. I spoke earlier of the work being done in terms of a multicampus approach to an advisory centre for manufacturing technology, to provide a wider degree of support for manufacturing industry to make the sorts of changes it is going to need to make. I also mentioned the concern that we had as a State Government that CAD and CAM were not adequately being picked up by industry in this State.

I also want to reiterate the fact that from information I have seen (and I do not have it available with me tonight to quote figures) concerning the situation over the last five years, there has also been a significant impact on the employment level in manufacturing industry that has been economically related. The health of the economy has had a lot to do with it, as have other extraneous factors. I point to the heavy engineering industry. I mentioned a moment ago about the AITC. One of the prime items of concern upon the agenda of that council has been heavy engineering. The reason for that concern has been partly issues of the state of the economy and its impact upon heavy engineering, but, secondly, the downturn or finishing up of major projects and no new projects coming on stream, or not sufficient new projects coming on stream to keep up the level of activity.

Clearly, the question of technology in that industry has also been of concern to that council and issues like CAD and the manufacturing centre address themselves to that, too. There is an industry that was reacting to economic circumstances plus other circumstances, and I do not think that we want to discount the effect of the economic recession of the early 1980s upon manufacturing employment.

If the member wants more data on that from the sources that advise me on that matter, I would be happy to provide it. I take the point that we do not want to sit back here, blithely ignoring the impact of technological change. We want to make sure that our manufacturing industry is well armed to make the changes necessary to keep their economic strength such that employment opportunities are maintained.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I would certainly appreciate any information that the Minister could supply or that the officers may have in that area, because it does concern me. I appreciate that there has been a change in the heavy manufacturing and metals manufacturing area, the prefabrication area, but we still have companies like Mason and Cox that have gone into receivership in the last three weeks, a company producing in the foundry area that must have the reputation of one of the best foundry companies in Adelaide. The list of foundries that have closed their doors or gone into receivership in South Australia in the past three years is an astounding one. There are about six or seven fairly notable companies.

We have the company that partly manufactures, assembles and distributes pumps throughout Australia. That company went into receivership a couple of months ago and has now been sold as a going concern to a Victorian company and is now based in Victoria. The signs are there that the hard core of our manufacturing industry is in trouble. It is important that we have an assessment of how serious is that trouble and what change we can expect across the board in manufacturing employment over the next few years.

Regarding the computer facilities of the Education Department at Angle Park, the former Director of that centre has now taken up an appointment elsewhere in the education system, and I understand that the person appointed in his place as Director has taken a job in private enterprise. To what extent is the facility at Angle Park coping with the needs of teaching teachers in this State in the use of computers? How many teachers have received basic training through that facility over the past 12 months, and in fact over the past three years, so as to give an indication of the trend?

From my contact with teachers and school councils, I believe that there is still a reluctance and almost a fear in the teaching profession concerning computers. Certainly, there is an ignorance as to their use. The one disappointing thing that has come through so far is that teachers are not using computers correctly as an educational tool: they are using them as a means of encouraging the kids to go off and do an hour on a computer awareness course once a week. They are not deriving the maximum educational benefit from computers.

Further, from what I can see, it is being used as a plaything in the lunch hour by students. Indeed, most of the computer work being done in schools is simply a repetition of what the students are doing at home: playing the same sort of games and achieving the same kind of child-minding facility from the use of computers instead of using them as a tool.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will get the department to supply whatever figures are available for the past three years in respect of the teaching service provided by the Angle Park computing centre, as well as information on the use of computers by students there, if such information is available. I understand that the level of individual student use has fallen because the centre has devoted more of its energies and resources to the servicing and development area and courseware development area, regarding those as two priority areas that it must presently target. I will get those

figures and hopefully have them subsequently incorporated in *Hansard*.

The honourable member is correct when he says that there is an element of caution or uncertainty concerning computers among teachers, many of whom who do not wish to know about them or do not know how to use them. In some schools, when a computer is purchased, it is not placed in the classroom, the resource centre or any special subject area: it is placed in the staff room and left there for people to get used to it and to play around with, thereby coming to terms with what it can and cannot do. It has been found that after a few months of that treatment more people feel comfortable with the computer.

