

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 September 1987

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chairman:

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Members:

The Hon. H. Allison
 The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore
 Mr J.H.C. Klunder
 Mr E.J. Meier
 Mr D.J. Robertson
 The Hon. J.W. Slater

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

Education, \$704 992 000; Works and Services—Education
 Department, \$5 500 000

Witness:

The Hon. G.J. Crafter, Minister of Education.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J.R. Steinle, Director-General of Education.
 Ms H.H. Kolbe, Director of Education (Resources).
 Mr D.A. Cambareri, Acting/Assistant Director, Finance.
 Mr J.C. Cusack, Director of Education (Southern Area).
 Mr J.D. Christie, Acting Deputy Director (Resources).

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. The rules of debate allow an opening statement of 15 minutes from the Opposition lead speaker, and a reply of 15 minutes from the Minister. Does the Opposition wish to take advantage of that?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: No, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister wish to take advantage of that?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: As is the practice, I will table statistical information additional to the Program Estimates outlining the costs associated with schools in South Australia. I make copies of this available to members of the Committee.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is regrettable that this information is provided while we are in the Committee stage and not prior to it as is done with the health estimates. At this stage it is impossible for me to analyse it and see whether or not it is relevant to questioning. If so, we will try to pick it up during the day.

In November 1986 a committee chaired by Ms Mary Beasley reported to the Minister on possible future options for the Raywood Inservice Centre at Bridgewater. When the issue of the possible sale of Raywood was raised, the Minister denied it vigorously and said that the committee was only looking at a more efficient use of resources. However, information passed on to me from sources in the Education Department indicates that the Beasley committee has included in its options the sale of Raywood and parts of the estate. Evidently, parts of the 100 hectare estate, such as the 20 hectares for Arbury school and another portion being used for public use by the Stirling council are likely to be excluded from any possible sale. I am further informed that a memo is circulating in the Education Department that is being considered by the senior executive of the

department which looks at the possible sale of Raywood (I refer to the Estimates of Receipts page 31).

I am told that the department will spend \$2.5 million on the orphanage buildings on Goodwood Road to convert them to a new in-service centre for the department, and that present staff at the orphanage are to be moved out into vacant school space. I think it is important to remember that all the staff at Wattle Park and Raywood are unaware of the Minister's intentions and are most concerned about future career planning. Will the Minister release the Beasley report on Raywood, will he confirm or deny that a future option in the report is the sale of Raywood and parts of the estate, and is the Minister considering selling Raywood?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: First, with respect to the information that I have just released to the Committee, next year I will most certainly look at whether it could be released earlier (and I think the honourable member made that point during last year's Estimates Committee). There is a difference (which I pointed out then) between the paucity of the information available to health Estimates Committees in the past and the substantial amount of information made available in the education area, but I will most certainly look at that matter. I am pleased to release that information not only to members of Parliament but to school communities. In fact, I would like to see a lot more information with respect to the costs associated with running schools made available to school councils and school communities generally. It is important that there is knowledge in the community of the enormous public expenditure vested in education and how it is actually spent.

With respect to Raywood, I point out that the report to which the honourable member refers has been prepared, and I think last year during the Estimates Committee I indicated that we were looking at alternative uses and management for Raywood. I did not rule out that we may have to dispose of that property, but I said that our first priority was to look for alternative forms of management. We are subsidising that centre to the extent of about \$3 000 per week, which is a substantial subsidy.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Yes, I think it is about \$140 000 per annum, but I will obtain the exact information for the honourable member. That level of funding obviously cannot continue. In our consideration we have noticed a lack of interest by other potential co-managers or users. Representation on the Beasley committee included the State Bank and we thought that it or the banking industry generally may well be interested in a joint management proposal or even an overall management program in which we could be one participant, but that did not appear to be attractive to the bank. Another member of the committee was Mr Bernie Lewis, formerly of the building society industry, and he gave the committee valuable advice.

One conclusion of the committee was that active consideration should be given to the sale of Raywood but, as I said last year, we saw that as the last resort. However, I think we are now in a position where we must consider the sale of Raywood as one active alternative or proposition with respect to the responsible management of our facilities and resources in the Education Department, and we are currently doing that. I will consider releasing the Beasley report and, if that is possible, I will certainly do it because it may assist in understanding the Education Department's difficulty in managing assets of this type.

I point out to the Committee that there has been a falling off in the use of this facility; it has a severe capacity limitation for conferences and for the standard of accommodation it provides, and this restricts our ability to have

it used on a much more commercial basis by users other than those in the Education Department. It is a property for which much affection is held in the education community throughout the State. It has served our community well. If a decision is taken to sell it that decision will be taken with considerable regret and we will want to ensure that there is put in place an alternative mode to provide training facilities and opportunities for senior staff in particular to be trained for leadership positions as they are the people for whom it has been used predominantly.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Minister confirm the Government's intention to spend \$2.5 million on the orphanage to convert it to the new in-service centre for the department? Also, would he consider a suggestion (which I warmly endorse and which was made by my colleague the Hon. Robert Lucas, shadow Minister for this portfolio) to consider naming it the Colin Thiele Centre in honour of a prominent South Australian educator who has had such an influence on in-service training? I think that that name sounds much better than, for instance, the South Australian Education Centre or whatever name is mooted at the moment.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I do not know who first raised the matter of what it should be called. However, I also suggested to people in the department that we should consider renaming the orphanage, and Mr Thiele's name was one suggested. That matter will be considered further in due course. It is not true to say that we propose spending \$2.5 million at the orphanage, but we are certainly looking at a substantial upgrading of its facilities; for example, there are four centralised libraries in the Education Department that we propose locating in a resource centre. We intend to upgrade and further develop the conference and in-service facilities at the orphanage.

A number of matters have to be taken into account before a final decision can be made on this matter; it is the subject of much work in the department at the moment. It has already been announced that it is proposed that the Wattle Park Teachers Centre and the Kings Park property be sold in order to provide funds for the refurbishment at Goodwood. In that context, the future of Raywood is being considered as well. Consideration is also being given to, and discussions have been held with the staff at Wattle Park and other centres about the transfer and final placement of those staff. It is the Government's intention wherever possible to place those people serving school communities as close as possible to those communities so that they are located on school properties, and are seen by the community and are in daily contact with the environment of a school.

The additional advantage of doing this is that a number of programs will be taken from rented properties, so there will be an overall reduction in the cost of providing accommodation for non-school based programs. I think I said last year that we did not want to see a continuation of the mentality abroad to some extent that there was a cosy coterie of people closeted in non-school institutions. To clarify it we wanted to entrench the very important role of those who serve school communities. We are bringing it into a much more visible position within our education community. All those ideals fit into the work which has now been going on for some time in the education community with respect to those properties and services provided from them.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I must say that I reject, from my observations of Wattle Park, any suggestions of a cosy coterie, but I do think the *esprit de corps* and the relationship between the various groups servicing schools are important and, if those groups were to be dis-

banded, much would be lost in terms of physical separation. Will the Minister confirm the decision to sell the old Grote street site of the Language and Multicultural Centre that was burnt down earlier this year? If he does, are the proceeds of that sale included in the Estimates of Receipts for this financial year?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I thank the honourable member for her concurrence with my view that there was not a cosy coterie at Wattle Park and other such centres. In fact, that was the intention. That was a criticism levelled at some of those people because they were not seen more visibly in the community. I agree also that they provide a very valuable service and have done so in our community. Of course, we want to see that continue and further entrenched and understood.

As to the Grote Street property, its future is still under consideration: no decision has been taken on that. Obviously, we are committed to seeing that historic property restored. It is probably the most valuable educational heritage building in South Australia and we most certainly want to see it restored. As to its future use and how the department can obtain the most value from its ownership of that property, we will have to determine that in due course.

Mr KLUNDER: I notice on page 413 of the Program Estimates the following programs:

16. Provision of pre-school services for 4 year olds.
17. Services for pre-school children with special needs.
18. Provision of Early Childhood Family Services Centres.

They roughly total \$4.5 million, but this sum does not appear in the Estimates of Payments. Why is that?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Ms Kolbe to comment.

Ms Kolbe: Besides our own programs, which are funded through our own vote lines, we have certain programs, of which these are some, that are actually paid for through deposit funding from another agency. These programs in the main are paid for by Children's Services, but we administer the programs.

Mr KLUNDER: Are those payments acknowledged in the Children's Services Office Program Estimates or the Estimates of Payments?

Ms Kolbe: Yes.

Mr KLUNDER: I will have to wait until we get there, because I could not find them. Secondly, there appears to be a major difference between programs 1 and 2 on page 131 of the Estimates of Payments and the same programs on page 414 of the Program Estimates. The provision for general primary school education in one is \$288 million and \$299 million in the other. Program 2 similarly shows a \$7 million difference between the programs, depending on where they are mentioned. That seems a large discrepancy. Is there an explanation for it?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Ms Kolbe to comment.

Ms Kolbe: The difference between the yellow book and white books is partly what we just talked about, that is, that the yellow book programs actually reflect the actual cost expected to be used to fund a program and the sources could be either the lines voted to us—the white book—or from interagency charges like funds that are provided through deposit accounts from Children's Services or from the Department of Housing and Construction and so on, or our own deposit funds, of which we have some publications—EDC working account, and so on: so there is that discrepancy in terms of sources of funding.

Mr KLUNDER: I take it that the same discrepancy shows up in the fact that the overall funding in the white pages is \$739 million for recurrent expenditure whereas it is \$743 million, I think, in the Program Estimates?

Ms Kolbe: That is correct.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Auditor-General's Report on page 56 notes that the average cost per square metre of cleaning by industrial contractors is 40 per cent lower than for weekly paid cleaners and about 33 per cent cheaper than for petty contractors. Whilst savings might not be as high as those suggested by a certain political columnist at the weekend, it is clear that there is room for significant savings in this area. The Auditor-General went on to note:

Following receipt of a proposal to phase out all cleaning contractors and replace them with weekly paid employees, a directive was issued to the department which required it to place a moratorium on tender calls.

My question is in three parts. When was the directive issued to the department, and for what reason? Does the Minister accept that the average cost per square metre could be even lower than the \$7.89 calculated by the Auditor-General if the moratorium were removed, because of possible savings generated by a competitive tender market between industrial contractors, and also the possibility of long-term contracts rather than the present short-term, month-by-month contracts? Thirdly, will the Minister ensure that the directive is removed and institute immediate action to increase the use of industrial contractors?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I guess it is easy to have simplistic solutions, as was suggested in the publicity to which the honourable member refers, and I guess the honourable member, from her own experience as a Minister within the health sphere—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am just asking what the Auditor-General is recommending.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I would suggest that the cost of cleaning in health institutions, particularly large hospitals, is substantially higher than the system, albeit imperfect, that exists in the education system. Indeed, there is a move that will see increased reduction in cleaning costs in our schools and educational institutions as a result of a good deal of work that has been done, not just in the Education Department itself but in conjunction with my colleague the Minister of Labour, because there are significant industrial implications with respect to bringing about the substantial change to which the honourable member refers and to which the Auditor-General is also referring, and in bringing about that change in the mode of delivery of these services one has to take into account that we need to maintain certain standards.

It simply is not allowing for the cheapest mode or tenderer to provide the service, because there is a history of unsatisfactory cleaning in our schools. There is also a history of unsatisfactory industrial conditions arising for workers (that is, contractors who do not fulfil their award obligations), and we want to ensure that in the changes that are being brought about, those matters are properly dealt with. The moratorium on calling tenders for school cleaning contracts was imposed in January 1986 so that we could effect these changes, and that has already brought about some savings. That moratorium will be lifted once the new arrangements are in place, and I hope that will occur in the reasonably near future.

We are subject, of course, to ongoing contractual obligations and long-standing arrangements which cannot be overturned overnight. As an interim measure to cover contractual vacancies as they occur due to resignation, retirement or dismissal of petty contractors, an industrial contractor of proven satisfactory performance has been selected and allocated the relinquished area on a month-by-month basis. The remuneration paid is calculated at a unit rate per square metre which equals a figure of 25 per cent lower than the prevailing petty contract rate. This system has been used

since the commencement of the moratorium and, as I said, it will continue until the new arrangements are in place, when it can be lifted. This is an area where the department has expended a good deal of activity and we have brought in those core agencies that are also concerned with bringing about improvements, and I am hopeful that the eventual result will be most satisfactory.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister referred to the new arrangements but did not exactly define what the new arrangements are. Will he do so? Will he respond to my question whether he accepts that the cost per square metre could be even lower if the moratorium and the month-by-month arrangements were removed? Obviously, a contractor who knows that he or she has a contract for, say, one year, 18 months or two years, can give a more competitive quote than is achieved through a month-by-month piecemeal approach. It is the precise nature of the new arrangements that I am interested in and the Minister's acknowledgment that a contractor who quotes for a longer term can be more competitive than a contractor who operates on a monthly arrangement.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: First, I should point out that the bulk of the expenditure for cleaning in the Education Department is as a result of petty contracts. Some \$13.9 million of the \$19.8 million was paid out under that head in the last financial year. The weekly-paid area represented a very small amount—\$300 000—and industrial contracts amounted to \$5.4 million. When one considers the cost, one sees that the petty contract rate is a very high rate indeed. It is obviously the subject of our current deliberations to expand the area of industrial contracts and it is the subject of the current negotiations that are being conducted. That brings with it a number of advantages, but we need to ensure that the disadvantages of the past are not repeated. However, it is not a simplistic matter to say that the lifting of the current requirements will, in fact, bring about the savings to which the honourable member refers. Ms Kolbe will briefly explain the potential dangers in forming that view.

Ms Kolbe: At present under the moratorium we are continuing industrial contracts at the rate at which they were originally negotiated. If a petty contractor resigns, the existing contractor may expand services within that same school or another school. If we were to call a new tender, the rate might be higher or, on the other hand, it might be lower, but this is a very competitive area of the market and one cannot say that by calling a wider contract the rate will necessarily be lower.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer to program 1, page 131 of the Program Estimates, in relation to teacher recruiting. I am informed that on Saturday at the annual conference of the Ethnic Schools Association the Director of Studies in the Education Department (Mr Giles) gave a most interesting speech which touched on many issues, including the teacher recruitment policy of the department.

Mr Giles indicated that the department's teacher recruitment policy had been very successful and that it was changing the profile of new teachers to the department. I understand that he said that the policy was now reflecting the diversity of multicultural Australia. Will the Minister or the Director-General elaborate on the present recruitment policy of the department and outline the strengths as referred to by the Director of Studies?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I thank the honourable member for that question, which is a most important one. Obviously members of the Committee are aware of the high priority that we are giving to language teaching in education, particularly in primary schools. In recent years we have dedi-

cated substantial additional salaries to that purpose. However, it is necessary to recruit persons with the appropriate skills, and while we are doing our bit in the education sphere we are working closely with the teacher training institutions to ensure that there is an ongoing supply of suitably qualified teachers. A substantial amount, and very progressive work, has been undertaken in our teacher training institutions in this area. Obviously, my colleague the Minister of Further Education can elaborate on that later this week. I will ask the Director-General to provide more specific information on this matter.

Mr Steidle: Historically we have taken the view that the one criterion for entering the Education Department should be that of excellence, and we have simply taken the best teachers available. However, it was pointed out by the Ethnic Affairs Commission some 18 months to two years ago that the representation of people from ethnic backgrounds was relatively small in the numbers of people who joined the Education Department. Therefore, where it is appropriate, we have adopted a policy of endeavouring to get a better balance between Australian born and non-Australian born teachers. Of course, the emphasis on languages has given us a greater opportunity to do that.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That answer arouses a whole set of further questions, as I am sure the Minister would appreciate. I understand that on 24 February 1986 seven senior members of the South Australian College of Advanced Education with expertise in the sciences and teacher education courses wrote to the Director-General, as follows:

We write seeking information about the nature and philosophy of the committee which selects prospective teachers—our graduates—for interview in the December of the year preceding appointment. In 1985 a number of our secondary students completing a B.Ed. or Grad.Dip.Ed failed to be recommended for an interview despite outstanding teacher reports and very good science results. Others of our students (graduates) but less outstanding were granted an interview. To us and our students this seems quite unjust, not to say demoralising. More importantly, the teaching service is denied the addition to its ranks of teachers of outstanding potential.

I am told that they wrote again on 3 April 1986 seeking a response. I am advised that they have still not had a response, either directly or through the South Australian college hierarchy. Will the Minister or the Director-General respond to what I consider to be quite damning criticisms (if they can be substantiated) made by these academics about the department's recruitment policy (whether or not in the light of the Ethnic Affairs Commission's requests, I do not know). Will the Minister order a review of this policy to ensure that our most outstanding teaching prospects do not miss out on being recruited by the department?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will try to ascertain the facts, and I would ask the honourable member to provide me, after the Committee is completed, with some of the specific information about that correspondence, which I understand was from a group of academics from tertiary institutions to an officer in the Education Department. I will check to see the basis of that and the response of the department. In fact, there are ongoing communications between the Education Department and the tertiary institutions—there are formal structures—and it is not as if each operates in a vacuum in this area. While there may be students who are quite academically gifted and entirely suited to a career in education, they may have qualifications in an area where the department has an excess of teachers, while another student may have the qualifications that are required but not the academic performance of the other student. The consideration of who is recruited and who is not is taken following some very detailed and well established rules and

procedures. I will have that matter looked at and obtain the answers which the honourable member seeks.

Mr ROBERTSON: How many floors of the Education Centre have been vacated in the past three years, particularly bearing in mind the surfeit of accommodation that is now available in some areas of the city (I draw particular attention to the south-western suburbs in this regard)? How much spare space is there? What has happened to it? How much money has been saved by the department? What are the projected savings from a continued run-down in requirement for urban space and a continuing surfeit of space in some of the regional areas?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: As I indicated, the general philosophy that we have adopted with respect to the provision of non-school education services is to locate them, wherever possible, as close as possible to schools and, where possible, on school properties. I believe that there is substantial value in doing that from the community's point of view. There is a public perception of the importance and role of those support services. It is very visible in the community. Secondly, we have surplus space in many schools throughout the State, and, while we have, it seems to me that we should not pay high rents or occupy buildings for which we could obtain rents where we can be located elsewhere, I believe in more appropriate situations.

Further, there has been a devolution of the administration of the Education Department in recent years and that has allowed for many of the 17 floors in the Education Building to be relinquished by the Education Department. I notice that the Victorian Education Department, which I think occupies some 30 floors of the Rialto Building in Collins Street in Melbourne, is also relinquishing many levels of the space in that building—in fact, some years after we have already achieved that in South Australia. During recent times we have vacated a third of level 1, the whole of levels 2 and 3, approximately half of level 14 and the whole of level 17. We currently occupy the basement, which is used for the mail exchange and storage for the department. About three-quarters of the ground floor of the building is used by the Education Department. We use the whole of levels 4 to 8 and about a quarter of level 9 of the building.

In the past three years about 180 Education Department staff have vacated offices in the Education Centre in Flinders Street. Notionally, the department has made savings in the order of \$900 000 per annum as a result of those public servants being no longer housed in the Education Centre. We are currently giving consideration to locating the Correspondence School, which occupies some two floors of the Education Building, in a community setting, and hopefully in a school setting as well, which I believe is more appropriate than occupying levels in a high rise building in the centre of the city.

Mr ROBERTSON: I preface my question by stating that I am aware of the link courses particularly between senior secondary students and various TAFE colleges and I am aware of work experience courses operating in some schools down as far as year 9. However, I am concerned with students in years 9 and 10, particularly because my daughter has just entered that level. It seems to me that many decisions are made in secondary schools, particularly in relation to the courses and curricula that those students follow, which have long term implications for the students in terms of certain choices precluding them from a range of post secondary training, and so on. Many of those choices in secondary schools are made at year 9.

My concern is that children at that level generally do not have a particularly good goal direction and see the work force as at least three or four years away. In many cases

they are too old to be motivated by respect for parents and teachers or to be so subservient to parents and teachers that they will give serious consideration to their future. Many children of that age appear to lack some form of direction. Has consideration been given to interfacing children in years 9 and 10 into the work force for, say, two or three months at a time to give them experience in handling money, handling responsibility, organising themselves and running the kinds of schedules that most of us must run in adult life? Is that a prospect worth exploring?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member raises a most important and pertinent series of questions and I will briefly touch on them. A good deal of work is going on in individual schools and within the Education Department generally, and indeed within other agencies at State and Federal level, in relation to this issue. Extensive programs have been developed overseas: in England, for example, there is the youth training scheme, and there is a similar scheme in Ireland and in most European countries to bridge the period from formal education to work to provide work experience options and a combination of formal education, vocational training and employment. I think that there has been a lack of embracing of that philosophy in this country, but I am hopeful that change will come about.

I think it is important that the Commonwealth gives us the lead and some of the resources to bring about these substantial changes. I was hopeful that the unemployment benefits paid to 16 and 17 year olds, for example, could be liberated to pay for programs of this type. I think we will find that the training funds made available at Commonwealth level will go some way to providing that. Perhaps the Austudy arrangements can be further expanded to embrace a more extensive form of work experience, but all of that is yet to come. It is an important area and I believe the time is coming when it will not be possible for young people to simply leave school and immediately join the work force.

There needs to be a bridge, and that involves work experience and some form of vocational training. There will be a continuation of increased retention rates in the senior secondary area for a number of reasons. That means that we will have to change the curriculum offering and indeed the structure of some of our secondary schools and educational institutions to meet the needs of those who do not perceive themselves as simply pursuing traditional academic work in those senior secondary years, and important work is already being undertaken in our schools in this regard. That touches on the question of the interface between the Department of Education and the Department of Technical and Further Education and there is in place—and has been for some time—formal arrangements in that area that pick up some students.

We have appointed the Principal of the Elizabeth TAFE College, Mr Vern Agar, to work on a consultancy in this area to further expand that cooperative arrangement. Many things are happening in this area and I will briefly touch on them. It is an area of some importance and the Director-General may like to add some comments. I point out that it was the subject of a seminar at the recent education Ministers meeting in Queensland; and in Brisbane earlier this year it was the subject of consultation between senior educators and Ministers in Australia and our counterparts from the United States. I give this matter high priority indeed in the education system in this State.

Mr Steinle: As a matter of principle we have taken the view that there is a clear difference between what we offer years 8, 9 and 10 in secondary schools and what we offer in the senior years 11 and 12. We are of the view that there

is a marked difference in young people between year 10 and year 11, so the general approach has been that in the first three years of secondary schooling we endeavour to offer general courses which give young people a taste of a variety of activities so that they do not lock themselves into any one area of study.

Specialisation begins at year 11, and I suppose it is there that the most dramatic changes have been made of the kind mentioned by the honourable member: that is, a relationship with work and commerce. I believe that interesting things are happening in not only what is taught through both the publicly examined courses and the school examined courses but also in the method of accreditation and presentation of that accreditation to employers or tertiary institutions. Indeed, members would be aware that it is now possible for young people doing drama, for example, to be assessed in an actual stage presentation, assessing those actually on the stage, those behind the scenes doing the lighting, and so on.

So the links between commerce, industry and study have been explored most energetically in the senior years rather than the junior years for the reasons that I have given. It is also significant that the number of students currently taking publicly examined courses (PEB) is static while the number taking school examined courses (the more flexible courses offered in schools) is rising. I think that indicates that young people are seeing the advantages in a more flexible approach to study. Those courses are becoming increasingly popular among young people, and I think that indicates their acceptability in commerce and industry.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The increase in the number of students taking school assessed subjects between 1986 and this year was 21.4 per cent, which is a substantial increase. The participation rate at year 12 increased from 54 per cent last year (one of the highest in Australia) to our estimate of 60 per cent this year, so considerable progress is being made along that track.

Mr ROBERTSON: On page 36 of the supplementary information on the estimates handed out this morning there is reference to Aboriginal education in the southern area. On page 3 of the *Southern Times* (the local Messenger newspaper for the southern area) last week there was a marvellous photograph of an Aboriginal student from O'Sullivan Beach Primary School who was coaching her class colleagues in various aspects of Aboriginal language and culture.

How successful have primary school courses in Aboriginal language and culture been in meeting the needs of the Aboriginal population and in broadening the understanding of non-Aboriginal students of their Aboriginal classmates? Has any consideration been given to extending what appears to be a successful primary school program into secondary schools beyond the scope of usual social/education type courses that most students can be expected to do at secondary school?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member raises an important question. There is no doubt that in recent times there has been much input into school curriculum involving Aboriginal culture and language. A good deal of interest in this has been shown in schools. There has certainly been active consideration given by the department to the expansion of the teaching of Aboriginal language in schools. I was in Whyalla a couple of weeks ago at a school where the Principal speaks fluent Pitjantjatjara. He introduced me to a little girl about 7 years of age who walks 2½ miles to school and home each day by herself. She passes another school to do that because she can communicate with the teacher who is running a course at the school for

a number of Aboriginal children. This indicates the importance of such teaching for the Aboriginal community. As the honourable member has suggested, there is a spinoff for all students. The Pitjantjatjara language, the predominant one of Aborigines in remote areas of South Australia, is taught in some metropolitan schools as part of the curriculum of Aboriginal language studies. There is an introduction to the Pitjantjatjara language as part of the Aboriginal culture studies across all schools, generally; I do not think that it can be described as any more than that.

I hope that over the next six months the department's Aboriginal education section will be discussing the feasibility of the Pitjantjatjara language as a substantive language choice offering in secondary schools. In South Australia we are fortunate that the language of our Aboriginal community has been preserved and is still very much a living language. We need to ensure that every step is taken to preserve the importance of that language and its relationship to the Aboriginal identity and culture.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: At page 61 of the Auditor-General's Report there is specific reference to the Libraries Resource Branch, previously called the School Libraries Branch. Does this branch still exist, or has everything been put in storage? It seems quite inaccessible to schools at the moment. Equipment is packed away and requests for loans are not being met—the whole thing seems to be in limbo.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Ms Kolbe to explain the current situation of the people in that department. However, a couple of weeks ago I was in a school where officers from that section were working, so I do not think that things are packed away. This is one of the units being transferred to a new location on school premises.