Earlier, the honourable member was absent for a few moments when the Director of the Ministry said that we would be shortly releasing a paper by Jonathan Anderson on the rationale for educational use of computers in schools. I have undertaken to give members a copy of this paper so that they might have his views on the use of computers in education, because that is a legitimate area of debate. There are various schools of thought. Some people suggest that the computer has no role in education. Indeed, it has even been said that they should not be in the primary school. On the other hand, there are those who say that computers have a significant role, although there is a divergence in thought as to what that role should be. Some people suggest that computers are there only to teach about computing technology. Others see them as a learning aid for all areas of the curriculum. Others would suggest that the playing around activity with the computer is in itself a useful educational experience, whereas others say it is not. The paper to which I have referred should stimulate further debate on this matter as an addition to a debate that is alive and well in our schools.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I apologise for my temporary absence from the Committee while I was answering a telephone call. My next question concerns the Data Processing Board. First, could the Committee have a complete list of all consultancies in the computing areas that have been used over the past 12 months and an indication of the areas in which such consultancies have worked? I should like that information to be an across the board assessment of work done for the Government and not necessarily of those taken on by the Data Processing Board.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will provide as much information as we can in reply to those questions.

Mr Mitchell: Could we know what the honourable member requires? Only recently, the Data Processing Board received a request from the Public Accounts Committee for a list of computing consultancies let over the past 12 months, their terms of reference, and the results of their work.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That sounds basically the sort of information that I require. Perhaps the information supplied to the Public Accounts Committee could be supplied to this Committee at the same time. Can the Minister indicate how much progress, if any, is being made by the Motor Registration Division in the installation and operation of an online computer for motor vehicle registration?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This matter is presently out to tender. Tenders will close soon and, after they have been evaluated, a decision will be made.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: A decision on what?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The whole on-line system, including hardware and software, is out to tender.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: For six years, we have been sitting around waiting for a decision to be made. As a member of the Budget Review Committee, I remember being promised that the installation of on-line computers in the Motor Registration Division would save 30 jobs in the first year. We were told that savings would pay for the

computer within 18 months, that enormous benefits would be derived from its operation, and that eventually as many as 80 staff positions would be saved.

Submissions have been made to the Public Service Board and much has been promised, but the whole thing keeps on being a mirage in the future. A year ago, the Estimates Committee was told that that system was to be put into operation during the next 12 months with consequent staff savings. Can the Minister say whether the system is out to tender and when we will see the benefits of this greatest promise ever?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I will not incorporate the tender specification in *Hansard* because it is too thick, but I will incorporate a potted version.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Could we expect the system to be operating within the next 12 months?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I suggest that the honourable member take a rain check on this question and ask me on next year's Estimate Committee: it should be up and running by then.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I think that there will be a technical problem in relation to that. I think that we will be in a different position, so the Minister might have to ask me.

Mr Kelly: The Motor Vehicle Registration Division carried out a feasibility study which was appraised by the Data Processing Board. Within the feasibility study staff savings were taken into account, as was a schedule of implementation giving a specific date for full operation of the system. Having appraised the feasibility study, it went to Cabinet and, through Cabinet, permission was given to go to tender. Tender itself would not, of course, necessarily indicate when the system would be installed—it would be the feasibility study. The Motor Vehicle Registration Division had gone through all the authorised Government procedures of appraisal.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Who is the reluctant bride in relation to this? Is it the Motor Vehicle Registration Division? I understand that there is an on-line system in Western Australia that can be picked up, put into place in South Australia and be operating within six months. That has been there for approximately three years waiting for someone to pick it up and use it here.