Ms Kolbe: This is one of the units that will transfer and some of the items with which it usually works are packed away. However, they are fully operational and recently changed their computing system for cataloguing items that they hold, so in that sense they are providing a service. On the other hand, they are moving and therefore some items to which they usually have easy access are in boxes, as happens when one transfers from one location to another.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Can the Minister advise the Committee where the branch is located presently and where it will be located in future?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will obtain that information for the honourable member. In recent times a good deal of work has been done in arranging their new location.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A matter that has worried me for the past three or four years is the apparent instability at the top of the Education Department. The Director-General is there as permanent head, but in the past three or four years there have been a number of acting spokesmen at Deputy Director-General level when the Director-General has been unavailable; these have included former Directors-General Mayfield, Tillett, Giles and more recently Mr Trevor Barr and Mr John Cusack. When can we anticipate stability in this area? Does the Minister intend that there be a permanently appointed Deputy Director-General of the department and, if so, when will the position be confirmed so that the department will have a stability to back up for the Director-General?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: We enjoy one of the most stable education systems in Australia. The Director-General has held that position in this State for the past 10 years and is the longest serving and youngest Director-General of Education in Australia. Regarding the rationalisation of senior positions within the department, the position of Deputy Director-General no longer exists, but persons act as

Deputy Director-General from time to time in the absence of the Director-General.

I do not see that as a destabilising situation, as it is good experience for various officers to occupy that position from time to time. In fact, it adds to leadership strength and the opportunity that exists for further development of senior executives in the Education Department. There is a considerable bank of long serving talent amongst the executives in our education system, so the transfer of those persons in that system from time to time adds to their experience and strengthens skills in certain areas of the department. I guess that some people like others to stay in positions for long periods of time. As Minister, I do not see the use of the best people in certain positions at any time is necessarily a destabilising influence in the department, so I do not accept that criticism—we do have stable leadership in the Education Department.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A hidden agenda is that while we have salary maintenance in the Public Service in South Australia, if we build up a steady accumulation of people with Deputy Director-General status and salary maintenance carries on in the Public Service for 12 months (as I believe it is at present), it is possible that there could be more than a handful of people equivalent to Deputy Director-General, all entitled to draw that salary, by your claims gathering experience and financial emoluments although being an additional charge at the top of the Education Department. Is that a false assumption, or are we carrying a number of top heavy salaries while people are redeployed in the nether regions? I refer particularly to three former Deputy Directors-General none of whom is presently in the head office with Deputy Director-General status. I believe that two or three of them are now in regions. Are they in those regions at Deputy Director-General level? It adds to the overall expenses.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Some senior officers who do retain that status within the ED executive range of the Public Service are now occupying other positions in the system because of the restructuring that has occurred within the senior levels of the department. I would argue that those people earn their salary. They are experienced, competent people, but they are in a transitory position within the Education Department and, when they are no longer in the public sector, those positions will revert to the substantive salary range. Because of the restructuring it has been necessary to place some of those people in other positions as we have moved through the restructuring process. Certainly, some of it was before my time as Minister.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It simply worries me that, if these people are relatively young and the Director-General has plans for the reorganisation of his department, it makes things difficult when allocating funds and there are shortages in the lower echelons. That is by way of comment. The security of schools has been a pressing matter. Probably, this has been one of the worst years that I can recall in the 30 years that I have been in Australia when several million dollars worth of schools has been burnt down by vandals.

The Director-General has indicated that it will cost about \$25 000 per school to provide security systems. That figure was challenged by at least one nationally reputable security company—I think, Wormalds, in the *News*—in one of the quotes that I saw. It was suggested that for between about \$5 000 and \$10 000 security systems could be installed in South Australian schools. Has the Director-General been able to confirm the cost of \$25 000 as being reliable compared with quotes from commercial enterprise? If not, will the Director-General look at the alternative quotes to see whether possible savings can be made, perhaps through the

purchase of a bulk selection of appliances to be installed in schools? I do not know whether that would be alarms, lights, people on premises, dogs, or whatever else. Also, will the Minister order an immediate review of the security policies of the department in order to explore all the claims made by the independent sector?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: First, referring to the honourable member's final comments in respect of senior management of the department, it should be said that a number of the department's senior officers have accepted career options outside the department as well. Too often in the past the career structure within education has been limited to the education community itself. The public sector has been the worse for that mentality, and I refer to Mr Edwards, who was the Southern Area Director of the department and who is now the head of the Department of Employment and Training. He is successfully heading up that important department.

As the member for Todd indicated in his question, the relationship between the department and the world of work is becoming an important interface indeed. To have an educationist occupying that position makes the development of that policy all that much easier and more effective. So, some of the fears expressed by the honourable member may be unfounded in future because I hope that we can develop a much broader career structure for senior executives not only to leave the department to go into other areas of the Public Service but also to go into the non-government sector as well, whether in the field of education or areas of training or industry itself. Those avenues could be much more formally developed in the years ahead. We are the largest single employer in the State. We deliver a very fundamental service in the community, and we need the best executives to lead that. Therefore, we need to develop those broad skills and career opportunities for our senior executives.

Arson in schools is a most distressing and unfortunate matter indeed. In the current financial year 10 fires have occurred in our schools, most of them in just recent weeks. I place on record a chart of the number of fires, content costs and building costs for the years 1982-83 to the current year up to this week. The number of fires fluctuates from year to year. As the honourable member will recall, the year 1982-83 was also disastrous for us. There were 36 fires and damage was \$2.66 million. This year we have had 10 fires and building costs have amounted to \$2.3 million. The department has suffered heavily as to building costs in this spate of fires, yet in 1983-84 there were 27 fires and building costs went down to \$1.2 million, while in 1984-85 and 1985-86, there were 15 fires in each year. In 1986-87 we had 16 fires. In recent years the number of fires has diminished, and there is no doubt that the installation by the department of a series of strategies, devices, equipment, patrolling, and the like, has been a deterrent as well as minimising damage where that has occurred.

It is not simply a matter of application of devices, because we know that in recent fires devices have been installed and response time has been quick but, because of the nature of the arson, we have still had substantial damage to our buildings. The department has stepped up its program in recent times. It is looking at a whole range of approaches for dealing with these matters, including the more formalised involvement of the community. We are fortunate that there is substantial support in the community for the care of our schools. That happens informally. We would like to formalise that more, and I understand that the Director-General, the Police Commissioner and other key core agencies have been involved in detailed discussions about this.

Most certainly, the installation of devices is one matter that is currently being actively dealt with in the department. As to costs, the Director-General might like to comment on that.

Mr Steinle: It is true that I advised the press that the cost of wiring one of our schools was \$25 000: that was an actual cost for a large complex high school. That was done by a private firm and not by the Government. The normal cost for alarming schools is about \$6 000 for primary schools and \$16 000 to \$18 000 for an average secondary school. While the sum of \$25 000 is an accurate figure for a school, it is certainly not an average cost across the State. The honourable member is correct when he says that the overall cost for wiring schools across the State on average would be less than the \$25 000 figure published in the press.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr Minister, I am in the unfortunate position that I cannot allow a chart to be incorporated in *Hansard*. I have had some extremely interesting discussions with the member for Murray-Mallee in recent weeks. I am under pressure—or instructions, if you like—from the Speaker that charts cannot be incorporated in *Hansard*. I can only accept tables of a statistical nature.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I believe it is in a form that could be regarded as a statistical table.

The CHAIRMAN: If the information can be presented in that way, it is quite acceptable. All material to be provided for insertion in *Hansard* must be received by 9 October.

Fires: Arson and accidental

	No. of Fires	Content Cost \$'000's	Building Cost \$'000's
1982-83	36	675	2 661
1983-84	27	296	1 208
1984-85	15	251	1 914
1985-86	15	192	1 091
1986-87	16	407	1 841
1987-88	10	256	2 360

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: On page 439 of the Program Estimates there is a comment under Issues and Trends as follows:

School councils are increasingly anxious to use school facilities for activities outside the normal school hours as a natural extension and consolidation of leisure education.

I take it that that comment relates to students using the school. It has been my experience over a number of years that school facilities after hours are not utilised as fully as they might be, not only by students but by the community in general. What are the trends in relation to the use of school facilities outside normal school hours? Are they regarded as community facilities? Do we intend to provide any new facility in this financial year, and what costs are involved in providing such facilities?

As I say, it has been my experience over a number of years in my electorate—as, perhaps, in others—that school councils have had some reluctance to provide those facilities to community groups and the community generally, for a number of reasons. Sometimes it was decided, perhaps, by the attitude of the school principal whether or not those facilities were available to community groups. What are the trends in relation to the use of school facilities, both by students after normal school hours and by the community generally?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I think the honourable member may be surprised to find the changes that are occurring in community use of education resources. They are resources established as a result of public funding, and need to be

utilised to the fullest possible extent. That requires there to be cooperation with the substantive users of those resources, so a good deal of work has been done in recent years to encourage and formalise those wider uses of the school facilities, whether recreational or educational, which are in existence.

There is very little of the fear that existed in the past, and of barriers to which the honourable members refers. One area which is racing ahead is the provision of structured community facilities which are on school sites, used by the school for its purposes and by the community for its purposes, for example, halls and gymnasiums, swimming pools and the like. There is a very successful capital works assistance scheme established in the department, and I refer to this list of new community facilities which are planned in the current year. These are all halls or hall-gymnasiums which will be used by the school and by the community.

In the Adelaide area they are the Black Forest Primary School, Mount Barker High School, Oakbank Area School and Prospect Primary School. In the northern area they are Gawler East Primary School, Banksia Park Primary School, Salisbury Primary School and Craigmore High School. In the southern area they are Moana Primary School, St Leonards Primary School, Morphett Vale Primary School and Pimpala Primary School, and in the western area they are Curtin Point Primary School, Ardrossan Area School, Woomea Area School and Tarcoola, where a swimming pool will be established. All of this is done with a contribution by the community, and often a very substantial community contribution, plus a contribution by the Education Department.

The total community contribution for those facilities is \$1.4 million, and the department's contribution is \$3.1 million, providing a total of \$4.5 million worth of additional community facilities for those communities. They make a very substantial impact on the resources that are available, as well as on the relationship between the school and the broader community. So, there is a great deal of which we can be proud in this area of opening up school facilities in this way. It does relate, however, to the point that the member for Mount Gambier was just making about security of schools, and the department is currently having to consider whether on all schools or some schools there should be a curfew in relation to community use after a certain time.

That is a difficult path to tread, and we do not want to bring down a ruling of that type, but current circumstances direct that we must also actively consider that option. As the honourable member will be aware, there is some community use of schools very late at night, and we must look at that. Generally, the greater the community use, the greater the sense of community responsibility and respect for that facility, the less likelihood there is of there being damage by way of either vandalism or arson to that school property.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Referring to program 1 on page 131 of the Program Estimates, and still on the subject of teacher training, on 6 May 1987, I am advised, that the Senior Qualifications Officer of the Victorian Ministry of Education wrote to the South Australian College of Advanced Education in the following terms:

A graduate of the Underdale Campus Diploma of Teaching, Middle Childhood, recently applied for employment with the Victorian Ministry of Education. She has been asked to undertake further studies before we will regard her as three year trained. In assessing her qualifications, the Board of Studies, Primary, considered the Diploma of Teaching, Junior Primary/Primary from your campus. I enclose for your information a copy of the current guidelines for Victorian courses of primary teacher training.

The Board of Studies, Primary, was concerned that graduates from your course appear to fall short of Victorian requirements

in the areas of mathematics, social studies and the practical. Under your present structure, students who are considering teaching in Victoria would be advised to include additional mathematics and social studies in their elective subjects.

I have been told the South Australian college has instituted some changes in the mathematics component as a result of that letter but that nothing has yet occurred in relation to social studies and the practical teaching criticisms, so my question to the Minister is in three parts. Does the South Australian Education Department have a document similar to the Victorian Department's guidelines for initial preparation of primary teachers, outlining requirements of the department in its teacher preparation from the South Australian college and, if not, why not? Is the Minister concerned at these criticisms of the teacher preparation courses in South Australia? Will the Minister initiate discussions with the South Australian college to ascertain its response to these criticisms, which are really very serious?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Very briefly, my answers are 'No', 'Yes', and 'Yes', but I will ask the Director-General to expand on that matter. Once again, I would appreciate if the honourable member could give us information with respect to that correspondence, so that the matter may be followed up further.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: If I correctly deduce that the Minister is saying 'No' to the question of the South Australian department having a document outlining requirements for teacher preparation, is the Minister sure that is the correct answer?

Mr Steinle: The answer is 'No', and the reasons are that we have very close liaison with the universities and the CAE on the question of teacher training, and we do that subject by subject. We also have members of the Education Department on the various accrediting authorities for those bodies, but the real issue is not one for the Education Department: it is really for the CAE and the universities themselves, and the question of recognition of diplomas and degrees between the States by the various departments has been a tortuous one which has been discussed without satisfactory resolution at the minister's conferences now for some years.

The department and the State have pressed for teachers to be able to move between the States easily with their qualifications being recognised. Two or three States have not agreed to that; not only do they not recognise the two year or three year training in other States but indeed they refuse registration to teachers from other States. The question is very complex, and it is not really a matter for our Education Department as much as a question of the acceptability of tertiary qualifications between the States, in particular in terms of the employment of teachers. As the Minister said, we would be very keen to examine the instance to which the honourable member refers. This matter has been discussed over some years through the AEC.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister may be able to provide general policy advice on the four questions I intend to ask that will supplement a reply on notice. I refer to student enrolments. Earlier this year the Opposition highlighted the problem of schools in South Australia overstating enrolments and the inadequacy of the department's auditing procedures in quickly establishing the problem. The Auditor-General (page 58) has reported that departmental audits were conducted in 168 schools, with 41 schools, nearly 25 per cent of those in which audits were conducted, being reported to the department for overstating enrolments in the February census. If this sample of 168 schools was a random sample, it is possible that as many as 175 schools State-wide might have overstated enrolments; clearly, the problem would be significant.

How many enrolment audits were conducted in 1983-84, 1984-85 and 1985-86 and how many schools were reported for overstating enrolments in February of those years? Secondly, without naming the school involved, will the Minister say what was the extent of the overstatement in each of the 41 schools reported in 1986-87 and what was the estimated increase in funding obtained by those schools? Thirdly, were all 168 enrolment audits conducted in relation to the February 1987 census, or were enrolments for earlier years considered? Finally, what action has the department taken in relation to the principals of those 41 schools?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I thank the honourable member for her question. This area has concerned me, and indeed the department has done a good deal of work on upgrading our audit capacity and the effectiveness of our methods in this area. Not only has that revealed abuses of the system but I believe it is unfair to the great majority of schools that provide accurate statistical information so that resources can be distributed to schools according to our formula. It is in the interests of every school community and every student that we have appropriate systems and checks and balances in this area.

As a result of the upgrading of our capacity in this area, under the Education Act three principals were charged with falsifying student enrolments at the beginning of this year. As members would know, this matter received some publicity. One principal was found guilty, his status was reduced and an economic penalty was imposed on him. That person was also counselled and cautioned officially by the department. In another case the principal was similarly found guilty and was officially reprimanded by the department. In the third case the matter was not proven and, therefore, disciplinary action was not appropriate. On each of those occasions the case was heard by an officer exercising, by delegation, the powers vested in the Director-General.

I will provide detailed information for the honourable member. However, I can say that the frequency of enrolment audits by the department's internal audit branch has been increased. That is a mandatory part of each school audit conducted from the beginning of the 1987 school year. Reporting systems have been established to inform departmental area officers of overstatements of five or more students immediately upon detection. We have improved our techniques to ensure accountability and proper provision of records in this area. I have also raised this matter with the Auditor-General and sought the guidance of his department and officers in relation to our approach to this matter within the department. I undertake to provide for the honourable member and the Committee additional information to the extent that it is available.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I note from page 415 of the yellow book that there is an increase of 21.4 full-time equivalents in special schools for the intellectually disabled, yet the estimated recurrent expenditure under this line is to increase by only \$250 000. On the surface it appears that there will be a cost of about \$11 700 for each full-time equivalent, which clearly does not make sense. It is stated at page 427 of the yellow book that one of the targets for 1987-88 is the allocation of additional teacher salaries to the severely multiple disabled program; is that related in any way to this increase? How can 21.4 more staff be employed with an increase in expenditure of only \$250 000? That would be a good trick! Finally, how many school age children were exempted from school during 1985, 1986 and 1987 on the basis of physical and/or intellectual disability, and what is the Minister's plan for the provision of education of these children?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will deal with the last matter first; I will have to obtain information for the honourable member as to the number of students who are exempted. The honourable member may be interested to know that the majority of students who are enrolled with the Correspondence School (and that is a very large school) are not geographically isolated but are students who live in the metropolitan area but are not able to attend schools for one reason or another, a number of those because of their disabilities. The Correspondence School provides a very valuable service to those students. I will obtain the detailed information that the honourable member has requested. Ms Kolbe will refer to the staffing with minimal resources to which the honourable member referred.

Ms Kolbe: Several items are related to the 21.4 additional staff. There was an increase in 1985-86, and in 1986-87 there was a carryover for the full year because most of the changes are made at the beginning of the school year. There was also a reduction of three average full-time equivalents because of the reversal of the impact of the four term school year. We expect to add an additional 14 ancillary staff to this program. The rather lower cost would be on the basis of the ancillary staff cuts rather than the teachers.

Mr KLUNDER: Page 54 of the Auditor-General's Report about two-thirds of the way down shows a total of \$41 383 000 under the heading 'Other payments on behalf of the department'. About halfway down page 419 of the Program Estimates, under 'Inter-agency support services not paid for', an amount of \$41 543 000 is shown for recurrent expenditure actual in 1986-87. I assume that these two headings describe the same services, and that the \$160 000 difference can be reconciled. I presume that it is again a matter of deposit funding.

Ms Kolbe: I have the details of the \$41 million on page 419 of the yellow book to which you referred. It consists of \$22 268 000 of debt charges which is Treasury interest and the sinking fund, the maintenance of school buildings, and the notional cost of the new housing authority to Government. In 1986-87 there was no cost for that item, but in 1987-88 there was a cost of \$5.9 million. The \$41 543 000 is made up of debt charges as well as the maintenance of school buildings, the latter being allocated to the Department of Housing and Construction.

Mr KLUNDER: Why is there that difference of \$160 000 between the two figures?

Ms Kolbe: I will have to look that up. I cannot tell the member offhand.

Mr KLUNDER: Of the \$41 543 000 on page 419, the amount of \$17 837 000 immediately below that figure is designated as being allocated to programs. The Auditor-General on page 54 (as Ms Kolbe has already indicated) has allocated \$22 169 000 to debt servicing, which leaves about \$1.5 million. Why was that \$1.5 million not also allocated to programs, and where has it been used?

Ms Kolbe: When one looks at the break-up of programs, we have contained in the intra-agency part what is commonly referred to as the overhead for the organisation, and the items that are included in the programs would not include that overhead category. To reconcile the various sets of figures one would need to go back and work them through, but in essence the rationale for the discrepancies is of the nature I have described, and the overheads (general administration, the central directorates, computing, and so on) would not be included and would therefore not be allocated to the programs, whereas the items that relate directly to each individual program would be distributed no matter where the source of funding was.

Mr KLUNDER: I would appreciate some reconciliation of that, because what I am picking up are a number of places in which the yellow pages and the white pages are still not reconcilable, even though over the past few years I have been pushing very hard for Commonwealth funding to be included in the white pages, which now has been done, in order to bring the two sets of figures closer together. Certainly, deposit funding, and now the problems with inter-agency support services and intra-agency support services, is still confusing the issue to the point where a casual observer cannot actually look at the figures and say that they reconcile. I ask the Minister to give some consideration in future, either by footnotes or in some other fashion, to make sure that the figures are so nominated or identified for a reconciliation to be possible.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will certainly consider that suggestion.

Ms Kolbe: The definition and the layout, and the terms that are being used and how the split-ups occur, is very much a matter of the layout of the books. I agree that the various sets of accounts can create confusion.

Mr KLUNDER: I appreciate that the department has to be caught under a standard format and that it may be quite difficult, given that format, to do it any other way except by footnotes, which will complicate the issue still more but which will at least enable somebody who is interested to reconcile the figures from the various sources.

Mr MEIER: In relation to the sale of Education Department assets, page 31 of the Estimates of Receipts under the Minister of Housing's line shows an estimate of \$2 352 000 for the sale of land and buildings in primary and secondary education. Also, under the heading of 'Sale of other Government buildings' there is an increase of \$7.1 million in the estimate compared to the actual sales last year. What assets are to be sold with receipts coming due this year? Has the Minister or officers of his department considered the possible sale of the Education Department building in Flinders Street? If so, what have been the results of those considerations? If the building cannot be sold, has there been any discussion about the Education Department moving into lower cost premises?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I have already referred to the sale of the Wattle Park and Kings Park properties for which authorisation was given prior to my becoming the Minister: that has been in the pipeline for some years. With respect to other properties I think that some estimates have been made, but I will need to obtain the detail of what is proposed. Obviously, some properties have potential to be sold but cannot be sold for one reason or another. I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

With respect to the Flinders Street site, I have not heard of any consideration about selling that property. From memory I think that it is not vested in the Minister of Education but is vested in the Minister of Public Works. He has not mentioned to me that he is interested in selling it, and we are its tenants. I certainly would not want to consider simply moving from that building to another one for those core programs that are now located in the building, and simply having another huge cost of re-establishing the

Minister's offices and other offices in another building: that could not be justified.

Perhaps it may be more convenient to be located in a suburban area, and I guess that that is the alternative for some purposes, but I do not think that the cost of that could be justified. Besides, there is a conference centre and other facilities in that building, and it is in proximity to other key Government agencies with which those core people who work in that building spend a lot of time relating. I have heard nothing about selling the Flinders Street building or moving into alternative premises.

Mr MEIER: Under the heading 'Workers Compensation Costs' on page 53 of the Auditor General's Report it is noted that the premiums paid for workers compensation have been increasing by about \$3 million per year over the past couple of years, and that the figure for 1987-88 could be up from \$9.5 million last year to about \$12 million. Earlier this year a study in Victoria showed that teachers retiring due to stress was a major problem in the Government sector but was not registering as a significant problem in the non-government sector. Is the department aware of a similar study in South Australia and, if so, what are the details? What percentage of the total number of teachers retiring due to ill health do so as a result of stress-related illness? When will the Minister implement the promise made by the Government at the recent election to have an independent study into teacher stress?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: This is an important matter from several points of view. The bulk of education expenditure is on salaries—over \$600 million a year. Indeed, our capacity to provide the services required of us by the community in the field of education depends on the quality of teachers and others who work in and support our schools. It is disturbing to see the level of injuries and other matters that detract from the ability of our staff to operate efficiently in our schools.

The department has spent a good deal of time and effort recently exploring a number of strategies: including, first, implementation of the report of Professor Yerbury into the personnel function of the department and its restructuring (which is taking place at present) and the new directions for the department recommended in the report; secondly, our response to the new workers compensation legislation and its emphasis on rehabilitation and how we as a department respond to that in the structures that we have; and, thirdly, our implementation of the occupational health, welfare and safety legislation and the creation of safer working environments for our staff.

As has been said, we are the largest single employer in the State. I think it is important that I table some statistical information detailing the situation between the financial years 1980-81 and 1986-87 with respect to workers compensation payments and their apportionment; and I have another table in relation to teacher stress, an area which receives considerable publicity. It is interesting to note that the number of teachers in the past financial year who claimed compensation as a result of work related stress fell from 161 in 1985-86 to 132, although the overall level of the payout of claims has continued to increase quite substantially.

(1) WORKERS COMPENSATION

Financial Year	Premium \$	Paid \$	New Claims	Av Cost/Claim \$
1980-81	1 189 658	1 102 324	977	1 128
1981-82	1 180 715	1 218 352	895	1 361
1982-83	1 299 738	1 718 987	978	1 758
1983-84	1 875 934	3 342 624	1 167	2 864
1984-85	3 000 000	4 934 395	1 310	3 768
1985-86	5 992 900	7 815 781	1 416	5 520
1986-87	9 500 000	8 924 526	(1 490)	5 990
1986-87 \$	1985-86 \$	1984-85 \$	1983-84 \$	
Premium	9 500 000	5 992 900	3 030 000	1 894 693
Weekly payments	4 280 281	4 367 391	2 943 177	1 491 523
Medical costs	1 143 965	810 689	681 712	457 543
Legal costs	290 351	196 951	111 965	106 621
Medical reports	71 019	59 488	24 653	14 909
Lump sum settlements	2 698 571	1 862 932	782 717	897 497
Common law settlements	440 336	518 330	390 170	374 531
Number of new claims	(1 490)	1 416	1 310	1 167

(2) STRESS REPORTS

	Teachers	Ancillary	Public Servants	Total	Total reports
1983-84	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	73	
1984-85	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	170	
1985-86	161	11	3	175	1 301
1986-87	132	7	1	140	1 490

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask the Director-General to comment on the Education Department's implementation of a consultancy in this area.

Mr Steinle: We have had discussions with the Department of Labour in relation to the employment of a risk management consultant, based on its experience with respect to the successful piloting of such a consultancy in the Department of Marine and Harbors. Rather than take steps on our own we thought it best to cooperate with the Department of Labour and other departments in the employment of an interstate consultant. We have good reason to believe that, if we can obtain results similar to those of the Department of Marine and Harbors, we should be able to reduce this cost considerably, and the people involved would be far better off because they would be back in the work force.

Mr MEIER: Do I take it then that that is the beginning of the independent study on teacher stress?

Mr Steinle: We have good data on the number of people with stress related illnesses. That number is much smaller than the large number of people on workers compensation as a result of slips, falls, sprains and strains, which remains the big area of workers compensation: the other area is vehicle accidents and overuse injuries. By far most workers compensation claims are not in the area of anxiety and depression but slips, falls, sprains and strains.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Ms Kolbe to comment on some of the department's work, not just with respect to teacher stress but all areas of workers compensation. Certainly, while we have focused on teacher stress and how to handle it (as promised), you cannot deal with it in isolation; it must be looked at in the context of other things now being undertaken.

Ms Kolbe: The independent study mentioned last year had an unexpected result. We worked with a Western Australian consultant who visited us three times and looked very closely at the practices and information services that we had in place in order to analyse and determine what preventative measures could be adopted. Once the consult-

ant looked at our methods of operation and what we were doing, he determined that he could not assist us any further because we were doing everything that could be done, so we did not proceed with an official report. We have a special employees services unit located in the central office: it has a psychologist and three consulting teachers who refer people on workers compensation, or those who may be anxious about stress and could become workers compensation cases, to the health development unit which runs courses on stress management and other things that relate to the well-being of an individual within the organisation. We also interface with an occupational clinic, which takes on these people, looks at them, and provides the organisation with reports. So there is a close interface with various agencies.

The Health Commission regularly analyses our data, and we are actually achieving something like risk management, in that this analysis indicates to us where the effort in terms of preventative policies, and so on, should be directed next. In the context of the 1988 school year, we intend to put resources into our area offices to work more directly and in conjunction with the new Act as it relate to schools. So a network will spread into the schools through the area offices that interface closely with schools and into the central unit located in the personnel area.

Mr MEIER: I refer to the 'Back to schools' policy. As the Minister well knows, in August 1986 he announced his 'Back to schools' policy, publicised as the movement of 67 (I believe) public servants in the Education Department back into schools and also that all advisers in the Education Department would have to teach in schools for one day a week. How many of those 67 displaced public servants actually ended up back in schools? What happened to the others? Have all advisers taught the equivalent of one day a week in schools in 1987 and, if not, what has been the situation?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The 'back to the schools' policy is an ongoing one that does not relate simply to that particular strategy. As I have said in answer to previous ques-

tions, it refers to a whole range of transfers of resources and emphases of departments towards schools and school communities. Part of the budget strategy last year was a reduction of 67 positions in the senior administrative ranks of the Education Department. The decision then to be made was whether resources would be reduced in the non-schools area or the schools area. Priority was given to the schools area, so in that sense there was a 'back to the schools' approach taken in that budget strategy.

There was a two-tier phase in respect of placement of those persons and their future careers. As positions were abolished people were placed in substantive positions in the Education Department according to their ability and where the vacancy existed. Their substantive positions were abolished, and to that extent the department no longer had those positions or the funding for them. The impact was to flatten the organisational structure of the Education Department and to transfer down into the system a greater degree of responsibility for the administration of the department. Not all of the persons affected have been permanently reassigned because, as I have said previously, it is a two tier phase, so approximately 28 positions have been retained in the department and staff are undertaking temporary duties in other substantive positions until their long term careers are established, hopefully this year.

The deployment of the 67 people is as follows: four transferred directly to the teaching service; 12 retired; one seconded to a Commonwealth funded position; three redeployed to other Government agencies; 19 transferred to other GME Act positions, many working directly with schools where they previously have not; and 28 assigned to temporary duties, but in substantive positions. No further substantial reductions in senior staff have occurred in this budget, but as part of the EO/AO policy right across the Public Service there will be a reduction of four positions in the current budget cycle.

I understand that there has been a substantive application of the requirement that advisers teach for the equivalent of one day a week in a school, and that has been welcomed by school communities. It is a flexible arrangement and may be carried out in a variety of ways. That flexibility has brought a new dimension to the role of advisers, to their relationship with schools, their maintenance of schools, their ability to support teachers and demonstrate teaching methods, develop new curriculum offerings and the like, and has given schools greater flexibility to bring about improvements, to provide additional teacher development time and to develop new approaches to their curriculum management, and the like. It has not been easy to implement and necessarily has brought changes in the work methods of advisers, but over all there has been a successful change of policy in this area. We are currently monitoring that, but it is early days yet in the implementation of that quite dramatic change to the work of advisers in the department.

Mr ROBERTSON: One of the difficulties encountered sometimes by parents of children with special needs is finding their way through the system. It seems to me that resources in the main are on the ground to meet the needs of children with special needs, but I note on page 36 of the supplementary information handed out this morning reference to a computerised information base for the purpose of identifying the location of special needs students, and presumably the needs of those students, and marrying the two. Has it been installed at this time? How is that working? What will be the results? Again, the difficulty seems to be marrying the service with the recipient.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: This matter relates to the Southern Area of the department, so I ask Mr Cusack, Director of that area, to provide the information sought.

Mr Cusack: The process in the Southern Area has been to identify a level of resource according to the level of disability with which a child comes into a school and, as a result, to allocate resources to schools accordingly. As indicated previously, a computerised information system has been developed and specific information has been entered into the system to allow quick reference to make more efficient the process of allocating resources. The majority of that information has been entered into the system, which will be fully operational if not next term certainly by the beginning of next year. The system being developed operates on a micro computer. Schools have provided specific information about individual students, their disability, the school at which they are located and, as a result of any change in the school that the child attends, that information will be fed back into the system so that we can do a complete analysis of the disability and where resources are being allocated.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

Mr ROBERTSON: In view of the document 'Into the Nineties', which has been promulgated amongst others, by the Primary Principals Association and which, I believe, has at least some merit, in view of some of the scurrilous comments made in recent weeks primarily by the President of the Primary Principals Association about the way in which the Government is approaching the problem, and in view also of the specific objectives for the 1987-88 year as enumerated on page 421 of the yellow book (specifically, the maintenance of class ratios of 1 to 25 and 1 to 27), can the Minister assure the Committee that the issues addressed by the 'Into the Nineties' document have been addressed in the past and that they will continue to be addressed to the extent that resources in primary schools will show a real and meaningful increase, and that these ratios can be expected to drop even further?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I thank the honourable member for raising this general issue of resources for primary schools. True, there is much more awareness in these times of the importance of the primary school years. This has already been recognised in South Australia, which is very much a leader in this area of education. For example, we have a substantial component of non-contact time made available for primary school teachers, whereas in New South Wales in recent weeks, for the first time, non-contact time has been provided for primary school teachers. Hitherto, 15 minutes a week has been made available as non-contact time and that is being built into primary school staffing formula in that State.

A whole range of additional resources has been placed in primary schools over recent years and I have enumerated those in the House on a number of occasions. There has been a dispute about the costing of the 'Into the Nineties' proposal, which is really an ambit claim on behalf of primary school principals. That push (if I can describe it as such) has been subsumed into the primary review, which is a substantial ongoing review undertaken in this State, which will report next year, and which will have a dramatic impact in the future on primary school education and its structure.

Additional resources have been put into primary schools and it is not simply a matter of a simplistic approach, as suggested by the primary school principals, of transferring resources from the secondary to the primary area. The costing, even following numerous discussions and debates between some of the primary school principals and officers of the department, still leaves \$50 million to be found to

reach a stage where the ambit claim of the 'Into the Nineties' proposals can be met.

It covers proposals to provide all R to 7 schools with an extra teacher for 100 children or part thereof, and we estimate that that would cost \$39 million. The increase in non-contact time in this State is already substantial—8 per cent on our estimate. They suggest that that figure be increased to 20 per cent. The provision of an extra 600 ancillary staff would also be an expensive item—\$12 million on our estimate. We simply cannot take all the additional ancillary staff that we are providing each year and allocate them to the purposes sought by the primary school principals.

The increases in support grants and the like are all substantial sums that must be found from somewhere. The cost of educating students in South Australian primary and secondary schools for 1987-88 is as follows: primary schools, an estimated \$3 100 a child; secondary schools, an estimated \$4 100 a child. Those figures are shown in comparative costs and based on 1987-88 prices. The comparative figures for educating a primary school child in certain previous years are as follows: 1982-83, \$2 600; 1977-78, \$2 100. For educating a secondary school student in those years, the comparative figures are: 1982-83, \$3 800; 1977-78, \$3 700. The real cost of educating a primary school student has increased on average by 19 per cent and 48 per cent since the years 1982-83 and 1977-78 respectively. The real cost of educating secondary students has increased by 8 per cent and 11 per cent since both those base years. So, it is important to consider the proposals contained in the 'Into the Nineties' document in a broader context and in the light of achievements already brought about by the department. I shall ask the Director-General to comment briefly on the progress of the primary review.

Mr Steine: The primary review was established two years ago under the direction of one of our Directors of Education and we seconded to it a staff led by an eminent primary school principal. That group has consulted widely with all interested parties and brought together most of the current literature on primary education. It has published a preliminary report, which was tabled publicly three or four months ago, and it will submit a report to me, not to the Government, at the end of this year.

The report is not a report in the usual sense: it is neither a report to the Government nor a series of recommendations. Rather it is a report prepared on the basis of action so that many of the things to which it points have been implemented as the review has proceeded. Therefore, in fact, it is an action document which has also had an impact on primary education and which, as the Minister has said, will give us pointers for the future when it is finally brought together at the end of the year.

Mr ROBERTSON: I understand that there was much concern before the acronym PASS was finally adopted by the department and I further understand that all acronyms involving the words 'parent involvement' were summarily rejected when an acronym was being sought. To what extent has that been successful and how much emphasis and effort will be put into PASS during the forthcoming years and specifically during the coming year?

The Hon. G.J. Cramer: In South Australia, we are fortunate to have the participation and the commitment of parents in the governance and life of our schools to the extent that we have. The emphasis on PASS and the ongoing matters that have arisen from that have been based on the entrenching and formalising of that position to the extent that is desirable and practicable in our school system. So, we are fortunate to have that tradition in South Australia. For example, New South Wales does not have school councils

or the formalised involvement of parents in the life of its schools.

We have a better education system, one that is more relevant, one involving the relationship between home and school, and in that environment of understanding and harmony, there is a learning environment that is so much greater and much more enhanced for those children. The year of PASS saw us bring about a whole series of initiatives that are now starting to bear fruit: for example, the involvement of parents on selection panels for the selection of principal positions, and the involvement of parents in professional development courses. A whole range of training programs is now feeding into a much more structured environment within the overall life of the department. There are also the changes to the Education Act regulations, with respect to involvement of parents in the government of schools and the dissemination of further information, to which I referred in the introductory remarks for today's Committee, and so on.

The financial commitment that we have given to a series of parent bodies has also been increased and we will continue to do that. The total extent of support proposed for this year is \$130 000. Substantial additional funds have been made available for the work of the organisations—the parent coordinating bodies themselves—and a good deal of that additional funding has been targeted to encourage parents, who traditionally do not find it easy to play a role in the life of school communities, to participate.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: At page XIII of the Auditor-General's Report he refers to the school transport system scheme. Can the Minister say whether the committee has reported to him as suggested in August 1987 with potential savings of \$3.8 million identified in the October 1986 study?

The Hon. G.J. Cramer: As a result of that work a number of initiatives have been taken in this area. I note that the honourable member does not refer to the suggestion of the Auditor-General that there should be a charge for those students who use public transport. This matter has been considered in the preparation of each budget for the department in which I have been involved, and it has been rejected by the Government (I presume that it was a matter dealt with by previous Governments also). It is on that basis that the recent publicity about potential areas of savings in the department saw millions of dollars accruing. Really, one should consider the consequences of introducing a fee for those students who are isolated and dependent upon this form of assistance to get to school, which is compulsory by law and which is a fundamental right of all children in the State.

So, to base a very substantial source of income as a burden on that group of young people and their families in the community at present is not a realistic approach to responsible budgeting. Nevertheless, this is a large item of expenditure in the department, which has a bus fleet almost equivalent to the size of the STA. I believe that we might have a few more buses than the STA. The fleet is run by a small number of staff. We do not have any industrial disputes and it provides a service in the main that is much appreciated in the community in a wide range of geographic locations and often operating in difficult circumstances indeed. We have adopted a number of new approaches in this area that have brought about improved services and some savings, and we will continue to do that. I will ask Ms Kolbe to outline steps that we have taken and further elaborate on that point.

Ms Kolbe: During the last financial year following the identification of various cost profiles that have been looked at, we did several things. We commissioned a consultancy

in order to understand better cost profiles between the private sector and the public sector and how we could optimise the various costs in the total sense and, therefore, save funds for Government. Not all buses are cheaper to run by the private sector and the very small 25-passenger buses are much more expensive if one goes out to tender. The other thing that has been made a cost item is tight scrutiny of repair costs. That work has been ongoing and has brought in substantial savings. The other matter raised in the report was route rationalisation. We have actually cut out 16 bus routes in the year between 1985-86 and 1986-87 and that has made some substantial savings.

The other matter mentioned was that of home to bus station travel, and we have discussed that extensively with DPIR, as the department having responsibility for industrial relations. At present we are still negotiating, but we do hope that at least part of that proposal can be implemented. In that sense we have taken up all the proposals that were put forward in that report.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Secondly, members may be aware that in recent years a number of children have been able to enjoy sleeping at school—both junior primary and primary children—and we believe that for many of them it has been an exciting time, something to which they have looked forward, enjoying the company of classmates and teachers. We have been advised that last week a number of schools were contacted by the department and advised that, as from that day, sleepovers at school were to be banned. I understand that this information came largely from schools in the northern area. Can the Minister confirm whether schools have been advised in this way? Will he tell the Committee whether it has anything to do with the current spate of arson and whether it also has to do with the department's legal situation, if arsonists were to strike while children were at the school?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter, to which I referred earlier in passing. I will ask the Director-General to explain the current state of affairs in this area.

Mr Steinle: I issued that directive through the area directors. I had to make a choice between writing directly to schools and issuing a directive to say that in my view, because of the dangers that children would be put at as a result of the current outbreak of arson, we ought not to proceed with sleepins unless satisfactory arrangements could be made to ensure the safety of children. That was conveyed to the schools by area directors by discussion and not by letter.

In a number of instances where prior arrangements had been made, especially where country children were coming to the city, our security people had to step up security around those schools. It is not true to say that they were banned. We asked principals to be careful and, in a couple of instances, I contacted schools personally about their arrangements. So, it was a safeguard rather than a blanket banning of children sleeping in schools.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My next question relates to the provision of speech pathology services in schools. I am not sure under which agency program it comes from the list of one to 20 on page 413 of the yellow book. Last year the Minister said in answer to a similar question that he recognised that there was a problem not only in recruiting staff, particularly those who were to serve in metropolitan areas, but also in retaining staff in this area. He said that it is perhaps a specialist area and that staff want to broaden their experience. He said there are lucrative offers in private practice and other institutions in the public sector that take away staff, particularly those who are more experienced,

from our service. That does create problems and several problems are associated with training. He said that we are having to send staff interstate to be trained. After that statement was made by the Minister, the Opposition was contacted by a rather angry speech pathologist who said, rightly or wrongly, that no interstate cadetships had been offered by the department since 1973.

The Education Department had a staff ceiling of 23 speech pathologists since 1982 and had refused to increase that, except on a temporary basis. He said that nearly 30 per cent of the 1986 graduates from the SACAE Sturt campus in the speech pathology program had moved interstate for employment. There were only four pathologists for 44 000 children in the southern area, and he said that there was little evidence of staff moving into private practice. Was the Minister in error or was there some misunderstanding in 1986 when he said that the Education Department did send staff interstate to be trained, and that part of the problem was a movement of staff into private practice? Did the Government make an election promise to increase the number of speech pathologists in the Education Department, and what action has been taken to implement that promise?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I may have been in error with respect to the staff who are trained interstate: it is teachers of the deaf who are trained interstate, but we still have three cadetships each year for speech pathologists. They are within South Australia, at the Sturt College at Bedford Park. There is a staff establishment of 23 full-time equivalents for our speech pathology effort: four in each of the eastern, western and Adelaide areas; five in both the northern and southern areas, which are the two rural areas of the department; and one person placed in the resource unit within the department. The matters to which I referred last year about difficulty in recruitment still exist in the department.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Over a period of years there have been rumours of an amalgamation of Strathmont High School with Gilles Plains High School. At one time, the Minister may recall, the Strathmont school was a technical school, and when that changed there was a substantial decline in the student population. The Minister may also recall that, over recent times, I have directed correspondence to him regarding the lack or upgrading of certain facilities associated with Strathmont High School. I am interested to know what is the future of the school and, indeed, what action can be taken to improve some of the facilities at the Strathmont High School.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I do not have any specific information before me in the Committee relating to the future of the schools to which the honourable member refers, although work is going on with respect to a number of schools in that locality involving a closer collaboration with respect to curriculum offering, clustering of offerings to students in those schools, greater sharing of resources, and the like. That is happening in many schools throughout the State, particularly in areas such as the honourable member's electorate where there has been a declining enrolment, and it is costing a great deal more per student to maintain those schools in some viable form.

Whilst the numbers are declining in those schools we are having to build new schools in the outer suburban areas of Adelaide, which is consuming a greater proportion of our capital works budget. So, it is harder and harder to find moneys to upgrade those particularly older schools that require refurbishment. The point the honourable member touches on is one common to many areas of Adelaide, and I will be pleased to obtain a more specific response about those two particular schools, with respect to their future,

the capital works programs which are related to their upgrading, and the educational offering they are able to provide in the future.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: An item on page 430 of the Program Estimates states:

Additionally, resources have been provided for the development of curriculum materials for the AIDS program.

I understand that the Minister recently made a statement in regard to a program associated with student education, not necessarily in relation to AIDS but sexually transmitted diseases generally. Can the Minister outline to the Committee the program and the resources which will be devoted to this program, and the manner in which it will be implemented in the schools?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The Education Department is fortunate to have received a great deal of cooperation from those persons with a legitimate interest in this area of education, concerning not only the education community (involvement of parents and others) but also what is going on with health authorities and community based groups, so we have been able in a relatively short period to develop an AIDS curriculum document as a supplement to existing health education curriculum materials. It is intended that this should become an official part of the common curriculum for our secondary schools. The curriculum is designed to cater for the requirements of children in that more mature age group, and will, in some situations, include children who are attending primary schools.

It should be a national AIDS education program on which we are basing this information and, in that sense, there is a lot of cooperation with other States, although it is true to say that South Australia is a little further advanced than other States in relation to this aspect of our curriculum. Education on sexual matters generally, I can tell the Committee, is always contentious, and there has been a great deal of interest in the community (which is reflected through the media) with respect to this aspect of the curriculum.

There is no requirement that students compulsorily attend health education classes, and there will always be a right for children not to attend, and parents will have the option to withdraw their children from classes should they desire. That is particularly important where such attendance would be contrary to parents' long established religious or other beliefs. It is very important, too, that associated with the development of the curriculum is a capacity to train teachers in order to teach this aspect of health education. A group of 30 teacher advisers and nurses have been trained to conduct in-service programs for all secondary schools, so we then have a teaching capacity to pass on those skills and that information to the people who actually teach those subjects.

These in-service programs are currently being conducted, and all schools will be represented by the end of October this year. In addition, 176 school counsellors have attended a three-day conference with a significant amount of program dedicated to education about AIDS. Two advisory teachers will be appointed from the beginning of term 1 next year to continue this program in the schools. The Government has provided an additional \$285 000 to the Education Department in this financial year for the purpose.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer again to teacher qualifications under program 1 at page 131 and program 12 at page 134. Prior to 1983 the Education Department collected data on the qualifications of teachers in the department as well as details of the subjects that teachers had studied when obtaining their qualifications. However, I am told that in 1983 the data collection system was changed so that the present method collects data on subjects taught by teachers and the level at which they are taught.

It also collects information on subjects offered and the level at which they are offered.

In 1982 a survey of English teachers in schools was conducted by Dr C. Woods, Superintendent of Studies, and it showed that about 17 per cent of teachers teaching English were unqualified in respect of an English qualification. Under the new data collection system it is not possible to undertake similar surveys in relation to English, maths, and science teachers. What was the reason for the change in the data collection system in 1983? Is there now a way of ascertaining information on the level of qualifications of teachers in specific subjects? Will the Minister order a review of the data collection system to provide information on the level of teachers' qualifications in various subjects?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: These questions have been put to the department by an academic who teaches in an English faculty in a tertiary institution in this State and who has launched a series of vitriolic and personal attacks on me and senior officers of the department over a long period. He touches on an issue which is important, one to which we are sensitive and, hopefully, responsive. However, there is a practical component in terms of our ability. As much as those in tertiary institutions would like to expand their faculties and provide the products of their fruits directly into positions within the education system, there are a series of priorities and other matters that must be taken into account in responsible management and placement of personnel. I will ask Mr Steinle to comment on the series of issues raised by the honourable member, because they are important and serious issues, and certainly we are responsive to them. However, we are unable to do all that those in the tertiary institutions would like us to do.

Mr Steinle: I outline the dilemma that faces us in this regard. The present staffing model provides that schools are asked to give us an outline of their teaching requirements. By and large, they are country schools, because that is where most young teachers first go on appointment. Clearly, these schools are smaller schools, and thus the profile of requirements tends to be across subject areas. It is rare for a school such as the Balaklava High School, for example, to want someone who is a physics or English specialist. In general, they want someone who can teach two or three subjects to, perhaps, matriculation level. Therefore, when we seek teachers to fill vacancies we tend to look for people with general qualifications.

When those teachers transfer to the city, they tend to become specialists, spending most of their time teaching, say, physics or English. As a result, it is true that there are significant numbers of teachers, particularly in the metropolitan area whom we would prefer to have English 3 or Physics 3 qualifications. However, we must look after both country and city schools and, therefore, we try to achieve a balance between people who have specialist qualifications and those who are general teachers. One understands and sympathises with the views of those who believe that English is the most significant subject in the curriculum and that all teachers of English should have an English 3 qualification. None of us would argue that teachers should be as well qualified as possible. However, we face the choice of providing either a spread of subjects in country schools at initial point of teachers' entry or specialisation. Regarding data collection, we hope that as we get our computer operations to a point where we can collect that kind of data we will certainly have that information at our finger tips. At present, that is not the case. I would like to have that data and, given time, we will achieve that.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: It may be of interest that there is a staff census each year whereby staff identify what subjects

they are qualified to teach and what subjects they are teaching, and that is adding to the bank of information that I believe the honourable member is seeking.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Supplementary to that, if there is a staff census that seeks the information that the Minister has just outlined, it seems that the problem has been overcome; the department knows who is qualified to teach what at any given time.

Ms Kolbe: We do know who is qualified to teach what, but the problem is that sometimes, as the Director-General said, teachers are not teaching the subjects they are qualified to teach because they have more general rather than specialist qualifications.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My second question relates to employment in education. At page 87 of the Premier's Financial Statement it is stated that average full-time equivalents in education for 1986-87 were: Public Service, 875.7; major non-Public Service, 14 799.4; and other, 2 672.6, making a total of 18 347.7. At page 413 of the yellow book the estimate for average full-time equivalents for 1987-88 was shown as 18 129, a decline of 217.7. The member for Todd asked a question about discrepancies in respect of money that may be related to this area. It seems that it would be a little harder to explain discrepancies in respect of people. Will the Minister provide an estimate for each of the classifications making up the estimated total of 18 129?

At page 413 of the yellow book the number of full-time equivalents as at 30 June 1987 was shown as 18 723, and the estimate for 30 June 1988 was given as 18 562, a decline of 161. Will the Minister provide a similar breakdown for each of these figures? It is this kind of figuring that is critical to the Government's promises and to schools. It is pretty hard to understand how there can be discrepancies like that.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will undertake to obtain that breakdown for the honourable member and the Committee to clarify this issue.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My attention has been drawn to the fact that the Auditor-General's Report shows an asterisk and states that that excludes staff funded through the Deposit Account, but that may not apply to my second question. Regarding school closures, when will the South-West Corner Schools Consultative Committee present its final report on possible rationalisation of schools in the south-west corner of Adelaide, and when will a similar committee in the Elizabeth/Munno Para area present its final report? Over what time frame does the Minister hope to implement the recommendations of these committees?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I believe that the South-West Corner Schools Consultative Committee report is to be handed down in the latter part of this year. That committee has been meeting for some time. However, the committee under the chairmanship of Mr Joel, the former Administrator of the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth, only recently commenced its activities and will report, presumably, either very late this year or early next year. We will await the outcome of those reports before we work out the response to the recommendations of the respective committees. I appreciate the work that is going on in that form of community consultation. These are very difficult issues, and I do not anticipate that the reports will set out the complete answer to the problem.

Some of the issues are very complex and very difficult. However, at least we can get from that community consultation and from the recommendations of those reports a good indication of the way in which education should move in future in those areas of steep enrolment decline, the way

in which we should manage our human and physical resources in the future in those areas, and how we can reconfigure our existing physical structures to provide for that.

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister indicate the provision that has been made in the past 12 months for long service leave, what the provision is for the oncoming 12 months, and where one could reasonably hope to find it in the Program Estimates or in the Estimates of Payments?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: In the budget it has been based on a consistent allocation of the provision for long service leave last year to this year. I will ask Ms Kolbe to explain precisely where it can be found in the documents.

Ms Kolbe: The costing would be included on the basis of an estimate in the various programs, but as mentioned previously, they are not easy to follow when one looks at individual details, and one would need to look behind the figures in the yellow book as well as in the white book. However, the level of backup provision is the same as was provided last year in the budget, so there is no increase and no decrease. It might interest members to know that last year for the first time we introduced long service leave backup provisions for ancillary staff, and that again is being maintained at that level in this budget.

Mr KLUNDER: In the case of the extra school assistants that have been taken on over the past 12 months, will the Minister indicate in which areas or by which function they have been allocated and, if possible, both?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The provision of additional ancillary staff has, I believe, substantially improved our ability to serve the community in a wide range of areas, particularly in high priority areas. I am pleased that there is provision in the budget for another allocation of 100 ancillary staff positions (that is for an average ancillary staffing position in the schools).

In the 1987 allocation of those 100 positions, 17 went to special education (which was of high priority) for work in the integration and mainstreaming of special needs students; 16 went to Aboriginal schools; 38 (a substantial number) went to improvements to the primary school sector, including transitional positions; nine went to improvements to area schools and special rural schools, including transitional positions; 5.5 went to school community libraries (and this I know has been very much appreciated and long sought by South Australian rural school community libraries which provide a very valuable service to the overall community, and this has meant extended hours and services); nine went to high schools; four went to bilingual and ethnic aids; and 1.5 was a general allocation.

One can see that they have been spread very broadly across the education system, but very carefully targetted to provide the maximum value. Discussions are continuing with various groups in the Education Department and the education community to allocate the 100 positions for this year.