Mr Kelly: The Motor Vehicle Registration Division, in considering whether it should go out to tender, made an analysis of all systems operating in all States. It felt, based on its needs, that there was a need to go to tender, look at the market place and see what the most cost-effective solution was. I am not aware of the Western Australian system, but, based on my experience, I doubt that it could be installed successfully within six months in another State.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I will not argue with that, because I understand that it is operating and that they are willing and have even offered to supply the software and everything else. It would be a very simple process, but I raise again that this Parliament, year after year, has been disappointed with the delays that have occurred. I thought it was bad enough when my Party was in government, but that was three years ago and we now find that there have been further delays of another three years. They seem to keep throwing it off to different bodies, partly to the Public Service Board to look at what sort of savings it can achieve, and what it will do with the staff, then partly to Treasury, and then partly, obviously, to the Data Processing Board. Someone needs to grasp the nettle and tell the department to implement the system rather quickly. I am pleased to hear that it is at least out to tender and that we may see some assessment shortly, but it has really been a hopeless situation.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There has been an extensive period of time involved in this and it needs to come to a firm resolution soon. As to the matter of the Western Australian system, I am not able to comment on that area. We will investigate that avenue, but that is all I can comment upon.

The CHAIRMAN: I wondered whether we could adjourn for 10 minutes. Are there any objections?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If it helps, I have finished this area and would like to spend the last hour on employment, but I am in the hands of any other members.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we had better straighten that position out now, because I have news for the Committee. It will not be spending the last hour on employment, because, despite what might have been written or not written, nobody can show me in the line with which we are dealing, whether or not we recommit the lines, where any money has been laid down on the question of employment. Perhaps we had better fix that up straight away.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: All I can indicate is that I understood that there were discussions between the leaders of the Parties as to the best way of handling matters in the area of employment, youth affairs and labour and that it had been determined that the most appropriate proposition that should be put before the appropriate Committees would be that the Committee would seek, by leave, to discuss the matter and that is what I understand ought to be happening now—that this Committee ought to be seeking, by leave (and I understand that Standing Orders provide for that to happen)—

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If I could back that up, as I understand it the Department of Labour has three different answers for three different Ministers: one is the Minister of Labour, one is the Minister of Employment, and one is the Minister of Youth Affairs. I understood that there was a clear understanding (and this was some weeks ago and it has certainly been conveyed to me) that on employment and training matters we would have the opportunity of questioning the Minister this evening, and the Minister seems to be of the same opinion, otherwise we are assuming that something like two-thirds of the Department of Labour budget cannot be debated or examined, because we are already through that line. I think that that was discussed either this afternoon, this morning, or yesterday.

Ms LENEHAN: That has not come up yet.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! What the honourable member for Davenport has said is not correct. The only lines that could possibly be linked with youth employment are to be found in the Minister of Labour's lines. It may be that, when the Minister of Labour is before the Committee, the particular Chairman might have some elasticity and allow the Committee to cross-examine him. I point out quite seriously that we are in some difficulty because, as everybody knows, this department has recently been formed and obviously Treasury has not had time to allocate certain budgetary requirements that would be normal within the lines.

If the Chair on this occasion allowed the Committee to debate something or ask questions about something that is not in a line, it opens up a Pandora's box as far as the particular Chairman is concerned. All we are doing in Committee is talking about and seeking advice about particular lines. If those lines are not before us, then I rule, purely and simply, that we cannot seek advice about them. That is the way I feel about it, and that is the way I stand on it.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Mr Chairman, can I comment on this? I find it incredible that this Parliament has reached certain gentlemen's agreements on how to handle these Estimates lines and it has done so for at least three weeks. There has been a clear understanding between the Govern-

ment and the Opposition as to when certain lines can be debated. We have come along this evening to examine the employment line. I sit here and observe in the gallery officers from the Department of Labour who have, no doubt, dedicated their time to come here and help with this examination this evening.