Mr KLUNDER: It is one of the oddities about the teaching service in this and in any other State that, while at any given time there might be an oversupply of teachers, there can also be an undersupply of teachers in particular specialist areas, such as music, physics, and so on. What interaction does the Minister have with the College of Advanced Education and the University to indicate the department's likely requirement for, first, teachers in overall numbers and, secondly, which particular subject areas will be needed in the foreseeable future?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member is quite correct. We are faced with a dilemma in relation to the surfeit of qualified teachers in our community and our

inability to employ the teachers who have great skills and enthusiasm. However, we also have a shortage of teachers in several areas, and it is important that the comments that were made earlier about our relationship with the tertiary sector is such that we can predict some of these trends and changes, although sometimes they occur very quickly, and that we have our supply of qualified teachers appropriately placed. I will ask Ms Kolbe to explain the structure for bringing that about.

Ms Kolbe: While the Tertiary Education Authority existed it predicted, from input from the various teaching institutions, the department and the non-government sector, the future supply and demand for teachers and various subjects. When TEASA was disbanded that was hanging in midair for some time. While we negotiated, especially with the South Australian College of Advanced Education, about our requirements, it was not a fully satisfactory service to replace the one that had been lost. It has now been agreed with the Office of Tertiary Education and the Minister of Further Education's portfolio that we and other organisations that use teachers will identify our demands, and that they will determine the supply and negotiate the requirements for the future supply of teachers in various subjects with the tertiary education institutions, because they are the only ones that have an impact on that. The shortfall in teaching subjects is very predictable—mathematics, business education, home economics, and so on—and those shortfalls have existed for some time.

Mr MEIER: The Auditor-General several times since 1984-85 has expressed concern that the absence of adequate and uniform procedures in the department could put financial control over the expenditures of the department at risk. This year the Auditor-General notes:

Progress has not been as great as planned.

Why has the progress required by the Auditor-General been so slow? How much longer will we have to endure a situation where the financial control of the department's expenditure is at risk?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: We would assert that the management of the department is not such that it does put that at risk, and that that is not the case. There is always room for improvement when one is managing a budget the size of the department's budget, when we are decreasing centralised resources in the department, and greater skills are required for the way in which we provide our management services. We are embarking on a much greater use of computers and the like. Hitherto, many of the methods used in the department have been outdated and crude to that extent. I will ask Ms Kolbe to explain the progress made in overcoming the fears expressed by the Auditor-General.

Ms Kolbe: Recognising that our procedures were not adequate in the reorganised department we have created a procedure writing team, which has been in existence for two years. That team and other officers have created manuals which in some instances are the first that the department has ever had. Following the introduction of the new Government management and employment legislation we created manuals, especially in the area of public servants, that other departments borrow to use as a model to write their own manuals. So we have created a large number of procedures, including the policy manuals.

We have not yet covered all areas, and indeed some of the older procedures in existence require rewriting, but I think that there has been considerable effort and considerable output. In some instances what has been produced is the first of its type; and in some areas I claim that they are the only manuals to exist in the public sector. However, with a decentralised organisation it is recognised that pro-

cedures need constant updating and rewriting from time to time to catch up with more modern methodology and systems, and that is the task of that team and a number of other officers who are working in this area.

Mr MEIER: The budget papers make no allowance for the payment of the second tier 4 per cent pay increase and indicate that if it is to be paid it must be cost neutral. Has the department commenced discussions with the South Australian Institute of Teachers about possible offsets for the 4 per cent increase? If the offsets are to be in the form of further cuts in teacher numbers or reduced non-contact time, is the Minister confident that such offsets would not affect the quality of education in our schools? When does the Minister anticipate that agreement might be reached with the institute on this matter?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The Government is not dealing with this matter on a department to union basis—it is dealing with it on an industry-wide basis. The discussions, which are proceeding, are being conducted by the United Trades and Labor Council with the Department of Labour and include the Institute of Teachers and the other unions that cover those persons who work in the education sector. In fact, I am advised that further progress has been made in the field of education than in many other fields. Already some agreement has been reached in industries where the 4 per cent productivity claim can be clearly established: those agreements have been finalised and will be ratified in due course. That has not been the case yet in the education area, but I understand that the discussions are proceeding and that there is some fruit in them. I do not know when the discussions will be concluded although, as the honourable member would know, there is a good deal of pressure from the industrial sector to conclude them. Obviously it is not easy, in the white collar area and in the field of education, to establish the basis on which there will be an increase in productivity to that extent, but discussions are proceeding.

Mr MEIER: I still cannot see how the 4 per cent rise, if it comes through, can be cost neutral if it is not budgeted for.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The 4 per cent is based on an increase in productivity, which is precisely the area that is being discussed at the moment.

Mr MEIER: I refer to a paper entitled 'Reflections' and an article headed 'Affirmative action' by a person called 'Observer'. I am quite happy to make a copy available to the Minister (although he may have seen it already). The article deals with equal opportunities and I will quote from it and relate it to the budget. A question was asked earlier about exit students from teachers college being employed, and this relates to the same matter. The article states:

It was early this year that the rumour went round that anyone coming straight from Teacher's College and claiming Aboriginal ancestry would be given a permanent teaching position immediately, regardless of teaching reports or other people's skills or needs. I was sceptical about the rumours. It did not seem to me that any bureaucrat could be so silly.

Then I found out during the year that anyone claiming Aboriginality would be offered any contract vacancies as they arose during the year, before anyone else, no matter what their skill or experience.

At one of our local principals meetings where the Area Director was present, one of my colleagues challenged the Director to confirm or deny this policy. Ten minutes of political blustering followed, but the fact was confirmed. Anyone with Aboriginal blood will get permanent or contract vacancies first.

Is that last statement—'Anyone with Aboriginal blood will get permanent or contract vacancies first'—correct?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I would be interested to see that document. I am certainly suspicious of documents that incite some sort of racial division in the community. It

seems that the paper was written by a group of persons within the education community, and that is most distressing. Traditionally, the Department of Education has wanted to employ more Aboriginal graduates (which is the case in many other States, also) with the appropriate qualifications. The record of Aboriginal participation in the education system is one of which we as a community cannot be proud. In fact, there have been only two Aboriginal graduates of the University of Adelaide (our oldest tertiary education institution in this State) in the history of European settlement of South Australia. Generally, we have had very few Aborigines pass through the tertiary education sector.

The South Australian college has made considerable progress in this area, and that is pleasing. The Education Department has encouraged this so we would be willing to employ Aboriginal graduates for the reasons that I have outlined. They are very much needed in our education system and they can do work in particular schools that teachers of European descent cannot do. However, to couch that need of the department in terms of racial division is really taking the debate to a low ebb. I will ask the Director-General whether he can add anything.

Mr Steinle: I think not. Aboriginality is indeed a qualification in a sense to teach young people, especially when we look for people who can teach Aboriginal children and be a role model for them. If we are to have Aboriginal leadership in Aboriginal schools then we need Aborigines to be employed as teachers. My guess is that an Aboriginal applicant for a position would win it on merit because of a willingness to go anywhere in the State and because that person would bring to the teaching job a particular skill that comes with his Aboriginality.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I have had an opportunity to look at this document. I think that it is part of a journal published by the Primary Principals Association and forms part of a series of statements that have come from that organisation attacking not only the rights of Aboriginal persons but also the affirmative action and equal opportunity policies generally in relation to the rights of women in education—not in this article, but in others. It is most disturbing to see that the person who penned this document did not have the courage to sign it or to acknowledge that this is their view or their contribution to this journal, learned or otherwise.

Mr MEIER: According to the answer given by the Director-General, Aborigines would be hired on merit, as is the case with everyone else, and would not be given preference simply because they are Aborigines—is that correct?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: But that must be based on the fact that there is a high need for these persons in our education system as there are so few of them.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Can the Minister say what incentives, if any, are given to teachers who make themselves available to teach in the country areas of South Australia?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There is a requirement on anyone who joins the teaching service in this State to serve in schools throughout the State. One of the great attributes of the teaching profession is that there has been a spirit of service in hardship positions—and some positions in remote or rural areas of the State can be described as such—as well as in the more desirable locations in the city. All such experiences form part of the general experience of our teaching service, and that has been one of the great strengths of the system.

Over many years we have built into our education system a series of incentives such as additional payments or other attractions to provide support for teachers in non-

metropolitan areas. I will not go through a whole list of those incentives, but I undertake to supply the honourable member with this information because it is of interest to know these benefits, which include housing, incentives in the form of promotion, direct additions to salary and other allowances, additional time for travel, and so on. They form a quite substantial package, which I will outline in my reply relating to the deliberations of this Committee.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Although for the past three years the Government and the Education Department have been involved in a review of the powers of school councils, there is still no sign of positive action by the Government. I have been informed by two or three councils of the latest proposals, which it seems involve giving school councils the right to hire and fire teaching staff—which would be a quite radical change—and in some limited circumstances to hire specialist teaching staff, for example, music teachers, who are in short supply, where they have not been supplied by the department. Will the Minister clarify the present position of the school council review? Will that review allow new powers of hiring and firing as suggested to me? What is the current legal position of a school council if it attempts to insist on uniforms for all students? Has there been any change in the past few years from the situation where Ministers and councils could strongly recommend but had no legal power to insist upon the wearing of uniforms? I recall that the last instruction I received from the Attorney-General's Department was that if a Minister insisted he might find himself paying for the uniforms.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: That is the position. However, it varies from school to school. In many schools there is substantial compliance because it is argued in many school communities that it is more economic for families to comply with uniform standards and requirements than to dress their children casually. There is probably a growing tendency for uniforms in our schools rather than a reversal of the situation which occurred some years ago.

During the year of PASS that report came forward and I referred it to the PASS committee so that we could have the benefit of its deliberations. It has worked its way through the consultation process of the committee and has been reshaped to the extent that that committee thought appropriate.

I do not believe that it embraces the situation where school principals or school councils have the right to hire and fire; that is a matter of debate at some schools. Broader considerations need to be taken into account in relation to the ability to provide teachers across the State—a matter to which I referred in answer to a previous question. The honourable member also referred to the hiring of special staff locally. There has always been an ability for that to happen to one degree or another. I am hopeful that the document that has come from the PASS committee will be distributed widely and result in a number of changes being requested across school communities of the State, and that it will formally entrench the role of parents and the school council in the governance of schools.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The present Government took a decision three or four years ago to give the Aboriginal people in the Pitjantjatjara lands the control of their health services—the Nganampa health service about which we are hearing a lot. Some people have raised the possibility of a similar handover of schools in the Pitjantjatjara lands. Have the Minister, members of the South Australian Aboriginal Education Consultative Committee, or officers of the Education Department, had discussions about that possibility, and what is the Minister's attitude to such a proposal, which

would involve the Aborigines virtually taking over educational responsibility on their lands?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I do not think that it is possible to compare the delivery of health services with the delivery of education services. The model used for the health service delivery on the Pitjantjatjara lands obviously has been found wanting, despite good intentions. I endorse the concept of the community having the ultimate say in the development of policies in this area and we have to embrace the concept of a much greater degree of self-management in the provision of education services by the communities on the Pitjantjatjara lands. The Director of Aboriginal education component of the department has recently visited the Pitjantjatjara lands and had discussions with members of the Pitjantjatjara Council and the school communities about ways in which there could be greater community involvement in the provision of education services on the lands.

That is in two tiers: one is the overriding administration of services on the lands, and the other arises within each community itself. I hope that we can develop structures where, although there may not be a school council as we know it, there will be greater formal involvement of the local community in the development of the curriculum, the offerings, and the management of these school communities.

The school is seen as the last European or colonial institution in many of those communities. That has been seen by some in a negative way, although in some ways it has been a positive structure in some of those communities during difficult times. I have much admiration for many of the European staff who have served for long periods under great difficulties in providing educational services, and for their families. However, we need to embrace change and that will occur, but I assure members that changes will be made sensitively and in a way that hopefully learns from the shortcomings of other systems of this type that had been developed.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Referring to gifted and talented children, I wished to refer specifically to a page in this year's yellow book, but I cannot. On checking last year's yellow book, I found that, as a target for achievement in 1986-87, area committees or networks were to be established for fostering the gifts and talents among children. However, page 427 of this year's yellow book makes no mention of this as a target for achievement this year. Can the Minister say what happened to that proposal in 1986-87 and what the department will do for children with gifts and talents in 1987-88? I realise that excellent work has been done in this area by a team headed by Miraca Gross, who won a scholarship a few months ago for her work among gifted and talented children. This seems to be a major omission this year, although I am sure that the department's interest in this matter is as strong as ever it was.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There has been a further advance in the way in which we can tackle this matter in our schools and I am continually pleased to see the special programs that are provided throughout our educational system for gifted and talented children. Indeed, there is much interest among our staff in those students and in the desire to give them the appropriate opportunities. The flexibility in our educational system to that is amazing. We have probably progressed past setting up structures to extricate some of those children and are now dealing with them in another way. We can now do it in a mainstream way within our school communities. I will ask the Director-General to provide more details on this matter.

Mr Steinle: I refer the Committee to page 427 of the yellow book which provides, under the heading '1987-88

Specific Targets/Objectives (Significant Initiatives/Improvements/Results Sought)', for policy implementation for children with gifts and talents. As the Minister said, we have tried, where possible, to mainstream our activities for these students. This has been aided by experience gained from the networks that were established. The work going on now is exciting and assisted greatly by new technologies such as computers. We also maintain secondary music schools, which are specially geared to those with gifts and talents in the music area. Similarly, there are dance, drama, and other programs in our secondary schools. So, as the Minister said, we have gone past the point of specific things. Our schools have picked up the work of ensuring that they provide opportunities for gifted and talented children to be motivated and stretched in line with their competence.

Mr KLUNDER: In asking this question I acknowledge a great interest shown in this matter by my colleague the member for Newland who, as members know, is chairing another committee in another place and cannot be here. Has the Minister considered establishing primary school enrolment ceilings and zones of right for primary schools where enrolment disparities between neighbouring schools would otherwise lead to expensive relocation of classrooms? The example that I have in front of me relates to the St Agnes and the Arntonish Primary Schools, each of which is situated on Smart Road, St Agnes, roughly one kilometre apart. Apparently the enrolments are up at Arntonish and down at St Agnes. The catchment areas for both schools overlap substantially. I understand that the department is considering relocating teaching space Demacs from one school to the other when it might in fact be cheaper to do such things as advertising vacancies or applying ceilings and zones of right.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will certainly make inquiries about the specific school communities to which the honourable member refers. We have brought down zones of right with regard to three metropolitan primary schools—Grange, Walkerville and Highgate Primary Schools—where those schools were reaching a capacity level. Grange reached 750 students, and almost a third of those students were travelling past at least one other primary school to attend that school. Not only were there difficulties with maintaining an orderly approach to the management of that school but the local council was bitterly complaining about the increase of buildings on a limited site, beyond which it had never been planned to accommodate that number of students. Also, there were good neighbouring schools with few students attending them.

So, the school communities themselves were most supportive of our establishing some rules of this sort with respect to future enrolments. It is interesting to see parents shopping around to that extent, even in primary school years, seeking out schools with particular programs. I guess that that is a healthy element in our education system. It is something that we have encouraged as a result of our zoning policies over many years.

Also, we have to provide an orderly management structure and allocate our resources efficiently so that there are limits to the implementation of that policy. As to whether or not the situation has reached that stage in the area to which the honourable member has referred, yes, I will ask the Director-General whether he can add anything.

Mr Steinle: No.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: We will ascertain that information.

Mr KLUNDER: Would the implementation of the recommendations of the Cox report involve extra cost, either

in a need for new personnel or in costs associated with promoting or making extra payments to existing staff?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: First, the Cox report has now been presented to us and has now been assessed by the department. Comments are being sought from interested groups but, as the honourable member would know from having read the report, it is based on the premise that it will be a reallocation of existing resources that will provide for the implementation of the report. We are assessing the position to see whether that is feasible, and I think our first reaction to it is that it is, although we also need to consider the time scale; but it is a very valuable report and one that I believe will be warmly welcomed by the community as a whole. Certainly, it has already received strong support from within the education system itself.

Mr KLUNDER: As to my third question, I am again indebted to my colleague the member for Newland. In view of the announced 16 per cent real increase in education expenditure since 1982 and the \$80 per student increase in the 1987-88 budget, can the Minister provide a breakdown of the areas that have benefited from increased expenditure in, say, both primary and secondary areas? Can the Minister also tell the Committee the extent to which those increases have gone into extra salary and leave payments for the increased proportion of senior teaching staff and senior departmental staff now in the system, and also to the extra ancillary secondary and primary staff?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Certainly, I undertake to do my best to ascertain that information. It may require a substantial amount of research and going through staff and leave records, and so forth. I can understand that it may well be valuable information to have and, to the extent that it is practical, given the other priorities of our staff, I undertake to obtain that information.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Following the Minister's response to the member for Goyder's question about employment for Aborigines and preference given in the teaching service, I am prompted to ask this question because I note that the Minister has about a dozen senior advisers around him of whom one is a woman. Can the Minister advise the Committee what is the department's policy about the administration section (not the school section) of the department and its administrative structure in relation to affirmative action?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: That is a very serious question and one to which the department has applied a great deal of time. It is true to say that we do not have women represented at the senior management level of the department to the extent that they reflect our teaching service, for example, but steps are being taken within the department to remedy this situation. A great deal has been achieved in the area of equal opportunity within the department during the 1980s, based on my reading of the department's dockets and looking at the programs that have been established in the department.

As the honourable member would know, it is not simply a matter of changing a policy and things happening quickly. It means a greater opportunity for people to participate in promotion positions and development of career structures that do allow for women to achieve equal opportunity. I would like to bring down a detailed statement about what is being done in that area and about the progress that has been made, and also an illustration of where there still exists a degree of inequity within the education bureaucracy in this State.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will that statement be included in the budget estimates replies?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Yes, I will bring it down for inclusion in *Hansard*.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My question relates to the Government Housing Employee Authority. On page 416 of the yellow book there is an increase of \$6.1 million for assistance in connection with teacher housing. Page 432 of the yellow book notes that this is the first year that estimated operating costs of the Government Housing Employee Authority have been included in the department's recurrent expenditure. Can the Minister indicate whether the \$6.1 million is the estimate for the operating costs of the authority and what is the rationale for the changed accounting procedure? Why is this figure not also included on page 134 of the Estimates of Payments under the same program heading?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Ms Kolbe to provide an explanation.

Ms Kolbe: It is a Treasury decision that the cost of operating that entity will be distributed in accordance with the way in which it is being used by various departments. That is our share of that particular cost.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I turn to page 135 of the Estimates of Payments under the heading Educational Facilities, which states that actual payments in 1986-87 were \$760 000 over the budgeted amount. Can the Minister explain the reason for that increase?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I cannot give you an off-the-cuff explanation of that, but will check the detailed records and bring down a reply.

Mr ROBERTSON: It is a function of almost historical accident, I suppose, that a large proportion of the teaching force at the moment, at least in secondary schools, is within the age range 35-45. It seems to me that one of the causes of disaffection, in a sense, within the force probably lies in the fact that promotional positions are pretty much frozen for those people and that, in previous generations, many people in that age group could have expected some form of promotion at about that time or shortly afterwards. It is quite clear that, under the present promotion system, that is pretty much precluded, and that those teachers who are able to vary the subjects they teach or perhaps transfer to another school as a way of introducing some novelty into their lives are able to stay enthused and continue to give of their best.

It also seems that there are a number of others who tend to get stuck in a rut. What actions are being taken to address that? In passing, I note that most of the disruption that seems to have surrounded the proposals for limited tenure has come from those who already have tenure rather than from those who do not. I am wondering whether the proposals for limited tenure of positions might go some way towards unblocking the log jam and allowing people who are professionally capable and very competent to have some prospect of promotion at some stage during their working lives.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member has not left the teaching service that long ago and, obviously, brings with him some of the narrowness of the perception that teachers have of their careers. We are committed to ensuring that the teaching service is a challenging and changing service, so that it is flexible, it meets the needs of the overall community, and people do not get bogged down in boring, monotonous or non-challenging appointments in our system—not only for themselves but for those they serve getting decreased satisfaction from their efforts.

There are three important reports and action following those reports that are all related to this issue in the macro sense. First, there is the leadership paper. The honourable

member has referred to tenure arrangements as proposed in that paper, the leadership structure that is proposed under that and the flexibility that brings, bearing in mind that we are now appointing deputy principals in the primary sector who were assessed in the year 1973, who are getting to the top of the list. We do have an outdated and unsatisfactory system of promotion within the Education Department, and we have to find alternatives to that.

Secondly, there is the Yerbury report into the personnel function of the department. The way in which we care for our staff and provide back-up services for them, and the way in which we administer our personnel functions are important to the issues the honourable member raises. Thirdly, there is the Cox report relating to the role of superintendents and the range of very important personnel who support schools, particularly the leadership in schools. A fourth element is our in-servicing program within the department; they are all interrelated and very important to overcome the issues to which the honourable member refers.

They are not easy. The leadership paper has been the subject of over 300 meetings during the 1980s since it has been the subject of discussion within the department. That is now coming to a conclusion, and I hope that that and the other reports to which I have referred, dovetailed in with our in-servicing program, will bring about substantial change in this area. At this point we have a problem of concretisation of our staffing profile and people being locked into positions that appear gloomy on the surface, and we need to bring about some change.

Mr Steinle: There are two other factors which perhaps escape some of those who express the concerns the honourable member has raised: that is, that in addition to the age profile of teachers one needs to look at the age profile of people in leadership positions. Indeed, the movement from the service in the senior ranks in the next few years will be marked, which will lead to far more movement than many teachers appreciate. The second is the change of demography of the State and the fact that, in primary schools in particular, the numbers are already beginning to turn up, so that over time, in my view, that situation will be less gloomy than some teachers now believe.

Mr ROBERTSON: Some mention has been made already of the policy on children with gifts and talents (at page 427 of the yellow book) but, as the parent of a child who recognised the existence of infinity before he was three and realised before he was four that you get there more quickly by multiplying than by adding numbers, I ask how it is that one can implement a program for kids with gifts and talents without appearing to be elitist, and whether it is considered by the department that more could be done for these kids, because that, in a sense, is a form of special education, and it seems that we do a pretty fair job of catering for kids at the other end who have learning difficulties.

A number of kids with gifts and talents also have their own kinds of learning difficulties, and it seems to me that there ought to be programs available within the syllabus to cater for that without the need for outside organisations which tend, almost by their nature, to be elitist.

Mr Steinle: That is a very good question, and the dilemma is very real for teachers. I believe that it is true that we have, over time, put a great deal of additional resources into teaching children on the lower end, as it were, of the education attainment spectrum, and that we need to do more for children on the other end of that continuum. I believe that people misconstrue these programs because of the efforts of teachers to give them titles other than 'gifted and talented'.

If one goes into a primary school, one will find groups of children working on things called 'search programs' and so forth, which are simply programs set up for those children who, having quickly done the normal courses, are then given additional and challenging things to do.

It is not the kind of busy work that for many years applied to bright children. They are stimulating and constructive programs. One of the significant facts is the enormous energy that has been put into teaching gifted and talented children. One must recognise that there is a difference between gifted children and talented children. Talented, of course, is a narrower factor than gifted. American research has had a profound impact on this State, and we had the good fortune to send one of our teachers to the United States. She studied there, and achieved a Masters degree in this area; she has received an offer to study for a PhD. With her efforts and those of a number of very active out-of-school groups, young people have the opportunity to undertake those activities on weekends.

The question of ensuring that those programs are not elitist is fundamental to what we have tried to do. We have insisted that programs are offered within schools; we do not take children out of schools. We endeavour to keep children within the classrooms so that they maintain links with children of their age group yet at the same time have the opportunity to undertake programs that are suitable to their level of attainment. The answer to the question is that there is a danger of such courses becoming elitist so that children are removed from contact with others in their age group. That contact is very important for them. However, I believe that by and large teachers are handling this issue sensibly and successfully.

Mr ROBERTSON: I am aware that public education, in this country at least, has adopted a brief to provide secular education for those who opt to attend public schools. It appears to me that the education we provide should not only be secular but appear to all intents and purposes to be secular. In that context, I have some concern with a move emanating from I know not where to introduce school chaplains into schools on a voluntary basis. I am aware that some schools have been approached with a view to the introduction of chaplains. I know, having read that communication, that the role of the chaplain would simply be to augment existing guidance and career type advice that students receive. How much sanction has that move received, and what stage has it reached? How widespread will the use of volunteer chaplains become within the public school system?

Mr Steinle: The practice is not widespread. This matter was discussed some time ago with the heads of churches, and a proposition was put forward. As a general principle it was decided not to proceed. A couple of schools have piloted the use of chaplains in the way in which the honourable member suggests—and that is in a very limited way. It might be worth mentioning that at the same time the dirth of what might be called moral education, as the honourable member points out, is something that has concerned us.

We have produced a publication which we will pilot in schools and which endeavours to come to grips with the question of giving young people what might be called moral education. I am very excited about the publication, although we still have some work to do on it, but it is pretty well ready for trial. It will draw from all courses offered the moral precepts and issues addressed in schools. It will give schools the opportunity to put more emphasis on the moral questions which are significant and which many people confuse with religious questions. Clearly, a State school

system, as the honourable member says, must remain secular, but that does not mean that it should ignore questions of morality.

Mr ROBERTSON: Social education, by definition, ought to be about social things and perhaps social education being opposed to anti-social education would be about social things, but I believe that we have tended to ignore some of the potential within the social education curriculum to draw out moral threads and make social education the education of how to be social.

Mr MEIER: I refer to education issues within the District of Goyder. On 5 August, I requested the Minister, on behalf of the Minlaton Primary School, to receive a deputation of four people in regard to unsatisfactory conditions at the school. I refer to the three separate sites: the school is on one site, the playground on another, and a further playing area on a third site. Some of the buildings are in very poor condition, and the staff in some cases must provide their own carpets. For some years the Minlaton Primary School has been seeking action, but nothing has occurred.

The Minister's office was contacted the week before last and it was indicated that there would be a reply to Minlaton last week, but today the Chairman of the council again telephoned my office asking whether I had heard anything. I indicated to my secretary that I would ask the Minister whether he proposed to meet the deputation so that the matter can at least be discussed and, hopefully, there can be some indication as to the future trend or future work.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I must explain to the honourable member that I am responsible for about 1 400 properties, many of which have problems associated with them. There is a physical problem in my meeting each group that wants to discuss problems personally. The honourable member wrote to me on another matter seeking a deputation in relation to the Aboriginal community and its relations in the town. My staff has done a great deal of work on my meeting with the community on that issue. I hope that, rather than receive deputations in Adelaide, I can visit the honourable members district and see the groups and the schools at the one time. That is what my staff are trying to achieve.

From my point of view it is much more satisfactory if I can actually see what people are talking about, on the spot, and then try to work out a solution to the problems, rather than people taking time off from work and coming to Adelaide. However, that means delay in addressing the problems in terms of scheduling: it is easier for me to schedule a time when people come here. If the honourable member sees the merit in that and passes it on to those who make representations to him, accompanied by my officers I will try to visit the areas and deal with matters on the spot.

Mr MEIER: I refer now to a deputation from the Balaklava community school library. The air-conditioning system at that school does not work and has not worked since last November. My most recent correspondence to the Minister was dated 2 September—20 days ago. People asked whether a date had been set. I was last in Balaklava on Friday, which was a reasonably warm day—about 25 degrees—and people were feeling discomfort. The community library building is similar to a Demac building but made of brick. The people who work in the library dread the prospect of the coming summer without the air-conditioning system operating. Will the Minister's tour of the peninsula include a tour to Balaklava, or would that be separate, when they would come to Adelaide?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: When we have many such matters I wonder whether it is beneficial to have me trying to sort

them out. If it is a position where no-one else can and it requires substantial intervention at the political level, then that may be appropriate. However, it may well be that this matter could be handled through officers of the department. The ultimate aim obviously is to get the air conditioning fixed so that the working environment and the learning environment for the children are in a satisfactory state. Normally in these situations someone tries to sort out the problem and advise me. Then I can advise you or your constituents and we can try to sort our way through that. In this case we should try to do that, and resolve it. Obviously, if we cannot we will have to sit down and talk about that. This is a different situation from the primary school which wants to carry out a consolidation. That is obviously a more complex matter and involves a capital works program and the like.

The other problem to which the honourable member has not referred, but to which I referred, is very complex. Obviously I am interested and concerned about it and want to see what I can do to help in the ongoing problem of community relations in that electorate. Three quite different problems may each require a different solution. However, I will try to address each of them as quickly as I can.

Mr MEIER: Would it be all right to indicate to the Minlaton Primary School Council Chairman later this afternoon, since it is meeting tonight, that the Minister intends to arrange for a meeting at the school site in the near future?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Yes.

Mr MEIER: I hope that the Minister will appreciate that I am man of great patience and that the cogs of bureaucracy do not always turn as rapidly as I would like. I wrote to the Minister on 12 March 1987—some six months plus ago—about the Moonta Area School. While my letter was acknowledged on 19 March, I am concerned that no action has occurred. I know that the Minister earlier indicated that he has some 1 400 other situations to attend to, but I think that this one is critical in many areas.

Some of the things I mentioned in that letter of 14 March included the fact that most buildings are in a very poor state of repair, although it would appear that the junior primary block is worst. The whole complex is riddled with white ants, and, because of that my wife was warned to be very careful as she walked around accompanying me. Many of the windows cannot be locked because the wood rot is so bad that the windows have distorted excessively. Rotting windows and window sills as well as areas devoid of paint and loose timber occur frequently. The staff/student toilets constitute another area of concern and, although approximately half of the plumbing was replaced, the other half regularly continues to block up because of tree roots and other problems. Problems also exist in the main stone buildings. Following renovation some years ago large cracks have appeared and, although camouflaged from time to time, they apparently are getting worse. The outside gables and woodwork need immediate attention, as most of the paint has flaked off, and they are deteriorating rapidly. The problem with pigeons in the roof was accentuated further recently when one of the boards under the gables fell off, and it was miraculous that, in falling, it did not kill or injure a student.

I recognise that I brought up many problems in the letter, but six months is a long time to wait for an answer. Does the Minister intend to visit the Moonta Area School and to address these problems when he comes?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I think that I have been to the Moonta Area School with the honourable member for the opening of the gymnasium a while ago, and part of that was a fairly extensive tour of the premises.

Mr MEIER: In fact, the first paragraph of my letter went into that.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will check on that correspondence. It may well have gone out of education and into housing and construction because many of the matters to which the honourable member refers are the responsibility of the Department of Housing and Construction in the ongoing maintenance of the building. That is where there may have been a breakdown in communications. I would be surprised if people in the Education Department had not got back to the school. However, I will check that out and respond about the problems raised.

Mr ROBERTSON: Page 424 of the yellow book refers to the mainstreaming of English as a second language. Of course, the ESL program has been running in schools for a number of years now. What future plans are in hand for mainstreaming ESL, and what role—given the role that it has served in the past of fitting migrant populations and those with English language difficulties into the school setting—is envisaged for ESL in future, given that the level of migration of non-English speakers has fallen in recent years? How is it envisaged that ESL will slot into the school system as a normal curriculum subject?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The ESL program has proved to be an extremely valuable and valued one in our schools. That was highlighted last year when the Commonwealth Government chose to reduce substantially funding to the ESL program, and the State made up that funding loss. It is also now a matter of record that, in the recent Federal budget, the Commonwealth Government maintained its commitment in this area and has announced additional funding in the area of languages policy. We have recently been involved in some preliminary discussions with the Commonwealth about the implementation of the Commonwealth Government's languages policy. At this stage we are developing policy for this State with respect to languages.

There was a consultation with the respective communities about this matter on Monday of this week. The ESL program has been operating for some time and we saw it appropriate last year, when there was a reduction in Commonwealth funding, that we conduct a review of the program. We are fortunate to have had a very thorough review which highlights the directions that need to be taken in this area, and some weaknesses in administration and its implementation in schools. That gives us a clear direction in relation to the way we can go in this area to improve the program and to more efficiently use the resources we have for it. There are 154 teachers employed in the ESL program in this State. So it is a substantial program. I will ask the Director-General to comment briefly on the report that we have received and on the specific issue of mainstreaming the program.

Mr Steinle: The first point is that the State looks good in terms of the nation generally. The officer who wrote the report recently came from interstate and knows the interstate scene quite well. So in terms of the country, the pattern of work in this State is commented upon favourably. It is a splendid piece of work in that, to my knowledge, it would be the best collection of data in this area produced anywhere in this country. It is a very detailed and insightful report. It contains some criticisms, not the least of which would be that we need to examine the way in which young people get into ESL classes and the way in which schools use ESL teachers. Those matters have been acknowledged. We have circulated the report for comment by appropriate officers and commentators, including people from the Ethnic Affairs Commission. However, I am confident that the responses will be positive, because most of those groups have already

had an opportunity to comment in the framework of the report. The report will profoundly influence our direction in the ESL area in the near future.

Mr ROBERTSON: I have periodically suggested to schools in my electorate which have computer facilities that it might be possible to build on that resource and open it up to community access in much the same way as we open joint use school facilities such as halls, hire out ovals to the community, allow the community to use libraries and in some cases domestic science wings, and so on. Could the community also make use of school computer systems? In view of the more recent trend to stand-alone units as a teaching aid in classrooms—which quite clearly runs counter to the alternative of networking the various computer consoles into one central data base—it may be no longer a viable proposition to have community use of those facilities, or is there some hope of schools which use mainframe computers opening them up to a community information system in relation to clubs and societies and, say, prices at the local butcher's shop? Is there such scope for community use or will the trend to stand-alone units destroy any hope one might have had of using computer mainframes in that way?

Mr Steinle: Most schools are enthusiastic about making computers available to public access. In a sense, it is probably schools which have brought home to parents most effectively the applications to which computers can be put. It is probable that there will be some significant changes in computing in the next generation of computers. The Minister and I had an opportunity to look at what is happening in the United Kingdom in the computing field. BBC, which is a major manufacturer of school computers, will be bringing out a much more powerful unit which I believe will be very competitive in this country and I think will challenge the two makes currently used most frequently in schools.

Because of its power I believe that it will give people an opportunity of the kind mentioned by the honourable member, that is, a chance to see applications which currently are not available to people with the normal range of micros. It is interesting that primary schools rather than secondary schools have undertaken the responsibility of community awareness in this area, and I am confident that that will continue.

Mr ROBERTSON: A program has been announced to broaden the use of languages other than English within primary schools. I believe that the Government is getting much closer to the stated objective of having all South Australian primary school children at least partially conversant in a language other than English. How is that program progressing and what steps will be taken in this regard in 1988? Given the philosophy of teaching and concentrating on languages of trade—namely, Japanese, Mandarin and Malay—and the languages of geographical relevance to Australia—again, Malay, Japanese and Chinese—can we add to that list the languages of underdevelopment, for example, Spanish, which is the language spoken by much of the developing world? Can we add underdevelopment as a criterion, when considering the kinds of languages taught in primary schools, to the two I have already mentioned, namely, those taught for reasons of trade or geography?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There has been a good deal of progress in this area and I think it is part of the understanding that South Australia leads the rest of this country in the area of language teaching. That was confirmed at a recent meeting with Mr Lobianco, who is the languages policy adviser to the Commonwealth Minister for Education. We have allocated additional salaries (and 20 are provided for in this budget) for language teaching to further expand our

offering in primary schools. That program is very much appreciated in school communities and by parents and children.

We have a severe disability as a nation because we are predominantly monolingual so, for a number of reasons, it is important that we maintain community languages to strengthen the relationships between children and their families and to strengthen our communities. I believe that language is central to the preservation of a culture and heritage, which are so valuable in a multicultural society. We are heading down that path vigorously, and we are embracing the teaching of languages of economic importance.

The report that is being prepared in this State, and to which I referred earlier, sets out our priorities and guidelines for our entire languages program and balancing some of the competing interests for those language salaries and the development of the variety of languages sought in our schools. It is a transition period, but it is a very exciting program indeed. I believe that, if we are to be able to restructure our economy and have a work force that has the skills and capacity to bring about the successful sale and marketing of the goods that we produce in this country and the skills that we have to offer the world generally, we need to have as fundamental to that capacity an ability in a number of languages. This forms the basis for that.

It is also interesting to note that it is simply not a matter of providing salaries in schools, because a number of opportunities are arising for the use of new technologies to teach languages. That may help us to reach some young people who otherwise would be disadvantaged in terms of their access to language teaching. We are trialing the use of public radio through 5UV FM, and we are also using our DUCT system in the department to reach a number of isolated children. For example, with the DUCT system we have been reaching 30 Polish background students scattered across six schools in this State.

We are hoping to expand further the use of new technology in that way, as we are now just scratching the surface. Extra teachers are very important and will enable many young people to improve their first language and to learn another. The boost will increase to nearly 200 the number of primary schools providing language programs during 1988, whereas five years ago only 46 primary schools provided language programs for students.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Page 430 of the yellow book deals with assessment policy. Will the Minister provide details of the targets behind the 'trial the assessment policy'? Is the Minister or any member of his department aware of any proposed change to the present assessment mix of 50 per cent external and 50 per cent internal year 12 subjects under the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia, and what is the Minister's attitude to any proposed change?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Mr Cusack to enlighten us about what is happening in that trialing of the assessment policy.

Mr Cusack: Discussions have been proceeding for a considerable time in relation to procedures used by schools in assessing student progress in various subject areas. A draft statement relating to some of the possibilities and different modes of assessment was distributed to schools, and comment was received. This is expected to result in a further draft statement of assessment policies before we move to implement any significant changes in those policies. It does not relate directly to the assessment policies being used by SSABSA, which establishes its own assessment policies, but would require us to reflect on current procedures used in

schools, working through with students and parents the level of achievement of students in relation to stated aims in our schools and their purposes.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Can the Minister say whether the continuing criticisms received from interstate, particularly from Victoria, when South Australian students apply for admission to colleges and universities are valid? Victoria seems to put an adverse weighting on South Australian scores before admitting South Australian students into Victorian establishments. They imply that the SSABSA scaling is inferior to the Victorian one.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I would be interested to gain further information about that discrimination, if I can use that term, because I believe that South Australian standards are regarded highly. In fact, SSABSA is also regarded highly. Its moderation processes and the resources put into it are being used very effectively. There is a great deal of confidence in our assessment process, so if there is that feeling abroad then I would like to track it down and have it investigated in an attempt to put paid to it, because I do not think that that is true.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I can give the Minister the names of two parents who believe that their students were weighted out of entry into Victorian universities on the basis that they were South Australians.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I can imagine there being a problem in the honourable member's electorate because it runs to the border. The matter of whether there is a subtle form of preference for students who come from Victoria, or whether they have implemented some barrier for our students, needs to be pursued. I would be keen to challenge any suggestion of lower standards.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is a ready acceptance of South Australian students into Warrnambool and Geelong, but these students were anxious to gain access to Melbourne University. On 25 August this year the Minister was reported in the *Advertiser* as having had discussions about a radical overhaul of education. In that radical overhaul there was to be a home cottage scheme to allow rural secondary students to attend schools in big towns where the subjects they wished to study were being offered.

I have a copy of a letter from a member of the Clare steering committee of the Isolated Children's Parents Association who wrote to the Minister seeking support for such a proposal in Clare. That letter is dated 12 August 1987. The Minister's response to that submission was to say that it was the responsibility of the director of the eastern area and that the matter had been referred to him for direct reply. Will the Minister say what specific policies he has implemented in order to achieve this goal of cottage home boarding facilities in South Australia, and when will the Boarding Options Working Party report be finalised and released?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: If that report has not been released, it is about to be released. Much work has been done on it by the respective directors of education in the western area. That committee, under the chairmanship of Dr Keith Were, has brought down a very valuable report. I am keen to pursue the matter of cottage accommodation for students in selected rural areas. I think that Mount Gambier has the potential for such accommodation, as do a number of key centres that could have an educational focus in time. It is not a matter into which we can leap because there is quite a bit of work to be done.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The nurses home at Mount Gambier has accommodation for scores of people.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: We are looking not for institutional accommodation as such but for accommodation for

a small group of students with a family, with cottage parents or with one person who lives with the students, a number of whom may be present for four nights a week and then return home on weekends, while other students are there for the whole of the term. We have seen a need for accommodation in other areas; for example, women's shelters now have 100 homes in the housing cooperative that they have established. A number of other housing cooperatives in the State have been very successful in providing for specific accommodation needs. We in the education system can learn from that process.

There could be a cluster of cottages around certain schools providing this sort of accommodation. We must look at the economics of this matter. I do not think that there are impossible barriers to achieving this aim. The recommendations of the working party show us how to go about this, and we are certainly keen to see this matter pursued expeditiously. There are very real difficulties and, as a result of that, inequities faced by young people who want to pursue senior secondary education offerings but who are unable to do so for economic and other reasons, come to the city.

The only option at present is to board, which is often expensive in boarding schools, or to find private accommodation, which can be expensive and which is inappropriate in many cases. So, this is an important and fruitful area of activity for our department to undertake. The individual schools would be a basis for the development of these programs. That would be a changed role perhaps for the school community, particularly the school council, so we would have to work our way through the processes to achieve that. I hope that we can progress down this road expeditiously.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: On 7 April 1987 the Minister released a press statement on the estimated cost of the staffing proposal in the 'Into the Nineties' document. This published policy was supported by over 300 school communities throughout the State. It is alleged that the Minister tried to scotch the policy by deliberately exaggerating the cost of this as being \$72 million a year, a sum that could be paid for only by Government initiatives such as increasing the cost of petrol by 4c a litre. Will the Minister confirm that officers of his department have costed the policy at \$2 million or \$3 million for the first year with an increase to \$11.3 million after the fifth year? Given that the assumptions of the policy were clearly outlined within the policy, can the Minister explain the initial error of between \$60 million and \$70 million in his or his staff's costings? Will he now commence discussions with the primary representatives on the possible implementation of even some parts of that policy in the middle to long term if he still believes that it cannot be afforded in the short term?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I have already gone into some detail earlier today on the issue of the costing of the proposals in the 'Into the Nineties' document. Although there has been an ambit claim by the group of primary school principals who prepared this submission initially and the officers of my department, there is still a huge discrepancy between what each side believes it will cost and how the resources can be achieved to bring about the implementation of this policy. There is another question of how desirable it is to spend these substantial resources if, as the primary principals propose, they be taken from other sectors of education without achieving a substantial division in the education community. After all, it is the same group of students who travel through the education system, although it is the static group that is advocating this allocation of resources.

Earlier today, I read into the transcript some of the costings which have been assessed and which undoubtedly, are in dispute. The whole matter of the claim embodied in 'Into the Nineties' should be put into the context of the primary review. That is where we will achieve the balance and the perspective required in the allocation of resources. We do not deny that there are needs in the primary sector. I have outlined to the Committee today and to the House previously how additional resources have been placed into the primary sector. That has brought about substantial improvements.

We must consider what we have achieved in South Australia compared to what has been achieved in other States. In that respect I believe that we stand tall. Simply by isolating certain proposals, by dealing with them in this way, by talking in terms of the many millions of dollars involved, and by hearing one side say that it will cost \$60 million and the other side only \$2 million, we can assume that it is somewhere in the middle and it is pointless to engage in that sort of debate.

It seems that some who are advocating this want to do so publicly, but I do not think that that is in the best interests of the public standing of our education system. I am proud of what occurs in our primary schools and of our progress in giving those schools the resources that they require so that they can operate at the standard that we desire.

Mr KLUNDER: Referring to capital rather than recurrent lines of expenditure, I point out that on page 60 of the Auditor-General's Report the total payments under capital operations are shown as \$31 505 000; on page 413, and again on page 420, of the Program Estimates the figure is \$31 869 000; and in the Estimates of Payments, at pages 194-5, the figure is \$6 956 749. The last figure obviously is nowhere near correct but, even adding to that 'Inter-agency support services not paid for' (\$26 312 000) on page 419, it overshoots the mark, and the total comes to over \$33 million.

So, we are in a strange situation concerning the three agencies: the Education Department through the Program Estimates; the Treasury through its Estimates of Payment; and the Auditor-General. All these authorities purport to give an accurate figure for capital spending by the Education Department, but their figures are all different. If those discrepancies can be reconciled on the spot, I shall be delighted, but I shall be happy to have this complex question taken on notice.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I shall ask Ms Kolbe to give a brief explanation of how the honourable member has become so confused.

Ms Kolbe: I think that we are all a little confused because of the number of pages. Considering the various reports, we must bear in mind to which line the amount has been budgeted. In 1986-87, for example, the sum of \$5 500 000 in our budget actually relates to the purchase of buses, computers, school furniture, and motor vehicles, and the sum of \$25 500 000 was actually in the budget of the Department of Housing and Construction. Adding those figures together gives a total of \$31 million. In reconciling that to the figures in the yellow book, one needs to make a slightly different assumption from the statements in the yellow book programs and in the support services. In order to reconcile the three figures quoted by the honourable member, we must take the question away and do the exercise thoroughly.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Regarding Commonwealth funding, the Premier's Financial Statement at page 173 refers to increased funding under the resource

agreement offset in part by a reduction in funding for School Commission programs. Will the Minister provide a detailed breakdown for this variation of \$2.6 million in the 1986-87 budget?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will get the information, but the programs that were cut were the ESL program; the professional development program, which was cut entirely; the special education program, the funding for which was reduced; and the multicultural education program, which was eliminated, no funding having been provided by the Commonwealth Government for that program.

There was a reduction in the Participation and Equity Program (PEP) as well last year. Consideration has been given to making up funding for a number of those programs and that was achieved in part for a number of programs, the ESL program, for example. I will obtain that information for the honourable member and have it explained.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This is more a supplementary question because it raises important policy issues for State Governments. What attitude would the Minister be referring to the Government in respect of accepting future Commonwealth grants for programs of the nature of the programs the Minister has just described that the Commonwealth is going to initiate and then, once the program has gained professional and popular support, drop it in the lap of the States, leaving it to carry an ongoing burden? How much longer can the States continue to pick up the responsibilities that the Commonwealth thrusts on them in terms of programs that are electorally popular and undoubtedly desirable when the capacity of the States to continue paying for them is limited?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The member raises a valid question. The simple answer is that the States cannot go on much longer making up: we have come to the limit almost of our ability to do so. It is not simply in education. Education is one of the smaller areas, but particularly in health and vulnerable programs for the disabled. We are concerned about the reduction or elimination of Commonwealth funding for programs that do give an enormous boost to the quality of life for persons who would otherwise be totally institutionalised or totally homebound. It is in crucial areas like that where funding is diminished that there is a good deal of odium transferred from the Commonwealth to the State when the State is unable to find the necessary resources to maintain that program.

We have seen that as one of the fundamental weaknesses of the Community Employment Program where it has been applied for human services. That is also a program that has been totally eliminated. Many of those very valuable programs are coming to an end. We face a dilemma in Commonwealth-State relations, particularly in the area of human service delivery. We have had our fingers burnt in a number of programs on which we have embarked in good faith. Other programs have had a finite life, but perhaps they have been programs that should never have been commenced in the first place, or perhaps they should have been commenced on the basis of a different understanding of the outcome.

We have lost two programs in the present budget in education that we simply cannot continue to fund—the PEP program and the BLIPS program (Basic Learning in Primary Schools program). Everyone in the education system knew that they were finite programs and that they were going to conclude at the end of a set funding period. They were monitored and established under the aegis of the Schools Commission but, nevertheless, expectations have been raised in those areas as well. My belief is that we will probably

find the Commonwealth not embarking on many of those programs in future, particularly in the field of education.

The trend is that it is trying to walk away from many of those programs and transfer them to the States or the community generally, and so we are not likely to be placed in a situation, particularly in the field of education, where the Commonwealth is coming with some funds and wanting to establish key programs, especially in equity areas and then leaving the States to deal with the problems when the funding dries up.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My second question relates to superannuation payroll accounting. On page 82 of his Financial Statement the Premier referred to a \$700 000 saving for 'changed accounting method of determining superannuation payroll payments'. Can the Minister provide an explanation for that reference?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Ms Kolbe.

Ms Kolbe: It is actually a change in the Treasury method of charging superannuation on our payroll. If I recall correctly, in the main it relates to the charging of superannuation on Commonwealth funded programs, but there are a few other items to that. It represents a method of change in the accounting references of Treasury. We could perhaps reconcile that figure for the member.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes. My third question relates to program 1—as so many of these questions do—relating to school grants. Have schools been required to pay the costs of telephone calls out of the school grants that are provided? If not, is there a proposal to suggest that schools should now meet the costs of all telephone calls? If that is done, what will be the effect of this policy on those schools that require use of the telephone for distance education teaching techniques especially in country areas? Will any special assistance be provided for these schools?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I ask Ms Kolbe to explain.

Ms Kolbe: Any telephone calls of any kind are paid through the area and, therefore, come from a central budget. The school does not pay for telephone calls. However, we are contemplating looking at the policy at present and what may actually occur is that schools, if they choose to use a certain technology, that may need to be funded in a different way, but that is only something that is being considered now and at this very instant all the schools are having their telephone calls paid through the area so that there is no charge to them for telephones at all.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: In addition, I might say that there has been concern expressed in a number of school communities about the difficulties that schools are having in budgeting, particularly in areas where many of the families have low incomes. It is for that reason that a special grant was made earlier this year by way of a supplementary school grant based on need to assist schools in their budgeting processes. Certainly, that does not relate to the costs associated with schools that are paid centrally and telephones are in that category, and water and the like—but in this budget that support grant has been increased by 7 per cent for primary and high schools.

In the past five years there has been a consistent and substantial increase in grants to all schools, but particularly an increased amount to those students in receipt of Government assistance, the so-called GAS student category. The increase this year and last year has been in excess of the overall student grant as well. We have attempted in these past two budgets to provide additional assistance to those students from more needy families to try to assist the school in providing the range of services from within the school budget itself.

Membership:

Mr I.P. Lewis substituted for the Hon. H. Allison.

Mr ROBERTSON: I note on page 430 of the yellow book a reference under 'Curriculum Services Program' that the department will continue the development of the policy on post-compulsory education. At what stage has that policy exercise reached now? What has been the final upshot of that policy? What does the Minister envisage as the aims of that policy, how soon can we expect to see it implemented, and with what results?

Mr Steinle: The most substantial changes in education at present are taking place in the post-compulsory area. There are two ways in which one can go about accommodating those changes: one is the method used by Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia, which is to write a report and in a top down fashion change the system rapidly. The history of this State is one of accommodating change in a pragmatic and slower fashion in consultation with schools. We have adopted that line with the adaptation of the senior curriculum in our schools.

In order to do that, we have a working party which has been working with schools to prepare a statement which will be made available to the community to indicate what our schools are doing in the post-compulsory area. It is a statement based on the developments which are taking place, but with agreement between the Education Department, State high schools, and non-State schools. There are a number of components to that: one is a broadening of the curriculum; the second is a broadening of the base of students admitted to senior secondary; the third is the accreditation procedures; and the fourth is the relationship between those classes and commerce and industry. The first set of papers has been prepared in draft, and one is being circulated to schools for feedback. A group of commentators is being asked to comment upon that.

I hope that that work will be finished within the next few months, and that we can then ensure that the community is clear about the changing nature of post-compulsory education. Some aspects of it have already been piloted. Perhaps one of the most interesting is that of a new style reporting arrangement, which is based on work done in Boston but also recently introduced in the ILEA (Inner London Education Authority) in Britain, which is a compendium of documents which students own for themselves.

It is a folio with loose leaf inserts, which will contain documentation about a child that will carry through the child's secondary years. It will contain data about academic results, comments about the child's activities at school and, if they wish, it will include references from employers children have had during their life at school, and other documentation they choose to place in the compendium.

With that, we hope that when a child applies for a job he can tailor the compendium which he will take to the employer or to the institution to which he wishes to gain entry, and it will reflect the life and attainments of the individual child. These are the kinds of issues which will be addressed in the paper.

Mr ROBERTSON: The major area of intellectual disability, which is well known, is Downs Syndrome. There has been a move over the past decade to keep Downs Syndrome children in the mainstream of CSO, primary schools, and secondary schools. How many Downs Syndrome children are currently enrolled in South Australian primary schools? How many are enrolled in secondary schools and how many Downs Syndrome children of school age are not within the school system for one reason or another?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I do not think that that information is readily available, but I undertake to find out whether it can be readily collected and make it available to the honourable member.