We now find that, although there is a general agreement and understanding between the Minister and the Opposition, and I understand the Government benches, on this, we are about to be stopped in our efforts to examine what appears to be about two-thirds of the Department of Labour line on what I think is an extremely important issue. I find it incredible that suddenly at this stage some vague technicality has been raised. This Parliament has things in its own hands: we can decide what we want to do within the Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: We can simply do that.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is beginning to take exception to the member for Davenport. We have in front of us certain budgetary lines that cover youth employment. If the honourable member for Davenport takes the time to look at the program to see what we are doing, I defy him to show me where in that program or in the budget papers we are dealing with any such line.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: You have thrown me a challenge, Sir. I have before me a formal publication of this Parliament called 'Estimates Committees Timetable' which shows that on Wednesday 25 September at 11 a.m. two committees will be sitting. One is Committee A, which is the sheet I have before me. Under that it has the Minister of Education, Minister for Technology and Minister of Employment. I would think that, therefore, under Minister of Employment it is right and proper for this Committee to discuss employment programs and the allocation of funds to those programs with the Minister who is responsible for them. You have asked me, Sir, and I have given you the evidence. You asked for the details: it is an official publication of the Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Davenport has used the word 'unemployment'. He wants to talk about the Youth Bureau and youth affairs.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No, it is employment and training.

The CHAIRMAN: Youth employment.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: No.

The CHAIRMAN: What the Chair is saying is that there is nothing in the budget papers before us that makes it possible for the Committee to debate those matters, because there is no such line. I will not allow a debate. If the honourable member for Ascot Park wishes to speak, that is fair enough, but I will not allow a debate on this issue.

Mr TRAINER: We seem to be in a bit of a constitutional quandary, but not through ill will on anyone's part. When this matter was raised we were on the point of adjourning. I suggest that we adjourn for a time, anyway, and during the break see if we can find some way around this quandary.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I am quite happy to accept that suggestion; it is the best thing at this stage. I have just been looking at this yellow publication, another official publication with the crest of the State on it, and it certainly mentions the Minister of Employment and funds allocated to him. I appreciate that we are debating other documents, but this yellow document is simply a different breakdown of those other documents. It allocates funds, programs and everything else for the Minister of Employment.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that at this stage we will have a break. I point out to the Committee quite strongly that I am quite firm on this question. If there is nothing before the Committee as such then it should not be debated.

[Sitting suspended from 9.5 to 9.25 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have given serious thought to what was raised prior to the short adjournment and, because it is obvious to all that the Government has set down a very firm policy on the matter that we have debated, and because it is very obvious that part of the expenditure that will be budgeted for is literally under the control of three Ministers, it is going to be rather awkward for the Opposition to ask questions of one Minister and get the right answers. The other point is that there has been some agreement between the Opposition and the Government. On that basis I am prepared to allow the debate to continue, but point out that I do not believe, as Chairman, that there is a line in the budget before us to cover that point. I make that quite clear. Secondly, I make quite clear that I am a little astounded that there should be some sort of an agreement without my knowledge. Thirdly, if I do allow this I make quite clear that it is not to create a precedent. Are there any questions?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I thank you, Mr Chairman, for your consideration of this matter and, on behalf of those who are party to the agreements made, I give an apology that that information had not been extended to you and the matter taken further. Can I also bring down some officers with respect to this matter of employment?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Mr Chairman, we appreciate your flexibility and review of this matter and the cooperation that has been achieved.

Mr LEWIS: Before we take a vote on the lines that were before the Committee prior to the adjournment, I wish to pursue a couple of matters that will only take a couple of minutes, if that is acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will allow it, but I am sorry that the length of time has been reduced. If the honourable member keeps it short, he will not deprive his colleague of any questions.

Mr LEWIS: I refer to a convention to be held in Adelaide in a fortnight's time, from 8 to 10 October, called 'The Management Information Technology Convention for South Australia and the Northern Territory'. I am sure that the Minister would be aware of the convention, as the glossy promotional brochure has his picture on the front cover. Regrettably, members of Parliament will not be able to participate in the Management and Information Technology Convention, as it conflicts with the sittings of the House. A wide range of subject matters, designed to bring people up to date with the state of the art and its application in technological terms, will be discussed, including automatic data processing and management in a wide range of activities within the economy.