Mr MEIER: The Minister would be aware that last year I brought up a situation which had been brought to my attention about the lack of music teachers in country areas, generally, but certainly in the western area. I know that the situation has not improved greatly since then. I am also aware of a person who is concerned with music education in the eastern area who has complained about the distribution of travelling music teacher resources in the department. There is no music teacher at the school with which this person is associated, although the school is hoping to gain access to a travelling music teacher to help develop a music program in the future—hopefully, the near future.

When this person spoke to the department he was told that resources could not be reallocated to the country until there had been a resignation from the city. The person believes that the division of salaries for music teachers between the various areas is as follows: for the city areas—Adelaide, 26 full-time equivalent music teachers; southern, 23.5; northern, 10.7; for the country regions—eastern area, 10.7; western, 7.2. However, this person was very cross when he noted in the *Education Gazette* of 4 September of this year an advertisement for a .6 vacancy for a percussion teacher to service schools in the Adelaide area with the additional responsibility to service the DUCT program in the western area.

He accepts that students who have commenced courses for this year should be able to complete their courses, but the salary should be reallocated as from next year for the country regions. Why was this vacancy not reallocated to one of the country areas?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask the Director-General to comment, but this indicates the extent to which resources have been applied for the teaching of music in our schools. I was just trying to add up those figures, and there are some 50-odd salaries to which the honourable member referred, which is substantial expenditure—many millions of dollars—provided for specialist music teaching in this area. The honourable member might like to make some comparisons between the offerings in other States in this area and the ability to also continue that music component of the curriculum through the years of education.

We have a very substantial commitment in this State to the teaching of music. It is a feature of our education system which is very much sought after. However, I think there is an explanation for the position, which might allay the anger of the teacher who made representations to you.

Mr Steinle: I am delighted to hear the Minister support the music programs in this State. They are something in which the State can take great pride, and the progress that has been made in South Australia is something of which, as South Australians, we can all be very proud. I believe that the question is based on a false premise. I question the original comment that the inquirer was told that an appointment could not be made to that area until there was a resignation in the city.

I assure the honourable member that a great deal of painstaking effort goes into the division of those resources and, once the allocations are made, the areas maintain that level of resources for the financial year. There is not some kind of hierarchy that determines that the Adelaide area is given additional resources at the expense of the other four areas. The areas stand alone in that regard. If a vacancy occurred in the eastern area, it would be filled within the allocation for the eastern area, in the same way as a vacancy within

the Adelaide area would be filled. I suspect that the information was provided by an officer of the department but, if it was given in that way, it was fundamentally incorrect.

Mr MEIER: I certainly support any moves to increase resources to the music area. I hope I made my point—that there is a definite lack of sufficient music resources in terms of paid staff in country areas. If we tally up the full-time equivalents, we see that there are almost 60 full-time equivalents in city areas but 18 for country areas. I am sure that the Minister could provide figures for city and country areas, and in most cases we would be talking about secondary schools. We would find that the ratio would probably not be three to one, as applies to staffing at present. But that is by the by. What is the department's policy on future vacancies in the Adelaide or southern areas? How does the department intend to overcome the disadvantages that country students currently suffer in music education programs?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Does the honourable member refer to western and southern areas, or eastern areas?

Mr MEIER: I refer to a broader area. The Director-General has said that it is not correct that there must be a resignation in the city area before teachers come to the country, and I accept that. How does the department or the Minister intend to overcome the disadvantage that currently exists with respect to the music program in country areas?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The points I made earlier about the use of new technologies are relevant. The job description which was advertised in early September and to which the honourable member referred stated that part of the duties of that officer would be to work with the DUCT system, that is, with students in isolated parts of the State. It was also indicated that peripatetic teachers travel to schools throughout the State and are now working with the advisers one day a week at each school. A number of those advisers are music specialists. There are opportunities to target specific schools or groups of schools to provide support for teachers who take on music components of the curriculum. In those and a variety of other ways we try to redress some of the difficulties faced by students in the more isolated areas of the State, particularly in very small schools where it is just not possible to have a music specialist on staff. There are a variety of ways in which we address some of those shortcomings. If the honourable member would like to take up that specific example and provide us with the information, perhaps we could provide a more detailed response on this situation.

Mr MEIER: That might be possible. I would be very interested to know to what extent city schools provide their own instruments, or whether they are purchased through fund raising, as I believe is the case in most country schools of which I am aware. To what extent does the department provide musical instruments for schools, or are all schools expected to raise funds, wherever possible, to purchase instruments? I recognise that many students would have their own instrument.

Mr Steinle: Where courses are run by the music branch, we provide instruments, but schools encourage young people to buy their own instruments. In a sense, there is a mix.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I was at Woodside Primary School recently; the school community, through fundraising had bought a series of electronic organs that were installed in such a way that individual tuition as well as group tuition using headphones and other equipment was possible. That was seen as a high priority by that school community. I believe that Marryatville High School recently raised \$100 000 to send a group of very talented students to Europe to extend their skills in the music field, to play at a number

of concerts, and to be tutored by very famous musicians. It depends very much on the focus of the school, the commitment of parents and staff and the ethos that has developed around the importance of music in various schools. That takes many and varied forms. As I said earlier, it is very much a feature of the life of schools in South Australia. During this week and last week there has been a series of superb concerts at the Festival Theatre that illustrate the achievements of music teaching in our schools.

Mr KLUNDER: The Program Estimates (page 414) under programs 1 and 2 refer to provision of general primary and secondary education in schools. I note that \$75 000 was allocated for classroom instruction in the 1986-87 financial year. I am dying to know what in classroom instruction involved \$75 000 worth of capital expenditure. Secondly, why did primary schools spend \$130 000 of the \$75 000 while secondary schools spent only \$9 000 of the \$75 000?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: We will have to obtain that information.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Earlier the Minister referred to the Correspondence School under program 8. What is the current status of proposed changes to the South Australian Correspondence School and when are they likely to be implemented? Has a new site been located for the school? Is there discussion within the Education Department about a possible closer link between the Correspondence School and the School of the Air?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I referred to a site for relocation earlier in response to a question about relocation of education services centrally located or adjacent to schools. It is our firm intention to relocate the Correspondence School, which has a staff of about 100 teachers, to a school site. There has been no final determination on an appropriate site, although there have certainly been ongoing discussions with school communities on that matter. With respect to the status of the Correspondence School in that transfer, there has been some discussion about separating the primary and secondary components, and it is not our intention to do that in this transfer. There is considerable merit in leaving the school as an entity.

However, it is evident that there is considerable value in the Correspondence School being located on or adjacent to a school and that there is also some advantage, particularly in the senior secondary areas, of having access to the staff and range of resources that are available in a school setting that may add to the ability of the Correspondence School to serve its students. Also, there is a question of access to the school by students, whether they are isolated by means of disability or by geographic domicile. All those matters can be addressed in the current round of discussions and action that is going on about this matter. I will ask the Director-General to comment on the School of the Air, as I am not aware of the precise nature of the discussions that are going on about that.

Mr Steinle: I am a little surprised that there would be a question about the relationship between the School of the Air and the Correspondence School, because the links are of long standing and the two work together. Indeed, it is not just a matter of our own School of the Air but the Broken Hill School of the Air and the Broken Hill Correspondence School as well, where the links are long standing. However, it may be that the question addresses the fact that, with the new technologies, the nature of the Correspondence School and the School of the Air themselves have been the subject of a great deal of discussion because, if we have access to satellites and we are in a position where young people can respond directly through the new tech-

nologies, the notion of correspondence education will need to be changed markedly.

We have given that a great deal of attention and my guess is that in the years ahead what we know as both the Correspondence School and the Schools of the Air will change because of the impact of new technology. Thus far it is difficult to be precise about that, because both cost and the uncertainty of the styles of new technologies themselves make that a little uncertain. The Deputy Principal of the Correspondence School, who was a world authority on the application of new technologies in correspondence education, has given this matter a great deal of thought, and he has been to Canada to keep in touch with what is happening there.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I noticed an ABC television program on the weekend covering one of the teachers who visits remote parts of the State, and that program highlighted the use of new technologies in distance education. Obviously, this is an area of rapidly changing techniques.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Pages 66 and 67 of the Premier's Financial Statement discuss the round sum allowance for increased wage and salary rates and other contingencies. Page 66 shows an amount of \$400 000 for computer processing costs in the Education Department and page 67 shows an amount of \$1.9 million for variations in Commonwealth and other receipts for education. What are the reasons for the department's computer processing costs being included in the round sum allowance? Will the Minister give a breakdown of the \$1.9 million referred to?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will ask Ms Kolbe to comment on those matters.

Ms Kolbe: The \$1.9 million from the Commonwealth refers to the betterment funding, and we were not sure whether or not it was going to come about. I will need to more carefully look at it to make sure that it is that particular \$1.9 million. The computer processing costs relate to increased costs that we have incurred on account of the Treasury Accounting System that was introduced last year. The understanding was that Treasury, because it was a Treasury requirement, would fund that particular processing cost separately. We will need to draw on that, if necessary. If the processing costs which cannot be totally assessed at this point in time will not require those funds to be used, then that will not be the case.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Is any budget line available to the Minister of Education that would allow him to direct grants to a school without formal consideration by the department? The Minister of Health had such a line.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Under the miscellaneous lines there is a capacity to do that if the Minister wanted to redirect money from one given line to another and went through the processes to do that, that is, to take the money away from one organisation and give it to a school.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Ministerial discretion?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Yes, that would be the only area in which that could be done. Within the minor works program I have sought, as a result of representations with a number of schools, to enter into agreements with schools where there is substantial capacity in a school to raise funds and that school would otherwise not be able to carry out works that are becoming major works, and then to provide an arrangement whereby funds could be provided so that on a dollar-for-dollar basis incentive can be given to that school to raise funds and over a period of years to develop a program and a massive sum of funds to enable that school to be redeveloped. I am very keen to enter down that track with a number of school communities where obviously

there is a very real commitment and capacity to raise funds without which those developments would not be able to take place. Outside of the works area, I do not know of any ability that the Minister would have to give grants to specific schools.

Mr ROBERTSON: One of the effects of falling enrolments in certain parts of the Adelaide metropolitan area particularly has been the release or so-called 'freeing up' of teachers, and other resources, I guess, not the least of which is space. In relation to teachers, how is it proposed to employ them in future, presuming that the majority of them will stay in the secondary system? What general guidelines will be applied to that redeployment process?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: As honourable members will be aware, a substantial enrolment decline in recent years—some 42 000 students in the last decade in our schools—has allowed for the so-called 'freeing up' of a very large number of teaching positions. It is estimated that some 600 positions have been freed up in that way and have been able to be applied for various programs, many of which we have referred to during the course of this Committee's deliberations.

A further allocation of some 90 positions has yet to be decided for the 1988 school year; and some 20 of them have been earmarked, as I said earlier, to the provision of language teaching in schools. This week discussions will be held with various interested groups directly involved in this matter in the education community about the allocation of the remaining 70 positions and how they will be expended during the 1988 school year.

Mr ROBERTSON: I refer to 'specific targets and objectives' on page 439 of the yellow book and to the seeking of outside sponsorship and media support for various vacation, recreation and disadvantaged activity programs within schools. I also note the intention to develop links between the various forms of vacation and out of hours school recreation programs with outside organisations such as the YMCA, YWCA, the scouts, 'Life. Be in it', and so on. How far have discussions proceeded in finding outside sponsorship, what steps have been taken to enlist media support, and what links have been forged thus far with outside groups such as the scouts and the YMCA?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There is a number of areas of fruitful consideration with respect to the ability of the department to provide important ongoing programs, particularly in the recreation area and our ability to gain resources outside of traditional sources to provide for those programs and, indeed, continue with some that are becoming expensive to maintain given relative changes in priorities. I refer to the Aussie Sport Program, which has been quite successful and has been funded from outside the department. Obviously it is very much in the interests of our schools to have their students participate in a program of that type.

In the aquatics area, the West Lakes Aquatic Centre, for example, has been able to call on substantial private sponsorship to develop its program. A large number of students go through the aquatics and water safety programs provided at that centre and indeed a number of other centres. So the range of funding made available from outside the department has been valuable in maintaining the viability of that centre. It is in that context that those discussions and proposals are continuing within the department.

Mr LEWIS: My question is supplementary to one put earlier in the day by the member for Mount Gambier in relation to library resources within the department and the packing up and storing away of books in boxes. I understand from what the Minister said in reply that there is no intention to close down or disband that resource and that the

inordinately long time that is being taken to find it a home has a reasonable explanation.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There certainly is no intention to close it down—and there never was. It is a valuable service and people are out in the schools working at the moment. In fact, I saw a person the other day at Tumby Bay assisting in the development of a library there, culling books, giving advice, and so on. The base for that program will be transferred from a central location into a school because the lease expired on the property that we were renting and we were evicted, as it were, from those premises and were able to save that rent by relocating in school premises where there is vacant space.

Negotiations have been occurring as to the transfer and funding of an appropriate school that will welcome that group of people. They will use that school as their base and obviously structural alterations will be required to accommodate them. That process is going on at the moment. There is nothing sinister about it and, in fact, I think the honourable member would support that process. It has involved some packing up of resources and some dislocation to the service. That is regretted but I hope that it will be of short duration.

Mr LEWIS: What is the score with the Priority Country Education Program at the present time, and how will that program continue in the future? Will it be modified at all?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I will have to obtain detailed information for the honourable member on that program and where it is in terms of funding from the Schools Commission. My initial reaction is that there is no change to the program, but I will have to check the facts to confirm that.

Mr LEWIS: I accept the Minister's assurance on that point. Why is it that schools such as Swan Reach cannot be included in the Priority Country Education Program? Schools such as Swan Reach are in the same boat as other schools that it relates to in the immediate geographic vicinity, and I refer to East Murray, Brown's Well, Karoonda, and Geranium. They are all area schools of limited numbers and well over 100 kilometres from Adelaide. Swan Reach is 140 kilometres from Adelaide yet for some reason it is not currently part of the Priority Country Education Program.

Certainly the children at Swan Reach are no different in my assessment in terms of the social and economic circumstances from which they come to those children in the schools that I have referred to nearby. The children at Swan Reach will continue to be disadvantaged in some measure if they are not included in this program. Mr Chairman, I urge you to allow me to put it to the Minister that the children of Swan Reach need extra assistance in the school to get them out of their insularity and isolation which occurs through no fault of their own.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Once again, why a particular school does not benefit from that program is something on which I will have to seek information, but I point out that schools receive assistance under that program on the basis of criteria established by the Federal Government. It may be that only a finite number of schools can participate in the program, and perhaps they are rotated from time to time, with some schools being joined and others dropped. I will need to check on that but I am sure that we all agree that the schools mentioned by the honourable member are probably little different from other schools that the honourable member mentioned which do receive the benefit of the program. We will check the facts and the criteria and see what is happening.

Mr LEWIS: Of the 151 enrolled students at the Swan Reach Area School 52 receive GAS allowances, and that is rather high. I now turn to the maintenance that parents and staff believe is necessary for the Murray Bridge South Primary School buildings. They have written to me pointing out that the buildings are showing evident signs of deterioration. A number of schools in my electorate have suffered the same difficulty in the past and I have drawn the Minister's attention to that fact, the most recent reference being to the Keith Area School. The Murray Bridge South Primary School Council does not understand why the school's wooden buildings will not be painted in the near future. They are fairly shabby and if they are let deteriorate much further we will have to start replacing timbers, which will cost a lot more than the interest on the money that would have been spent to paint them this year.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member touches on an issue of ongoing concern to the Education Department, which owns over \$2 billion worth of properties around the State at a thousand locations and which is unable to raise sufficient revenue to maintain all of them. I acknowledge that, as I have done publicly on a number of occasions. One problem is declining enrolments resulting in an inefficient use of properties, which in turn results in the consumption of a disproportionate amount of resources in maintaining schools which should no longer exist. It is not easy to find a solution to the reconfiguration of schools that will bring about a much more efficient delivery of education services for students and parents, a better working environment for teachers and a lesser burden on the taxpayers of this State.

There are buildings passing their appropriate maintenance cycle: for example, painting. That applies not only to the Murray Bridge South Primary School—many schools in this State are going through that process, and I regret that very much. As I said earlier, we are looking for ways to overcome this problem and to support the parents where there is an obvious commitment by them to either raise funds or do the painting themselves. I would like to break through some of the barriers that make that difficult to achieve, perhaps by way of dollar for dollar funds, and the like, so that we can spread existing financial resources a little more widely in the community. Perhaps this is a fruitful area for further discussion between the department and the schools involved.

Mr LEWIS: I presume that the Minister can see the benefits in involving willing school councils in doing minor, straightforward maintenance and repair jobs around schools on a tender basis, if I can put it that way, knowing that by so doing it will ensure the retention of the asset in good condition for the children and in the best interests of the State's assets overall.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I cannot say that that is a general policy, because it is fraught with many difficulties in relation to industrial health, welfare and safety, for example. I am not ruling out the possibility of discussion to ascertain whether there can be movement down that path with individual school communities to get that work done.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I take the next question I will open the miscellaneous line so that questions can be taken until 6 o'clock while Education Department officials are present. We will not close that line because there will be further questions relating to other parts of the Minister's jurisdiction.

Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs,
Miscellaneous, \$47 215 000

Chairman:

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Members:

The Hon. P.B. Arnold
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Mr I.P. Lewis
Mr E.J. Meier
Mr D.J. Robertson
The Hon. J.W. Slater

Witness:

The Hon. G.J. Crafter, Minister of Education.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J.R. Steinle, Director-General.
Ms H. Kolbe, Director, Education (Resources).
Mr D.A. Cambareri, Acting Assistant Director, Finance.
Mr J.C. Cusack, Director of Education (Southern Area).
Mr J.D. Christie, Acting Deputy Director (Resources).
Ms C. Sen Chee, Senior Administration Officer.
Ms R.C. Gracanin, Executive Officer.
Mr R.P. Webbe, Executive Officer, Government Schools Secretariat.
Dr V.G. Eyers, Director, Senior Secondary Assessment Board.
Mr J. Moriarty, Director, Office of Aboriginal Affairs.
Mr G. Knill, Chief Administrative Officer.
Ms J. Haynes, Senior Project Officer.

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

Mr ROBERTSON: Early last year a number of items of playground equipment in various schools in the southern area were found to be suspect or dangerous, and parent bodies undertook to replace various pieces of equipment, some of which was quite dangerous for the children playing on it. I understand that since that time guidelines have been produced for the benefit of schools and have presumably been issued to the schools. Can the Minister say whether any doubts that the schools held about what was safe equipment and what was unsafe have been removed so that schools will not again be put through the exercise of ripping out relatively expensive equipment and replacing it at short notice?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: It has not traditionally been the responsibility of the Education Department to provide funds for the cost, installation or erection of playground equipment. We provided a small sum in the budget last year and again this year to assist a small number of schools in this transition situation where there has been much uncertainty. I guess that many schools erred on the side of caution and safety and removed equipment so that there would be no danger to the welfare of students using that equipment. Technology in this area and the understanding of the nature of playground equipment has changed dramatically in recent years. There is now much more knowledge available to us and to schools about what is safe equipment and about the importance of play to the overall education and development of children.

This is a changing area and one where technology is changing also. Much work is being done to bring together the various authorities involved in advising schools and establishing regulations. There are people with expertise in the provision of this type of equipment such as the consultants, parent organisations and people involved with the

schools, so there is a structure in place and work being done. This subject has caused heartburn in a number of school communities about which we are all aware, but hopefully the outcome will be a satisfactory one for us all.

Mr MEIER: I would like to take this matter further. The Minister may remember that some time ago I raised with them the problem that the Edithburg Primary School was having with its playground, which was put out of bounds for a time because it was supposedly not up to appropriate standards. Thankfully that problem has been addressed and the playground has been operating again for most of this year. Can the Minister outline the guidelines for the types of equipment that can be used in playgrounds?

Concern was expressed to me when I visited other schools that they virtually wanted to keep their playground quiet and out of sight of visitors because they are scared that if the wrong person came to look at it they might put it out of bounds. I refer to the example where I saw a slippery dip going into a sandpit. I said that there would not be a problem on that score and was told that I must be joking. I was told that if the wrong official saw that slippery dip it would be put out of bounds or it would have to be changed straight away. On asking why, I was told because there was sand underneath it. I would have thought that sand formed an excellent base but I was told that it was not the right surface underneath and that children could play in the sand.

I understand the concerns of these people because I have in front of me two documents, one of which is a memo from the Director-General, dated 17 July 1986, entitled 'A Circular to Principals of Schools and Chairpersons of School Councils: Management of School Playgrounds'. That circular details four items relating to the management of playgrounds for the attention of principals and school council chairmen. An attachment is headed 'Ground treatment under playground equipment' from the Site Development Office, Department of Housing and Construction. It is overdated 17 July 1986, the same date as the Director-General's memo or circular, and states:

150-200 mm depth of clean washed natural sand, with a single particle size approx. 0.75-1.5 mm. Particles should be spherical in shape in contrast with quarry type products that are angular. The best description of the recommended sand is common 'beach sand'.

That is one of the recommended materials. In the same memo, paragraph 3 provides:

Grass: in low use areas a thick grass cover of kikuyu or buffalo is normally satisfactory, but unlikely to last very long in well used areas.

That is one attachment. A letter from the Western Area Manager for Facilities contained another attachment, entitled 'The 1987 Playground Manual', also from the Department of Housing and Construction. At page 19 that manual states:

Note: Sand of all types is unacceptable, and not to be used.

Further down it states:

As a result of the above testing it has been found that grass and natural sand are also unacceptable, and they should be replaced with one of the recommended materials.

It was quite understandable that the school that referred this matter to me was confused as to what was or was not acceptable. I was told that in future the school would not make any fuss, that it would just keep the playground in the background and hope that there would not be any accidents. Clearly, that anomaly involving the two directives should be cleared up.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Also, those directions need to be put in chronological order. As I said earlier, it is true that approaches and technologies have been changing. The Department of Housing and Construction and also the

Health Commission have been advising on some aspects. There is now formed a coordinating structure so that there is a more unified approach to this, and a refinement of all the advice that has been given by the various authorities, albeit in good faith, to school communities. Ultimately the taxpayer is responsible for injuries resulting from equipment on property that forms part of a school. So, we do have some legal obligations as a department and the definition of what is safe and unsafe obviously is the subject of debate. Ultimately that is decided by a court where there is a challenge, but we need to ensure that there is coordinated provision of information, that the latest understandings and technologies are synthesised and made available clearly and simply to school communities, and there is now a structure in place that can do that where hitherto there has not been. That is why there has been a scattering of that information, albeit in good faith but coming from different sources, and that has been undoubtedly confusing to school communities.

Mr MEIER: In other words, one can only take the most recent publication as being the accurate information on what is allowed. Certainly, it is of great concern to me not only about school playgrounds but playgrounds generally that we may have gone overboard. I recognise the necessity for safety measures, but I hope that commonsense will prevail and that we will not have a series of books or other sheets with officers coming in and saying that, although equipment looks safe, it will have to be disposed of. One thing I would hate to see disappear is commonsense.

My second question refers to the miscellaneous lines. On page 137 of the Estimates of Payment the listing of grants to organisations includes an allocation of \$307 000 for this year. Will the Minister provide details of which organisations will receive funding and how much each organisation will receive? Will the Minister also provide similar information for 1986-87?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Yes, I will ensure that that information is provided to the honourable member.

Mr MEIER: My last question deals with school sport. Members will probably be aware that the South Australian Secondary School Sports Association is presently situated at the Orphanage, Goodwood Road. Two executive officers work for the program. Will one of those two positions be axed for next year?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I have no knowledge of that. I will undertake to find out whether there is any proposal to change that structure, but I certainly have no knowledge of that.

Mr MEIER: As a supplementary question, has the department an application for funding to take a team of school children to Brisbane for the Pacific School Games? If so, what has been the response?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Again, I have no personal knowledge of that. We get up to 200 letters a day in my office, and the department, through its numerous outlets, receives many more letters than that. We will have to track that question down. I might say that the sports programs provided by the department through the various associations and the substantial resources that are applied, particularly through the temporary relief teaching days, for the involvement of teachers in the organised competitive sporting activities, are substantial and stand us once again in good stead with other States. We have a group of dedicated people, working in the department in schools, who provide the basis for that very good program.

Mr KLUNDER: I refer to page 430 of the yellow book under the heading '1987-88 Specific Targets/Objectives' a point indicates that one of the targets is to develop guide-

lines to address the issue of inclusivity in all curriculum areas. I am afraid that that shorthand is beyond me. Is there someone with skill in curriculum who would not mind explaining that to me?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I refer that to the Director-General.

Mr Steinle: May I say that I have great sympathy for the honourable member in relation to the appalling education jargon, and I think that that is one of the worst examples of it. It simply means that, as a curriculum principle, things like the equality of opportunity, and so on, should not be marginalised: that there should not be a separate block of activity on equality of opportunity, education of Aborigines and those kinds of things that should be made part of the fabric of what schools do. The word is appalling, I agree, but it simply means that we should not break up the curriculum into a lot of little bits and pieces but that all those things should be subsumed into the whole—and I will pass on the reservation about the words.

Mr LEWIS: The Minister referred earlier today to the Yerbury report. In the past 12 months there has been a lot of discussion about that and the leadership paper. Can the Minister indicate to the Committee the current status of those discussions and a possible time frame for action?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The two matters are interrelated, to some extent, and are now the subject of detailed discussions between the interested parties. It should not be seen, though, as nothing has been done. Progress has been made on both those reports and, in part, they have been implemented. However, there are still some very substantive issues to be resolved with respect to both those documents. I ask Mr Christie, who is directly involved in those as Director of Personnel of the department, to comment further.

Mr Christie: In terms of the leadership proposals, we have seconded Dr Hicks, an Assistant Director, Personnel, from the southern area, to work on those proposals. He is currently trying to develop what we had from a conceptual model down to a fairly practical model, looking at what effect this proposal would have at the school level, what sort of leadership position should be used, and doing some costing. I believe that, once we have done the necessary costing, this will need to be discussed with Treasury. I believe that Cabinet would want to be involved in that before we started negotiating with the SAIT.