Matters to be discussed include the future of Australian manufacturing industry, computer related technologies, office automation, the key to better management developments in EDP inventory control for accounting and auditing purposes, the implications of computer technology on future curriculums, advanced communications for Government (a matter about which we learnt something tonight), commerce and industry, and the secretary in today's computerised environment. Also, a number of workshops will be held, and the one to which I wish to refer and ask a question about concerns the workshop called 'Smart card—The impact'.

Within the knowledge of the Minister's purview of his portfolio, has the advisory board or any other agency had any impact into the application of the 'smart card' as a means of providing drivers licences, for instance, instead of using outmoded, outdated and more destructible pieces of paper and plastic, such as those that we use as present?

I believe that the 'smart card' approach to providing people with proof positive of their identity would be a more

sensible way of ensuring that a driver's licence, for instance, actually belongs to the person who claims to be the owner of it. 'Smart cards' can incorporate such things as magnetic information that can be read off through a machine that gives a facsimile reproduction of a photograph of the individual concerned, as well as citizenship or birth certificate number, date of issue, details of whether or not it is current, and for what forms—and without it being possible to forge them. I want to know whether or not any of the Minister's departmental staff have been consulted in relation to possible changes in technology which would enable us to more accurately identify who belongs to which driver's licence, for example, than at present under the existing system.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am not aware of any discussions concerning this matter. As the relevant officers have now gone, I will ask them later to advise me on this matter, and I shall provide a report to the honourable member.

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister undertake to seek information from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles about the application of that technology to its needs in this respect, namely, the provision of drivers licences?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I shall seek that information through the Minister of Transport.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr H.R. Bachmann, Director, Department of Labour.

Mr P. Bentley, Deputy Director, Department of Labour.

Mr B. Bartlett, Chief Administrative Officer, Department of Labour.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I want to ask the Minister a number of questions about the various employment programs that the Government has initiated. Will the Minister provide an assessment as to how many people will be taken up under traineeships in 1986?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The information that I have is that there will be 1 600 traineeships in 1986. The starting times for those will be staggered. I am advised as to the nature of the staggering that there are 1 600 for the financial year, some of whom will be starting in late January and others will be starting later. I am not able to provide further information at this stage.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: There are 1 600 starting in late January, or was it 800?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There are 1 600 who will commence within the financial year. Some will start in late January and others will start later.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: How many of those will be in the State Government?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I understand that we are looking at as many as 500 in government, in the public sector.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Of the 500 who are starting work with the Government, how many of those will simply replace the normal intake of young people taken in through the Public Service Board who will not be taken in through that means? To what extent is there substitution of that 500?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The advice I have on the provision of funds is that none of it will be by means of substitution.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I seek information about how many young people were taken on last year, this year, at the beginning of the year, and how many will be taken in at the beginning of next year under the normal intake of young people? I seek that differentiation without including in those figures any of the traineeships.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will provide that information for *Hansard*.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the 500 trainees taken on in government not include substitutions for people otherwise taken on in normal employment?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes. We will include that information.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Premier announced last Sunday week the YES program that we have debated in the House already (something picked up from Victoria). Can the Minister indicate what has been the total cost of the YES program?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I understand that the State funding involved in the YES program is \$4.85 million in this financial year. In addition, it is coordinated with funding provided by the Commonwealth Priority One program. We are seeing the two linking with each other and there will be further funds committed in the following two financial years.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Can the Minister indicate what the Commonwealth contribution will be?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The State contribution is \$4.85 million. The problem is that it is hard to work out at this stage what the full Commonwealth contribution will be because there are still discussions between the State and the Commonwealth with respect to certain programs they have announced and we are not yet satisfied with some of the propositions they are making. When we get a final figure we will do our best to incorporate that in the information to be supplied.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I seek a breakdown of how the \$4.8 million will be spent on the program. Further, what is the total cost of the publicity program currently being undertaken by the Government that the Premier launched last Sunday week, which includes television advertisements, all brochures and all other material relating to that present program?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: In answer to the initial question of the \$4.8 million, I have figures totalling \$4.81 million and I will have a copy inserted in *Hansard*, as follows:

EXTRA FUNDS REQUIRED 1985-86 TO 1987-88
FOR NEW PROGRAMS AND EXPANSIONS (\$'000)

Program	Estimated Budget		
	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
Department of Labour			
Bridging the Gap	45	85	85
CITY High Schools	31	121	121
CITY Rural	101	101	101
Disabled Persons Training	80	80	—
Government G.A.S.	—	192	288
Group Apprenticeship Scheme	196	139	157
Group Training Schemes	100	150	200
Jubilee Y.E.P.	928	817	—
L.E.D.	87	160	160
S.E.V.S.	348	348	348
Traineeships	90	128	152
Training Centres	36	35	—
New Initiatives	—	—	744
Publicity and Promotion	265	200	200
	2 307	2 556	2 556
Department of TAFE			
	1986	1987	1988
Apprenticeships	1 400	1 400	1 400
New Opportunities for Women	56	112	112
Pre-Vocational Training	1 540	3 008	3 991
Traineeships	500	1 000	1 250
TAFE Equity	1 315	1 315	1 315
	4 811	6 835	8 068

	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88
Financial Year Estimate	2 406	5 823	7 452
Total	4 713	8 379	10 008

N.B. These amounts are additional to 1984-85.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I would like a copy of that information, too.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes. A publicity contract has been let for \$160 000 to cover the cost of the Government's television, radio and press advertisements, printed material in the form of brochures and posters is being printed through the Government Printer at an approximate cost of \$100 000. In all, 12 pamphlets have been produced and eight posters. These are being sent out to employers, all local councils and school councillors (staff at schools).

A further \$5 000 has been provided for publicity purposes for such miscellaneous things as posters. In all, the allocation has been the provision of an extra \$265 000 for publicity and promotion. This has been apportioned across three programs in the following ways: youth services not elsewhere considered, \$15 000; industrial and commercial training, \$80 000; employment and employee sectors, \$170 000.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That \$265 000 which you just outlined, does that cover all of the program? Are there any other additional costs or associated areas as part of that total package?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: This is the total estimated cost. If we ran out of all the brochures, there would have to be a reprint, in which case that will cost extra, and that may not be provided for here.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Did you indicate that in fact there were brochures already being reprinted? Has that decision already been made?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Part of the cost that I quoted was \$100 000 for brochures and posters being printed. There are 12 pamphlets and eight posters. Some of those pamphlets are updated versions of some earlier pamphlets on earlier schemes that these new schemes are a successor to, or are continuing schemes that are now incorporated in the broad package. To that extent, they are certainly reprints.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: There are no other costs involved whatsoever in that program? The \$265 000 covers the entire costs?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am advised that that is the full cost for publicity information for this financial year for the programs.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is not anticipated to increase beyond that?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Well, the only caveats that I give on that are first, if there needs to be any reprinting of material, in which case that could lead to some extra cost. Secondly, that is the budget that we have given for the program. We need to await final receipt of accounts from various people including the Government Printer and the media through whose avenues the advertisements have appeared. I think you could say that is safely the approximate figure.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: So, what you are saying is the actual cost is simply an estimate at this stage; the final accounts have not come in, and there is a distinct possibility that it could blow out beyond the \$265 000?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: No, that is not reasonable. We have in fact pre-booked the advertisements, the number of advertisements that will appear in both the printed media and the electronic media, so that is a finite figure. There is no suggestion that suddenly this Saturday we will decide to run 100 advertisements where previously there was only