So, there is still some work to be done, but I hope that within the next three or four weeks we will be in a position to take up the matter with Treasury. On the Yerbury proposals, I think that it is important to note that that document covers just about every aspect of the personnel process or function in the department. It has something like 60 recommendations, many of which are very general in nature. They point to directions and require quite in-depth investigations themselves. Some recommendations have already been put into effect, some are currently being researched, some are under negotiation with the SAIT, and some are yet to be commenced. So, I think it is a question of resources as to just how quickly we complete this. I cannot give you a time line as to when it will be completed, because there is just such comprehensive coverage that it would be pointless to do that. We are working on them as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr LEWIS: Does that mean weeks, months, or are we looking at 1990?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: With respect to the leadership paper there have been ongoing discussions in the department since the early 1980s. Some 300 meetings have been held, and the strategy that Mr Christie is outlining is to

bring this to a conclusion. That requires some substantive issues to be addressed, so the time span is now closing to bring this matter to a fruitful conclusion.

Mr LEWIS: We just do not know how long it will be? I am not asking you to say next month: I am asking you to indicate whether you think it will be within months or will it still take years?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: In some of the areas it may be necessary for the SAIT to have a referendum of its members and, obviously, those issues will take some time. But we are getting closer to those sorts of decisions being made. I hope that within this financial year both those papers can be concluded.

Mr LEWIS: Thank you. I appreciate being able to get that measure of clarification. I believe it to be an important consideration, in that it will avoid in future the very unnecessary and unfortunate embarrassment that was caused to a school in my electorate when the house husband of Senator Janine Haines cast aspersions on the integrity and respectability of the Tintinara Area School. I think that that school is quite outstanding, given the limited resources at its disposal and the sort of support that it gets from its community. The question of who should go where and under what terms needs to be defined in a way that ensures that its staff know the rules, and at present they do not.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I thank the Minister and his officers for the manner in which the questions have been dealt with, and I am especially grateful for the patience of the officers. I have sent the Minister correspondence about the difficulties that are occurring in some high schools in the Adelaide area in relation to area procedures for assessing enrolment applications. I refer particularly to Norwood High School's difficulty. It is a school which is well over its optimum size, and that difficulty is exacerbated by the fact that the area gives precedence to second preference applications which have failed in their first preference to Marryatville High or any other school over first preference applications, out-of-zone applications, for Norwood High School.

The result is that at least one student in my electorate—and very likely more than one—has expressed a first preference for Norwood High and lives closer to the school than others who have had a second preference for Norwood High accepted from suburbs as far away as Athelstone, Dernancourt and even Brahma Lodge. That seems to me to be a wrong system, and I ask the Minister whether he would be willing to review the present procedures.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I have had similar representations to those put to the honourable member, as we share that high school in our electorates, and I undertake to have a review of those arrangements, because there does seem to be an anomaly in the system. I know that there is a common catchment area, and Marryatville has a small catchment area because it is a special focus music school as well. There is very real pressure on the enrolments of both those schools, indicating the quality of the education that is provided there. There are many students who also come from non-government schools to enrol in those schools, and this is a further measure of the quality of education provided. I will be pleased to undertake that for the honourable member.

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

Children's Services Office, \$38 030 000; Works and Services—Children's Services Office, \$400 000

Chairman:

Mr D.M. Ferguson

Members:

The Hon. H. Allison
The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore
Mr J.H.C. Klunder
Mr E.J. Meier
Mr D.J. Robertson
The Hon. J.W. Slater

Witness:

The Hon. G.J. Crafter, Minister of Children's Services.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr B. Wright, Director, Children's Services Office.
Mr G. Habersfeld, Director of Resources, Children's Services Office.
Ms A. Howe, Director, Policy, Planning and Development.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I note from page 453 of the yellow book that one of the targets for 1987-88 is the development of 17 Commonwealth-State child-care centres. Mrs L. Work, the President of the Private Child-care Association, has told the Opposition that, while centres are badly needed in many low socio-economic areas, many of the new centres are built close to private centres. For example, there is a Government centre in the same Wayville street as a private centre, and a Tea Tree Gully centre only five minutes from a Redwood Park private centre. Mrs Work further advises that there are many permanent vacancies in private centres at present. Has the Minister considered the possibility of using vacancies in private centres and providing subsidies to the needy rather than outlaying large sums of money on building new centres? Does the CSO try to work with the Private Child-care Association in the delivery of care services, or is it seen as a competing agency? What is the reason for the long delays in approval of new private child-care centres by the CSO? For example, I understand that there was a 12-month delay in relation to the Redwood Park centre and a 14-month delay for a centre at Gawler.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The child-care program is a Commonwealth initiated program, although, as a result of the Commonwealth-State agreement, it requires cooperation of and certainly some capital funding by the State Government. Current funding is provided by the Commonwealth. Planning for centres comes about as a result of a joint Commonwealth-State planning committee and, as the honourable member suggested, centres are provided in areas of high need as determined by various indicators.

So far sharing of resources has not been part of the model, and I understand that the initial thrust in the provision of these 20 000 child-care places around Australia has been to try to meet some of the enormous need in the community for child-care. I recall that last year during the Estimates Committees the honourable member expressed concern about the substantial unmet need in the community not only for child-care as we know it (that is, day care provided by these centres) but also occasional care, respite care, and the like. The situation may arise where changes can be made in the operation of this program, but I suggest that we are still in the very early stages of meeting the very substantial unmet

need for this service in our community. It has been estimated that as yet we are not meeting 10 per cent of the need in the community. It boils down to who can afford that service. That is one of the difficulties that the privately owned child-care centres face. Sure, there is a need for that service, but who can afford to pay for it? How does one access assistance?

I have had discussions with the private child-care centre people about that very issue, and they are seeking tax subsidies, and the like. I am aware of their concerns in this area. In relation to one centre we have approached the Commonwealth Government. Where a centre is on the market and is proving to be not viable for the operators, and where it is in an area in which we would like to provide a community-based subsidised centre, we have suggested that the Commonwealth look to a different form of arrangement involving our acquiring or leasing that privately owned child-care centre. To date the Commonwealth has not indicated support for that proposal. I suggest that perhaps the concerns expressed or the proposals put forward by the honourable member on behalf of those who have made representations to her should not be ruled out of court but may be premature in terms of where we are at present in providing a service to the community.

There are a multitude of reasons why there have been delays in the construction of centres, ranging from suitability of property, access to property, and the difficulties in gaining title, and the like. The Director may be able to throw some light on the examples that the honourable member has raised. If not, I will obtain that information.

Mr Wright: I believe that the honourable member was talking about delays in licensing centres, rather than delays in construction; am I correct?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, in terms of approval, which obviously relates to the licence.

Mr Wright: I am not aware that there have been substantial delays. The honourable member referred to two centres in particular. I know that the Gawler centre is a private centre which is currently under construction and nearing completion. I understand that the proprietor, as late as last week, had not actually applied for a licence. The licensing regulations for child-care centres are quite specific and last week the proprietors were at the point of bringing their new property up to the standard required by the regulations before they actually made a move to seek a licence. I encouraged them to move as quickly as they could because, while there is no substantial delay, obviously there must be some delay while inspections are made. I am not aware that there are long delays; rather, delays are caused by other factors, such as preparation of the site to meet licensing requirements.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Supplementary to what the Minister said, I take it from his rather guarded response that he has no philosophical objection to subsidising places in private child-care centres. If 10 per cent of the need is unmet, surely it makes sense, rather than expending huge capital sums on building new centres, to use available vacant places in the same way as in the use of private hospitals for public patients and in appropriate circumstances in the provision of Housing Trust rental subsidies for private accommodation instead of expending capital on new public housing. Would the Minister be willing to make representations to the Commonwealth seeking approval not to lease unviable centres (because that is quite a separate policy) but to subsidise the fees in private child-care centres for children who need free places where those places are not available because of the lack of Government centres?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I believe that the honourable member misunderstood; I said that we were meeting only 10 per cent of the need rather than there being 10 per cent to be met.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am sorry; I reversed that.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: What I am saying is that I have not addressed the situation to which the honourable member refers and I believe that any consideration on that is premature at this stage, because we really have to get the facilities in accordance with the Commonwealth-State agreement on the ground, operating and under way before we can consider the further opportunities that may be available for extending the provision of this service in the community. I do not rule out the question of the non-government child-care sector being involved but, as I said, I have not addressed that, and I believe that it is premature to do that. Therefore, it would be pointless of me at this stage to make representations at least until we get down the track in developing an infrastructure in the community with respect to at least meeting a minimal amount of the need in the community.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Has the Children's Services Office yet been able to review the effects of the new enrolment policy? If it has, what are the results of that review?

Mr Wright: We have had a preliminary look at the enrolment policy effects. Members may be interested to know that we conduct a census of all children's services on an annual basis. We conducted the 1987 census recently. The results are in but they are not fully analysed or tabulated. We have had a preliminary look at the figures and it would appear that the primary effect of the enrolment policy has been to enable more four-year-olds to attend kindergarten. In other words, we have been able to increase the access to kindergarten for those children who, in accordance with Government policy, are entitled to attend kindergarten. There has been a small reduction in the number of children who are either under four or over five attending kindergarten.

The objective of the enrolment policy was to ensure that the resources available are directed at those children to whom they are intended to go. The preliminary look at those figures suggests that the policy is effective in achieving that objective.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Page 453 of the yellow book refers to major changes in the administration of the family day care program. What have been the major changes to that program? Have the regulations that apply to it been changed recently and, if so, in what respect?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Once again, it is a wholly Commonwealth funded program, and as a result of decisions taken by the Commonwealth Government it has been possible to expand it. We have also been able to streamline the administration of it, and that has meant a restructuring and a relocation of some of the decentralised offices that administer the program as well. I will ask Mr Wright to give the Committee the details of that reorganisation.

Mr Wright: The restructuring involved the reduction in a number of schemes (that is, administrative units) operating family day care services in the State from 22 to around 13. That has meant that we have been able to place more resources, because of a reduction in administrative overheads, into field workers who are the staff who recruit, select, train and supervise the ongoing family day care activities in the community. The reduced number of family day care schemes now have administrative arrangements in place which enable them to be held more accountable for the quality and accessibility of the family day care services

and allows us, as the organisation administering the scheme as a whole, to have a much better picture of the level of need that is being met by family day care and to see where deficiencies are apparent, also allowing us to have far better control over funds that the Commonwealth provides for the scheme.

It has meant that family day care is now available in communities where it had not been available before. In other words, we have been able to extend the family day care service into more isolated communities, and that has been an important priority for us because in country communities family day care is often the only child-care service that is available. Therefore, we have placed a priority on making sure that family day care services extend as far out into remote and isolated communities as is possible.

Mr KLUNDER: This afternoon I said that I was surprised that there were three programs concerning education in the yellow book that did not appear in the white pages, those being the provision for preschool services for four-year-olds, services for preschool children with special needs, and the provision of early childhood family services centres. If I recall Ms Kolbe's answer correctly, she indicated that the reason for that was that there was some form of transfer funding from the Children's Services Office. Since the amount is some \$4.5 million, I would like to know whether the Children's Services Office is aware of this and, if it is, where that money comes from.

Mr Haberfeld: Basically, the amount that was transferred related to four early childhood service centres and it involved an amount of \$216 000 only, which was transferred partly from education and partly from the Department for Community Welfare. Unfortunately, I do not have the break-up of the transfers from those two agencies, but if necessary I can provide it. The amount of funds that we provide to the Education Department falls under our preschool education program and under the grants for preschool services. The amount that we are proposing this year is \$4 315 000.

Mr KLUNDER: The Commonwealth has set a target for more child-care places: what does that mean in terms of a target for South Australia? How many places are intended to be placed in South Australia? What sort of time is envisaged? In particular, what extra child-care places are there for the north-eastern suburbs?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There is to be a provision of some 638 places in child-care centres in the form of long day care in the following locations: Elizabeth, Port Pirie, St Morris, Ascot Park, Munno Para, Modbury, Reynella, Victor Harbor, Pennington, Kidman Park, Hillbank, Surrey Downs, Berri, Parafield Gardens, Camden, and in two other areas where sites have yet to be confirmed. Generally, these are in the northern suburbs and the Adelaide Hills. They will provide some 638 additional places and are becoming available as a result of the joint Commonwealth-State agreement. In addition, there are additional family day care places. I do not have in front of me information on where those additional places have been located, but they have also been spread across the State on a needs basis.

In addition to the long day care places under the joint Commonwealth-State program (that is, the 17 centres to which I referred), 197 places are Commonwealth only funded places (they are exclusive of that joint Commonwealth-State agreement); family day care places number 554; and there are an additional 172 occasional care places (an area I know that is in urgent need in the State). There are also 810 new places for out of school hours care and the establishment of a number of new programs there. A range of special projects and services are being funded to assist children with special needs, and expenditure in this State for those

programs of a special services nature amounts to some \$400 000. There is a substantial increase of effort in that area. With respect to the geographic areas that are of particular interest to the honourable member, I will obtain some further information on them.

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister also give an idea of the time limit of these happenings?

Mr Wright: Speaking generally, the new centre based places are expected to be completed by the end of 1988. In other words, the 17 new centres just outlined by the Minister will be in operation by the end of the next calendar year. The completion dates for the centres range throughout the year: some will be finishing as early as March and they will tail off until the program is completed by the end of 1988.

Mr MEIER: Page 452 of the Program Estimates, under '1986-87 specific targets/objectives', states:

Participation with the Education Department in the establishment of a project with the Downs Syndrome Association of South Australia.

What are the details of that project? How much funding did the Children's Services Office and the Education Department provide? Is this program continuing in 1987-88?

Mr Wright: The program referred to by the honourable member was a program in which we cooperated with the Education Department and the Downs Syndrome Association. My understanding is that the project was to be funded exclusively from CEP grants. I am not sure about the current status of the project. I believe that there have been a few delays in getting it off the ground. I undertake to find out specifically for the honourable member what is the plan for the project for the remainder of this year and for 1988.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the Minister that there is a 9 October deadline for material to go into *Hansard*.

Mr MEIER: I believe that the review of child care centre regulations has been delayed for some time. Can the Minister say when new regulations will be implemented? Concern has been expressed that those regulations might lead to a net reduction in the number of available care places.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There have been extensive consultations and preparations in relation to these new regulations over quite a period, and that process is coming to a conclusion. The regulations will be presented to Cabinet soon in line with the way in which we deal with the regulation making process. They will then be subjected to further scrutiny by the community and Parliament. It is not envisaged that there will be the negative effect to which the honourable member refers. Obviously, if there are concerns we will need to assess the matter and take them into account.

The regulations have been discussed for a long time and canvassed widely in the community. We are trying to upgrade them in accordance with desirable standards. This is an area where it is important that adequate regulations are in place. Of course, they must be reasonable in their intent and must provide the security, safety and proper arrangements required by the community and under the head legislation. I congratulate officers of the Children's Services Office who have been grappling with this issue for a long time. There are a number of diverse interest groups in this area who are asking for these regulations to include matters that are at times difficult to reconcile. As I have said before, the matter will be subjected to further scrutiny including the scrutiny of the Parliament in due course.

Mr MEIER: I gained the impression from the Minister's answer that the regulations will be prepared soon. Can he be a little more specific about how soon—before Christmas?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I am hopeful that they will be introduced into the House before Christmas.

Mr MEIER: A Cabinet submission dated 3 June this year, signed 'J. Cornwall' and titled 'Review of Services to Children with Special Needs,' proposes that a pool of specialists be established to provide a comprehensive range of early intervention services to children in the 0-8 year age range. It went on to recommend that the coordinating agency be either the Children's Services Office or CAFHS. Is the CSO likely to take on this responsibility?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: That matter is yet to be decided. Cabinet has established a group of persons to implement a number of the proposals that came from that review. The matter raised by the honourable member has not yet been determined. Mr Wright may be able to comment further on the situation.

Mr Wright: The group established by Cabinet was convened and chaired by a senior officer of the Health Commission and included representation from a number of agencies including non-government ones. The group has not yet produced any solid recommendations on the matter to which the honourable member refers and I do not expect that it will for some time. The task that it has been set is quite complex and involves identifying publicly funded resources across a fairly broad spectrum of community agencies and specialist agencies such as hospitals and then deciding on the manner in which they can be linked together most efficiently in order to provide an adequate early intervention service. The task is complex and I do not expect that it will be completed quickly.

Mr MEIER: The Cabinet submission highlights specific deficits in early intervention services such as occupational therapy, physiotherapy, speech pathology and developmental paediatric services. What action is the CSO taking to rectify these problems, and does it support the recommendation to implement a key worker system under the leadership of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council?

Mr Wright: Yes, to take the last part of the honourable member's question first, we support the notion of a key worker, who is simply a person identified with specific responsibilities to coordinate all efforts designed to assist a family with a child with special needs. I am sure that the honourable member appreciates that very often children born with special needs have a vast array of personnel working with them within the family. These people can range from specialised medical personnel in hospitals right through to community based support services, such as CAFHS.

The difficulty with many of these situations involving many people is that the family receiving benefit from these services can become overwhelmed and lost in the myriad of services required by their child and which they understand their child needs, but which can be quite daunting. So the notion of a key worker is to provide one focal or contact point for the family. That contact point can then arrange, in some logical and manageable sequence, the services required by the child and the family. So the CSO was supportive of that notion, and we would encourage IDSC to proceed with the development of a proposal in this area.

In relation to the first part of the honourable member's question about deficiencies in certain specialist paramedical services, the CSO does not see itself as having a primary role in providing those resources. For the most part, the resources described by the honourable member, particularly occupational therapists, and the like, we see as falling within the sphere of medical services. They are health related services and we do not see that we have a charter to provide them. In considering the interests of the child, we have a strong interest in ensuring that the services are available,

but we do not necessarily believe that it is our task to provide them.

Mr ROBERTSON: Following on from the question asked by the member for Goyder a moment ago, I refer to page 452 of the yellow book under the program title 'Services for children with special needs', and I note that one of the specific objectives for this year is the establishment of a special needs client data base. In a sense, it will obviously mesh in rather neatly with the concept of the key worker. A range of services is available under the umbrella of CSO and beyond a whole range of HACC programs such as respite care, family day care, CAFHS, CSO programs, private child-care playgroups, toy libraries, out of hours care programs, and so on.

It seems to me at least that this data base is absolutely essential and one would expect it to work hand in glove with the key worker concept and facilitate the work of the key worker. How close to fruition is the special needs client data base and is it expected that it will not only enhance the efficiency of the services provided by CSO and other agencies but also enable the service providers to reach every potential recipient instead of what tends to happen at the moment where a number of people sitting on the nodes get lots of services and some of those sitting between the nodes get nothing?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I think that illustration exemplifies the need for the role played by the Children's Services Office with respect to the delivery of services to children. Our capacity to develop that sort of information base is already showing how important it is for the office to be an advocate for children's services, a coordinator of disparate services in this area and to pinpoint those children, as the honourable member says, who often fall between the more traditional service provision modes. In looking at the approach to the delivery of children's services now developing in this State, its umbrella function and its ability to draw conclusions about the total needs of children in this State, there are huge comparisons with the difficulties still being experienced in other States, where a number of these services are provided by different agencies often locked into big bureaucracies, and I refer to health, welfare, education and non-government sector agencies. We have a valuable institution in the CSO, and its potential for developing programs such as this is quite exciting. I will now ask Mr Wright to discuss the development of the data base.

Mr Wright: I suspect that the honourable member has read more into the plan than we intended. Our first priority is to ensure that the CSO has a clear idea about its own services, to whom they are going and what effect they are having. The more important task, and the one alluded to by the honourable member, is to ensure that the services are linked with what is provided by other agencies. I would see that as phase 2 of the data base plan, but that phase is not contemplated at this stage. At this stage our proposal is limited to collecting information and analysing it in relation to those children with whom we work directly.

I would add to something the Minister said a moment ago about the general issue of cooperation in this State. I am in regular contact with other States in the area of children's services. A major advantage in South Australia is that there is a sense of cooperation between organisations working in the area of children's special needs. There is a willingness right across sectors—the private sector, non-profit and Government sectors—to work cooperatively, share resources and regard the interests of the child as the prime concern. That is not the case in other States and I believe that we have a significant advantage over other States in that respect.

Mr ROBERTSON: I refer to '1987-88 specific targets/objectives' on page 453 of the yellow book and in particular reference to the apparent shortfall in trained child-care workers and a move to offer bridging courses run by TAFE to enable persons with overseas qualifications to mesh into the system in South Australia. How was that shortfall allowed to develop and what was it about the tertiary education authorities that prevented them from foreseeing the need to provide child-care workers?

It would seem that many exit students from secondary schools would dearly love to go into child care. It seems a great pity, without wishing to sound too parochial, that the need has been allowed to develop. Was there an oversight on the part of the CAEs in this respect, or has the need for child-care workers risen so dramatically that the system has been unable to provide them?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: A fundamental issue has been a matter of Government policy. In a way, the child-care sector has been at the mercy and whim of respective Federal Governments, and there has been a substantial difference in the approach and policies of respective Federal Governments to the provision of child-care services. We saw them being important when Sir Phillip Lynch was Minister of Labour when the Child Care Act was introduced in 1972. During the period of the Whitlam Government there was substantial additional funding for child-care. The Office of Child Care was established. We then saw under successive Fraser Governments a freezing of funds and a diminution of the role of the Office of Child Care federally.

In this State there was a winding down and in some cases an abolition of the TAFE offerings for the training of child-care workers in the early part of this decade. With the election of the Hawke Government and its commitment to the 20 000 child-care places we then had to crank up the tertiary sector's offerings for the training of child-care workers. The outcome of that is lagging behind in the training process, and that is causing some real problems in the staffing of child-care centres which will take us some time to overcome.

Mr ROBERTSON: As a supplementary question, and again out of interest, is the number of people exiting teacher training institutions providing a supply of child-care workers, albeit perhaps somewhat overtrained? Are teachers who are trained and who are unable to obtain employment immediately tending to give child-care a miss? Do they not regard this as a viable form of long-term employment?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I ask Mr Wright to comment.

Mr Wright: It is the case that the CAEs are producing more trained teachers than can be employed in positions in the kindergarten sector. My understanding is that a significant number of those people who are not being employed in the kindergarten sector are working in child-care. I had recent discussions with CAE personnel who made clear that final year students are now showing much more interest in the child-care field because they recognise that this is an area in which employment is possible. A number of graduates have even established private child-care services on their own account. A new private centre in Renmark has been established by two preschool teachers. That is a good thing. We believe that the skills that are acquired by students who are training to be preschool teachers are eminently suitable for child-care.

Mr ROBERTSON: In my third question I simply seek numbers. As to the number of children with some form of intellectual or physical disability, what is the number of children catered for by the CSO centres? What number is in family day care and, as a comparison, what is the number of those who are currently slotted into the various integra-

tion programs that are operating in South Australia? I do not expect the Minister to have that information immediately available, but I would be grateful to receive the figures.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I can tell the member that the total number of children referred from July 1986 to June 1987 in the categories of speech pathology needs, psychology needs, special education, social work or community nursing needs was 2 326.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I refer to page 455 of the yellow book, which identifies as a target for the current year assessment of the new consultative structure which came into operation in late 1986. Having consulted with kindergartens in my electorate, and somewhat beyond, my impression from them is that the consultative structure is based on subregional committees and that it is far too clumsy and ineffective. Can the Minister say what the CSO considers to have been the strengths and weaknesses of the structure? Did any members of the State consultative committee refuse to travel to the location of the country meeting of the committee? What number of members attended the country meeting, which I understand was poorly attended? What was the cost of conducting the committee meeting in the country location?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: As the member would know, the consultative structure is a large and elaborate one, and I would like to blame the honourable member and her colleagues more than my colleagues for that, because many of the amendments were at the insistence of the Opposition when the Bill went through the House.

We are faced with some real difficulties in making that consultative structure work adequately. It is an elaborate, all embracing and lowest common denominator type of structure. I accept that there were probably reasons at the time why people wanted to ensure by statute that they actually sat on the consultative committee. The problem that we are facing is developing an authentic and effective consultative process that is very important in the delivery children's services in this State. It will not operate effectively without that thorough consultative process.

There are evident very many strengths in the consultative process, but there are weaknesses in the way that it is structured in the legislation. It may be that in time—and we need some time at least—we can see how the system works. There are country meetings because it is required by statute: there must be a meeting in the country once a year. That is a costly exercise, and those resources could be better used in a number of other areas where we dearly need resources, rather than simply travelling *en masse*. We are dealing with a group of over 30 people who must be peripatetic in that sense each year. A little further down the track we need to review the situation and perhaps come back to the House to seek amendments to the consultative structure.

With respect to the cost of the meeting that was held in Murray Bridge, it was designed so that it was in a non-metropolitan area but certainly accessible for people to travel to within the day without having to stay overnight, and so forth. I understand that that is still not easy for people. We want people who have young children to participate in the consultative process, but they often have real limitations on their ability to be away from their homes and families for a long period. I will check on the cost of that meeting.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My next question comes under program 1, preschool education salaries. Before I ask the Minister the question, I want to convey to him what I consider to be some very disturbing views that are held, I believe validly, by preschool educators, who say that, because of the arrangements in the Children's Services Office,

kindergartens no longer have a public advocate because there is virtually no-one above the grass roots teaching level who has both the authority and knowledge to speak on behalf of kindergartens. This is because all senior positions in the CSO are now filled by bureaucrats and not educators.

It is claimed that the senior women in the preschool education area with all the knowledge and expertise that has been built up over decades have now been worn down to the point where they are either retiring early or are pursuing their jobs with no further energy left to ensure that the professional principles that they hold dear are regarded as standards by which preschool education should be measured. They also claim that highly educated preschool staff are not seeking senior positions because they feel that there would be no moral support for their professional standards and values.

One of the most important elements, the staff consider, in the gradual downgrading of preschool professionalism is the fact that preschool advisers—a key professional position—are now answerable to non-educators. This is regarded by kindergarten directors as a fundamental flaw in the new system. They claim that it is impossible to maintain professional standards if the professionals are reporting to officers who do not understand professional issues.