one scheduled. There is a schedule that has already gone out and has been agreed to. It will not blow out.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Could I have some indication of what the cost was of actually producing the television commercial?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am advised that the cost to produce the television advertisement was between \$10 000 and \$15 000.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That includes all fees, to both the people who starred or featured in the advertisement as well as to the advertising agency?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes. Incidentally, it is worth noting that all the young people who appear in the advertisement are in fact young people who could well be potential beneficiaries of these schemes.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Could the Minister indicate what sort of response there has been to that campaign?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is early days yet. However, I can say that there have been calls for brochures and information about the scheme. I do not have any quantified data on that matter but between 350 and 500 calls have been received by the hotline to date, plus calls to regional offices or other access points for information where people might guess that information might be available. That is the response to that.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Is that figure of between 350 and 500 a guesstimate?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes. We are monitoring the exact number so that we can supply more accurate data when the hotline is completed.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: How long is the publicity program due to run?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The current part of the campaign will run for five weeks, and a subsequent part will run for two weeks in January 1986.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Do the costs include provision for the January campaign?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

Membership:

Mr Groom substituted for Mr Klunder.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I notice in the figures provided to me that the blowout will occur as a result of increased funding in future years in the TAFE sector. The figures before me indicate that the TAFE estimate for 1986 is \$4.8 million; in 1987 it is \$6.8 million; and in 1988 it is \$8 million. What is the funding source for the fairly significant increase in costs for the program over the next three years?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It is proposed that, basically, it will come out of State Government resources and, therefore, I suppose out of general revenue. The funding in this year's budget has been provided by the vote we considered earlier today which resulted in an increase of about 4 per cent in real terms in the TAFE budget largely because of accommodating this program.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Was it the Minister's intention to reduce the allocation for the Commonwealth employment program this year? Has there been a switch or substitution of CEP for program in the TAFE sector?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The extent to which there has been a drawing of funds from that area has been with respect to the funds available for State Government sponsorship of projects, that is, money that in the previous financial year was allocated by the State Government to assist in the funding of projects being run by Government departments or authorities.

Last year the State Government provided \$2 million for Government departments and statutory authorities to participate in the Community Employment Program. This

amount included provision for grants under the Home Assistance Scheme for which we have proposed \$900 000 as a separate item. This year the Commonwealth has reduced its contribution to South Australia under CEP. This has caused the State to reconsider its position, and it is not therefore proposed to have a separate State fund from which department or State authorities could obtain funds to participate with new projects in the program.

However, the State has offset this reduction in its proposal for employment and employee incentives by proposing to increase its expenditure by \$2.897 million. In addition, industrial and commercial training is to be increased by about \$1 million. Certainly, it is true that the State Government sponsorship for CEP undertaken through Government departments and statutory authorities is finishing. Those funds are being reallocated to these programs, among others.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister indicate whether the federal Government has indicated its intention regarding CEP? The Kirby report contains the strong recommendation that CEP should be phased out and that traineeships and other training schemes should take its place and use those funds. Will the Minister indicate whether that will occur and whether the Federal Government has given a clear indication of its longer term intentions?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The advice I have is that CEP is certainly continuing into 1986. I am advised that the Commonwealth Cabinet presently has a submission before it with respect to a successor for CEP to take effect after 1987 and beyond. No decisions are yet available on that. Certainly, for 1986 CEP will continue.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: At this stage it appears that it will operate for another year, and then another program will operate?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: In relation to the figures the Minister provided, while there will be a significant increase in training, it appears that the biggest increase will be in prevocational training: in 1986, \$1.6 million has been set aside; in 1987, \$3 million; and in 1988, \$4 million. Will the Minister indicate whether the number of people involved in prevocational training has increased recently or whether it has remained static? Will the Minister also indicate the numbers of people likely to be trained under that program in each of those three years?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: It certainly has increased in recent years. In fact, I provided that information during the debate in this House on youth employment questions some time ago. I will have the relevant data incorporated. I will refer the honourable member to figures I quoted in the House during a no-confidence debate on the matter. In relation to what is proposed for next year and the subsequent two years, I am advised that the prevocational training figure for next year is 1 100; the year after, 1 400; and the year after, 1 600. If I recall rightly the figure for 1983 was about 500 to 600. I will obtain the accurate figures. Mr Bentley says that the figure may have been 650. I refer the honourable member to the figures I quoted during the no-confidence debate on this matter, because I then had the actual tabular statement in front of me.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Can that table be incorporated in *Hansard*?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will incorporate in *Hansard* the table for the prevocational figures for the past three years and the projected figures for the next three years.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister indicate what he sees as the potential number of trainees to be trained under the scheme based on the allocation of funds given here for the calendar years 1986, 1987 and 1988?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The figures for trainees for next year, as previously announced, are 1 600; for the year after, 3 000; and the year after that, 4 000.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I thought the figure of 1 600 was for this financial year. Are not funds allocated on a calendar year basis?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: We will try to translate those financial year figures into calendar year figures.

Mr MEIER: Over the weekend a constituent who runs a farm and has an interest in a machinery business (retail sales) contacted me. I advised him to ring the hotline, which I assume he would have done during the past day or two. To what extent can rural producers expect to obtain assistance from this scheme?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I believe that, depending upon the kind of concerns they have, the CITY rural program would offer itself for young people in rural areas. The other thing that has happened during the life of this Government has been the declaration of farming as a declared vocation. That has been approved by Cabinet and, indeed, TAFE is making the necessary resource adjustments in terms of providing an extra base. We discussed that this afternoon. Extra bases have been available in the vocation of farming within TAFE. It was introduced in late 1984 and the first people were recruited in early 1985. At the end of the last financial year almost 100 contracts of training had been registered in the declared vocation of farming and, as I say, additional funds have been allocated in that area in the 1985-86 budget, so there is that program, which is a pre-existing program that started late last year. There is also the CITY rural program, which is designed to extend to rural youth the kind of work that Community Involvement Through Youth has been doing very successfully in the metropolitan area.

Mr MEIER: To what extent would an employer be assisted when he takes on a trainee?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I might ask Mr Bachmann to give the exact information as to the figures.

Mr Bachmann: The current indications are that the Commonwealth will support any employer who takes on a trainee by subsidising a person's salary at \$1 000 per employee per annum.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Can I point out a discrepancy between the figures given by the Minister on the sheet just a moment ago. You have given for bridging the gap \$45 000 this financial year. The official budget paper showed that they got \$95 000. I think that the Government announcement was in fact \$95 000.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes, I am advised that the figure for 1985-86 is in fact an incremental figure over and above what was already applied in those areas. I am certain that the honourable member would understand that, for example, in relation to apprenticeships, where they clearly cost more than \$1.4 million, that is the incremental figure that is involved. The figure of \$95 000 for bridging the gap in fact incorporates the expansion funds plus existing funds in that area.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: So, these are extra funds required?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: So, in fact, what you are saying is that it is \$2.4 million extra this year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is \$5.8 million extra the next year after that?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: And it is \$7.4 million extra the year after that?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Yes.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That is not total expenditure but, rather, additional expenditure. I presume that it is not additional expenditure based on the previous year, but additional expenditure based on the present base? The \$7.4 million extra in 1987-88 is not extra over and above the \$5.8 million but includes the \$5.8 million of the previous year?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: You relate back the increment to 1984-85, so that in fact the 1985-86 figures are the increases over 1984-85. The 1986-87 figures are the increases over 1984-85 and the 1987-88 increases are the increases over 1984-85: in other words, you do not do a cumulative total by adding 1986-87 on to 1985-86. That would give you a much larger figure and that is not correct.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: There are a lot of other questions that I would like to ask, but time has beaten us.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair apologises in one way for that, but it does not apologise that we are now talking about something totally irrelevant as far as the Committee is concerned. There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the vote completed.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Before you adjourn the Committee, Mr Chairman, I would like to clarify a further point before we have a similar problem to that which we have experienced this evening. There is a Minister of Youth Affairs. She also has something like a third of the Department of Labour budget. I am not quite sure how they get on—it is the only case I know of where there are three Ministers with one permanent head. I want an assurance now as to how we can handle that so that we do not have the delays that occurred tonight.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will consider that at the appropriate time. The member for Davenport should not draw the bow too wide.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.1 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 26 September at 11 a.m.