These complaints from the heart were put to me about three months ago. I am not sure whether anything in the Children's Services Office has changed since then. Is it the Government's intention to have preschool advisers answerable to educators—which I would expect that the Minister should and would regard as an ideal situation—and how many senior officers do preschool advisers report to at the moment? What is their status and qualification?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member said that these comments had come to her from the heart of people: I suggest that that is probably right, but they should have also come from the head, because there is a lot of emotionalism and, unfortunately, misinformation about this area. This has existed since the time of the establishment of the CSO and, fortunately, it is diminishing to some extent, although some people still are prepared to man the trenches to fight anyone who is not in a professional mode, which this particular group of people are.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is quite widely stated by directors whom I would respect.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I have also had discussions with many of those people, and I guess that some of them will hold this view throughout their careers. I have referred to one group who came to me about this form of academic imperialism, as I call it, who insist that the only people who understand and from whom they will receive directions are persons who hold those academic skills that they possess. I have had it not only in this area but also in the Education Department, where a group of people who are specialists in their area said that they were not prepared to be relocated into areas because they wanted to receive their directions and have their administrative structure related only to people within their professional area.

They said that it was non-professional to be responsible to anyone other than a preferred person holding professional skills, which really meant that the Director-General of Education, in that case, had to possess the sort of skills they had, which were in the non-education area. So, whilst being sensitive to people who hold those views, I think we have perhaps to expand their thinking a little but, nevertheless, respect their professionalism, and that can be done.

I believe that it is being done within the Children's Services Office. There are people on the executive committee of the CSO who possess those very qualifications, who are

involved in making the key decisions that are taken in the CSO, and who are very valuable and valued members of that executive. There are organisations which represent that professional category who come and see me and discuss those issues directly, and with the Director of the CSO.

Unfortunately, some of those views will prevail for a long period of time. Fortunately, that will be a diminishing group because there will then be confidence in the administrative structure that has developed in this State, and there has been a good deal of effort placed, particularly in this area of assessment to which the honourable member is referring, to ensure that that professional integrity is maintained. I will ask the Director to comment a little further on this matter, because it is important.

Mr Wright: I am, certainly, aware of the existence of those views the honourable member has conveyed and, although I could be accused of being biased, it is my genuine belief that views of the sort the honourable member has conveyed to us are diminishing. There is an increasing level of support for the objectives of the Children's Services Office amongst teachers in preschool facilities and, at the risk of appearing immodest, an increasing degree of confidence in the management of the CSO.

We have made every attempt possible to communicate with, consult with, and talk to people who may hold the views to which the honourable member has referred, and I believe that, notwithstanding the fact that those expressions of concern may have come to her as recently as three months ago, almost all of our staff—I would be game enough to say almost all of our staff—would concede that the quality of preschool services which we have had in this State for a number of years, and of which we can be very proud, has been maintained and, in fact, strengthened in the two years during which the CSO has been in operation.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I would now like to turn back to the CSO staffing policy, which we raised earlier. Several kindergartens in my electorate have expressed concern about what they see as the ambiguous way in which the policy is drafted. They are uncertain as to whether the one to 10 ratio applies to all kindergartens or is an average across the State. They are uncertain as to how the CSO determines need, and how and when kindergartens are advised of their status in respect of need, and they wonder, if the system is going to be formula based on a one to 10 basis, at what level are staff lost.

For example, once the weighting for children with special needs was removed, that in some kindergartens resulted in the loss of a staff member, and they feel that it was by no means compensated for by the new arrangements for calling in consultancy or supervisory advice, because it meant that children in real need did not have that continuity of service. In the two or three minutes available, can the Minister particularly refer to how the CSO determines need, how and when are centres advised of their status in respect of need, and does the one to 10 ratio apply to all kindergartens across the State or is it an average?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The one to 10 staffing ratio is certainly our objective, but no Government has ever reached that objective.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: But would you see it as an objective as an average or for everyone?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: That is a goal more than a guideline under which we are able to staff kindergartens. We have said that that is our objective: we are trying to work towards that, but we are certainly not able to use that as the benchmark for staffing of kindergartens, nor has any previous Government in this State been able to achieve

that. I will ask Mr Wright to explain the preparation of the needs based formula and the notification of it to preschools.

Mr Wright: The needs based formula is broadly derived from the Education Department's method of classifying schools in relation to need, and it is a very simple system which involves only three categories. Consistent with the policy of working towards the one to 10 ratio, our task is to pay the most attention to achieving the one to 10 ratio in those preschool centres which are in the highest need category, and so on, down to the third category. We give priority to achieving a one to 10 ratio in those high need centres.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the Children's Services Office lines completed.

We will now resume the Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous line.

Mr LEWIS: What is the explanation for the dilemma in which the Minister and the Minister of Lands found themselves in connection with the piece of land located in the hundred of Bonney in the Meningie district council area which was originally set aside for people of Aboriginal extraction and about which I wrote to the Minister earlier this year? That land has not yet been allocated to any particular purpose, even though a local Aboriginal person, a member of the Ngarinjeri tribe and his wife, a member of the same tribe, sought to be allocated that land under the terms under which it was originally set aside or to buy or lease it. Where have we gone wrong? Do we not give any consideration to those people who originally owned the land? Under the terms of the Act it is intended that someone should get that land.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member raised this question previously. This matter indicates the difficulties that Aboriginal persons face in dealing with complex areas of land ownership and in working their way through bureaucracy when they do not have advocates in the system other than through their local member of Parliament or an agency such as the Office of Aboriginal Affairs to help them work their way through what can be a complicated and expensive exercise. Our office has been pleased to assist in this matter and certainly it is our wish that those people have that land vested in them. It is only a small parcel of land, but it is only right and proper that that should occur. We have expressed our wish to the respective State authorities and directed them in that regard. I understand that the matter is with the Crown Law Office at present as one stage of transferring the title of that land to those people.

Mr LEWIS: I am pleased to learn that something positive is happening. I know that the Minister was the only Minister of the Crown who made any positive sound in response to my earlier correspondence on this matter. I acknowledge that happily and openly, and I point out to the Committee that not only the immediate family of the people who applied for the land but also other members of the tribe were optimistic that something could happen, because they saw it as an opportunity for one of them to make good and prove that they could live in the twentieth century and accept a responsible role in that regard. I place on record my gratitude to the Minister for the way in which he has dealt with this matter. I thought it had sunk without a trace.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: No, I said that I wished that the land be transferred to those people. We have recommended that and asked the other authorities to take that into account in processing.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I refer to Aboriginal education (page 132 of the Program Estimates) and I note that \$3 million was allocated last year, only \$2.8 million being

spent, but there is a significant increase this year. What benefits will the Aboriginal people derive from that significant increase? What will be the tangible benefits to Aboriginals from the additional money expended for salaries, wages and related payments?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: This relates to the education component; it does not come under this line. I would like to be able to provide that information, because it is an important question. I can only surmise that Commonwealth funds are involved, and that may explain the increase. It is Commonwealth funded through the South Australian Education Department. I will take the question on notice and provide the information.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: This is a significant amount in a comparatively small budget in relation to Aboriginal people.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: If I can hazard a guess, it will be not an increase in programs but an increase in the way in which money is accounted for in that line in the budget (in other words, we are accounting for money in a different way in that line). I do not think that the Commonwealth has come forward with any additional substantial funds for programs of the dimension that I would like.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Recently I travelled through the north and the Pitjantjatjara lands with three of my colleagues. It was worthwhile inasmuch as we had the opportunity of discussing with people at the various centres some of the problems that they see. We travelled through virtually unannounced and were not presented with an artificial scene. The police aids believe that the Government has made a decision to withdraw the police officers at the end of the year. If any department is working effectively throughout the Aboriginal lands it is the Police Department, particularly the program of training police aids. It was pleasing to see the manner in which they have risen to the job. They were extremely concerned that the Government was going to withdraw police officers. The police aids were turned out immaculately and seemed to be keen on the work they were doing. However, they felt that if police officers were withdrawn it would be difficult for them to continue without that person's authority. Does the Government intend to withdraw officers in the various centres back to, say, Marla or somewhere like that?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I appreciate the interest that the honourable member and his colleagues take in the Pitjantjatjara lands because it is valuable to have that first-hand information. I welcome members paying visits to the area. There is no doubt that the program of police aids, which was established by the Police Department and which has been strongly supported by the Commissioner of Police, has been successful. I believe that it has been a worthwhile extension of the role that the Police Department plays in a most delicate and difficult situation. It was not a step that was taken without criticism, and substantial risks were associated with it. The proposal was that there be police officers placed alongside the aides for the initial period, and that period was established as being 12 months. The honourable member has indicated that perhaps that period of initial support at the local level should be retained for a further period, and I think that there is some merit in that suggestion. I have also received representations from the Pitjantjatjara Council about that issue and I have passed those on to the Deputy Premier with a recommendation that the matter be given urgent consideration.

It is a matter of allocating resources in the Police Department and there are competing priorities for that. It is unlikely that we could obtain additional fresh moneys for that program, but obviously that will have to be considered by the

Deputy Premier and the Commissioner of Police. In passing on to the Deputy Premier the concerns that have been raised by the honourable member tonight, I also would like to see a further extension of that support given to those people because of the importance of the program and the implications of it for policing Aboriginal communities elsewhere in the State. Because it does touch on some very fundamental issues, we need to give it quite a while to settle down. It would be quite tragic if the effectiveness of that program was destroyed by the premature evacuation of the police officers.

Mr KLUNDER: I think that the bookwork here shows classic signs of the amount of money actually expended in this area not being properly shown. For instance, under the miscellaneous line only \$600 000 to \$700 000 is shown, as there is in the yellow book, but page 61 of the Auditor-General's Report shows a trust account for Commonwealth grants totalling over \$7 million. Will the Minister look at ways of ensuring that the money that goes through his department for this purpose is put in one area so that it can be shown as a program rather than being dumped under the miscellaneous line?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: As the honourable member would realise, and as was said earlier today, Treasury is now recording money received from the Commonwealth in a different way so that figures are clearer and to enable members and others to determine the passage of that money and the services provided with it. I will take that suggestion on board in next presenting this line. I have had discussions with the core agencies for a number of years about how the Aboriginal Affairs line should be recorded in the budget documents. I have reservations about its being included with another department because some people may draw the conclusion that the Aboriginal Affairs ministry is subsumed in another part of the bureaucracy, and that is not so.

That has been the specific purpose of creating a ministry outside other bureaucracies. For administrative convenience it is described in other ways in the budget documents. The Under Treasurer has been of considerable assistance in working our way through this, although we have not yet reached a formula of how this can be done. The functions of the Office of Aboriginal Affairs are quite mechanical with regard to receipt and payment of these moneys, which go to respective agencies such as housing construction, health, welfare, education and the like. My ability to answer questions about this matter is limited to that extent. Nevertheless, they should be recorded and shown clearly in the budget documents.

Mr ROBERTSON: It was announced in the Federal budget that money had been earmarked specifically for youth training programs slanted towards Aboriginal youth. How much of this money is expected to come to South Australia and in what form? When it arrives, how is it intended to use that money to provide employment training for young Aboriginal people?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The final figure for South Australia has not yet been determined. A global figure was given in the Federal budget and our estimation is that South Australia can expect to receive some \$4.5 million, \$2 million of which is already committed to ongoing programs. The remainder of the amount will be available for apprenticeships, formal training courses and for developing enterprises which will create employment and training opportunities in remote and rural areas.

Mr ROBERTSON: I understand that the Tjilbruke trail was partially marked by way of a ceremony late last year to mark the spot at Port Noarlunga generally recognised as

one of the stopping points on the trail. I understand that seven or eight points of major significance have been marked on the trail. What further work is proposed in order to do more than mark significant sites on the trail running from Kingston Park to Brukunga and whether it is proposed to actually do something about making an accessible walking track for both Aboriginal and non Aboriginal people who wish to trace the steps of the hero Tjilbruke?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The Tjilbruke trail is an important legend of the Kurna people who occupied the Adelaide Plains. It commemorates the hero Tjilbruke, who carried the body of his nephew from near Kingston Park along the coast to Cape Jervis, Rosetta Head and Brukunga. Many of the natural features of the walk, the sandhills, water holes and rivers, were named by Tjilbruke and are areas of significance to that legend and to the Aboriginal people of the Adelaide Plains. The district councils of the South Coast area have cooperated with this project and a number of cairns have been erected along the trail to commemorate aspects of the legend. I acknowledge the cooperation and support of those district councils.

During the recent NADOC week the District Council of Encounter Bay was given an award and the presentation was made to the Clerk of the council in the absence of the Mayor, who was ill in hospital. It was given for cooperation and support in developing this trail, and the cairns in particular. As part of the NADOC week celebrations a marquette was unveiled which is a scale model of a statue of Tjilbruke which will be erected at Rosetta Head, Encounter Bay. A fund has been opened to establish that statue. The Tjilbruke committee, which Mr Moriarty chairs, was established in the early 1970s and was revitalised by the Jubilee 150 celebrations. It will compile all aspects of the legend. I ask Mr Moriarty to comment on the work of that committee.

Mr Moriarty: The committee is primarily comprised of Aboriginal people. It will perpetuate the legend and memory of Tjilbruke, as has been stated. The marquette unveiled during National Aborigines Week two weeks ago was to make known to anyone interested the possibility of donating funds for the establishment of this cairn at the Bluff at Rosetta Head, at Victor Harbor. The statue is of bronze and was designed by Gabriel Sterrk, who was located until recently in the Adelaide Hills, at Hahndorf, but who is now back in Holland but working out of Paris. He designed the cairn in conjunction with the committee.

The statue will be almost twice the size of a human being and will be located in a prominent spot on the Bluff. Many Aboriginal people consider this area to be quite exciting. It involves the hard politics that most Aboriginal people have to deal with from day to day and it is an issue that most people, including children, can become involved with and from which they can learn how this great country was formed and can gain some knowledge of Aboriginal history, which dates back over 40 000 years.

Mr ROBERTSON: Earlier, during discussion on the education line, there was mention of the Pitjantjatjara language becoming a mainstream language course in South Australia, presumably on the same basic footing as French, German, Japanese and the like. I am aware that the language is taught in many primary schools, partly to teach Aboriginal culture and to impart a few words of Pitjantjatjara to primary school children who come in contact with the Aboriginal studies course.

To what extent has the idea of mainstreaming the language been explored and how quickly can it reach that stage? In other words, what is the demand for Pitjantjatjara as a secondary language, and can it be used in secondary schools

in much the same way that it is now being used in primary schools, that is, as a medium to impart an understanding of that culture?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Obviously there is some interest in our secondary schools in the teaching of the Pitjantjatjara language. As I said this morning, over the next six months or so the Aboriginal section of the Education Department will discuss the feasibility of the Pitjantjatjara language as a language choice in secondary schools as a result of the number of schools that have indicated an interest in this area. To what extent that is feasible or practical I cannot say, but it is certainly being explored by the department.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Do the Minister and the Office of Aboriginal Affairs share the opinion of the Minister of Health who was fairly critical of the Nganampa Health Council and in fact spoke of abolishing it? Does the Minister see the situation in the same light as the Minister of Health?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The Minister of Health is responsible for the provision of health services, and I do not interfere in other Ministers' areas. However, I share the Minister's concern in terms of the effectiveness of the program that has been developed by the Nganampa health organisation. So, I readily accept the review into that program instigated by the Minister of Health as to how it might be better organised to ensure that better health services are delivered on those lands.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I do not think anyone denies that there are certainly massive problems in this area in relation to health, and I think that much of that responsibility falls back on the services that have been provided. As I said, I was favourably impressed with the performance of police officers and police aids, and I think that much of that is a result of the discipline of the police department, which is similar to that of the armed forces. However, that same discipline does not exist within other Government departments, and that could be a failing in this area. It is a difficult job for individual officers working in a single unit situation, in that they would find it difficult to maintain the standards expected of them in a hospital in a major town or in Adelaide. I believe that much could be done if some way could be found to maintain the standard of registered nurses who might be appointed or decided to work at any one of the Aboriginal settlements.

There is an enormous difference between the management of the Police Department and the health services in this area. Is there any way of ensuring that standards are maintained by registered nurses, officers of the Department for Community Welfare and the Education Department in the way that teachers maintain a basis to work from?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I think there is a fundamental difference between the provision of the service which provides law and order in the community and that which provides health services for a wide range of health fields because isolated communities require a different approach in relation to the delivery of medical services than we expect in urbanised South Australia. I think that, sometimes with the best intentions, people have tried to develop new approaches and more sensitive ways as they perceive them to deliver those services. However, I think it can be concluded that many of those approaches have not been successful. Discipline, if you like, is one approach to service delivery, and obviously it has some merits. However, it is a wider issue than simply that of discipline.

I am not, and never have been, directly involved in the delivery of health services, so I cannot comment on the differences involved in that area. As I said, I support the Minister of Health's initiatives as announced earlier, to review them and to take a different tack in this area. It may

be that the honourable member will address some of his specific questions to my colleague when he appears before the Estimates Committee tomorrow.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: We are concerned about the overall situation as it affects the Aboriginal people. Police officers and police aids in this area are immaculately turned out in their uniforms and the police station is immaculate. However, if you go 25 metres around the corner to the health clinic, and without labouring the point, you could hardly say that it was immaculate. As I have said, the senior officer or registered nurse in charge could hardly be described as being immaculate. However, the registered nurse as part of her training in the metropolitan area would have had a mandatory requirement to turn out immaculately every morning, but that seems to have gone totally by the board. After all, we are talking about people's health. I do not see how satisfactory health services can be provided from a clinic that is far from clean and where the officers are not immaculate.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The honourable member raises some quite fundamental issues, and I am sure that he is aware of that. The organisation established is community based and is not part of Government, although it receives Government funding. I suppose it is akin to the St John Ambulance Brigade and organisations such as that. The Police Department is an instrumentality of the State and is a highly organised and disciplined service. It is uniform across the State in relation to the services that it provides and in relation to those who come under its umbrella, such as police aids. The predominant source of funding for health programs is the Commonwealth, although some of it goes directly to the non-government organisation, some goes through the Health Commission and some State based funding also goes through the Health Commission to the Aboriginal health organisation and then to the Nganampa health organisation.

Whether the review instigated by the Minister of Health tackles those fundamental questions of whether you have a Police Department type of structure or a community based structure is the issue that the honourable member is raising, and obviously it must be resolved. We have gone through a transition period where the State had an orderly and centrally controlled and structured delivery of services in those communities, mostly organised by the Department for Community Welfare or its precursors. When an agreement was signed with the Commonwealth following the 1967 referendum, responsibility was transferred to the Commonwealth in the early 1970s through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. The State vacated the area but recently it has been getting back into this area, and the Commonwealth has been urging us to do that, but through community based and community controlled Aboriginal organisations. That is the very model that is currently in question in terms of delivery of health services.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: It does not matter what the department is—Community Welfare, Health or Education—because it all comes back to basic standards that have to be maintained within these communities if we are ever going to come to grips with the massive health and other problems that we have got.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The Minister of Health has recognised that and is trying to remedy that situation. I might also say that we have had an extensive look at the provision of human services and their coordination to Aboriginal communities. We have had a committee working for a considerable time. It has come back to the Human Services Subcommittee of Cabinet on a number of occasions and we are trying to grapple with that in conjunction with the

Commonwealth as to the sharing of responsibility between the Commonwealth and the State, the funding of it and the administration of it. It does highlight a much broader issue of how those services are developing, how they are administered and how standards are maintained for the delivery of fundamental services for those communities.

Mr ROBERTSON: At page 446 of the yellow book one of the specific targets for this year involves in general terms assistance with the clean-up of nuclear waste on the Maralinga lands. What steps have been taken towards bringing that objective to some sort of fruition? Where does the issue of clean-up stand at the moment? Specifically, what compensation is contemplated? The word 'compensation' is mentioned, but there is no explanation of what compensation is being contemplated and who is compensating whom and for what?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: This is a most important issue, and there is a good deal of work going on in terms of how the clean-up is to be tackled on the lands. I recently visited Maralinga with the then Federal Minister for Energy and a number of officials from the British Government and technical experts and was briefed on the activities that are occurring at Maralinga at the present time. A number of officers are based there, living on site, and an extensive survey program is being undertaken by the Australian and British authorities, using sophisticated helicopter and computer equipment to determine the extent and nature of the radioactive waste in the general vicinity.

A number of committees have been established following the Royal Commission's findings to monitor what was happening, plan it and to develop further action. Mr Knill has been sitting on one of those Committees and I will ask him to briefly explain what is occurring on the lands at the moment. I might also add that this is a matter that will be given further consideration by the Parliamentary Committee on the Maralinga lands. When we visit Maralinga in the future we will receive a briefing as a committee and, in due course, report to Parliament on the activities that are now being undertaken on those lands.

Mr Knill: Currently a scientific program is being undertaken at the Maralinga test sites to determine the nature and extent of nuclear contamination in the area. Up to 40 or 50 scientists currently at the village are conducting a number of experiments, particularly to determine how the level of contamination will affect future settlement of that area. The scientists are looking at the dust, the contamination of the soil, and the uptake of nuclear wastes into the food chain that might affect Aborigines in the future. The scientific tests now under way will determine ultimately the extent that the clean-up will take in future, how much it will cost and how long it will take, and the nature of these tests at the moment will help them to get a good idea of just what that clean-up program will be.

The Maralinga people represented on the Commonwealth committees assessing this problem are having maximum input into the clean-up program. Presently, the program will cost about \$3 million and will be carried over into next year. Once the tests have been finalised, recommendations will be made to the Commonwealth about the level of clean-up. The clean-up will need to look at contamination of the earth itself and also the level of contamination in some of the materials that are buried there, and recommendations will be made on how to deal with those problems. We would assume that in 12 months we will have a fair idea and a fair indication of what needs to be done, how long it will take and how much it will cost.

Mr ROBERTSON: Some time ago in this place—in the last session—I raised the issue of what I perceived to be

the need for some sort of recognition of significant conflict sites between traditional Aboriginal cultures in this country and the European culture that took over the major parts of the agricultural and pastoral regions of South Australia last century. There was a degree of unanimity in this place about the fact that, providing that kind of network of monuments was done with sensitivity and in consultation with the Aboriginal communities (with their complete consent), there might be some gain to the European population particularly by establishing a network of monuments to mark not just conflict sites but also other significant sites to Aboriginal people other than sacred sites.

The idea was to mark sites that were generally known by both races so that Europeans, particularly those travelling on the major transcontinental routes such as the Stuart Highway and the highway to Western Australia, would know of some of the incidents that took place and would have some sort of appreciation of the disastrous history of colonisation pursued by the Europeans when they arrived in this part of the continent. Therefore, what does the Minister envisage as a reasonable program for the establishment of these monuments? Is there an interest in the department in backing the establishment of such monuments? Is there any sympathy in local communities for a rather formalised way of commemorating that conflict?

Mr Moriarty: The issue that was raised by the member for Bright is one of general concern to Aborigines and, as I mentioned previously at another meeting here, the question of a cairn at Elliston was of concern to me from 1966, I think it was, when the matter was first raised, and we had a lot of opposition to that. As we see it, the principle is a very good one and Aborigines are very conscious that an accurate assessment of the history of this country, particularly as it involves them, should be portrayed to the public at large.

Sometimes this history is not a very good one between the whites and the blacks, and often the more violent of these interactions between black and white will bring equivalent reactions from both sides. Irrespective of that, the Office of Aboriginal Affairs has done some research in that area, particularly with the Elliston issue, and Janine Haynes (on my left) had contacted two or three of the elders of that tribe who, while they are pretty old and feeble, were willing to give information on these aspects of history.

Also, it is only a small office and our resources are stretched, and we are not able to put this on the top of the priority list as basic things such as health, clean water and other things are of more pressing importance to Aborigines and take up our time. We would like to take up the issue if and when we can spare the resources to take it up.

Mr ROBERTSON: Several weeks ago the Western Australian Government got itself into trouble by allowing a group to refurbish some of the traditional rock art, and the response of local people was not very encouraging. It was felt that the people who carried out the work, for a start, were not authorised to do so, had no traditional right to do it and that, in fact, the resulting refurbishment was more of a desecration than a decoration. In light of the salutary experience suffered by the Western Australian authorities, would the Minister care to give some sort of assurance that that kind of approach would never be adopted in this State in relation to traditional rock art and that, if and when such rock art is to be refurbished, it should be done by and of course with the approval of the relevant people who are bound to that site by tradition?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: To the extent that the Government can prevent that occurring, I can assure the honourable member that this Government will. In the Department

of Environment and Planning there is an Aboriginal Heritage Unit which is very effective and highly regarded, but I must say—and I am sure that the honourable member is aware—that there are deficiencies in our current legislation in this area, and the Minister of Environment and Planning is soon to bring legislation into the Parliament which will provide legislative safeguards to ensure that that sort of thing does not happen in South Australia.

Mr MEIER: The Minister would be aware that on 14 May this year I wrote to him seeking a deputation with him relating to two issues. One was the continuing high instances of truancy at schools in the CYP area. The second issue related to the development of the Point Pearce oval and sports clubrooms which, since being completed several years ago, have been virtually unused. I have had considerable dialogue with the Minister's office since then, and quite a lot has transpired—but I will not go into that. In view of a reply that the Minister gave previously on education generally, will he say whether the deputation can still go ahead in the future?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: As I said earlier when I alluded to the honourable member's request for me to receive a deputation on those matters, I propose to visit the area, including Point Pearce, and discuss these issues with the honourable member in the presence of the representatives and residents of the community, education officers and other people, and hopefully we can make some progress, rather than a group coming to Adelaide to see me. It is better that I go to the area for discussions.

As I explained, there is some delay in that process and it would be quicker for people to come here, but it would also be less effective and I can also do the other things to which I referred earlier. The Education Department and the Office of Aboriginal Affairs have undertaken work in this area. The issue was raised by the honourable member, and meetings have been held with officers to further explore what avenues can be taken to achieve improvement in this area. Hopefully, we can meet in the near future and pursue this matter further.

Mr MEIER: The Minister would be aware that construction of the new Point Pearce school is well under way following the unfortunate burning down of the original school. Is special provision made in the budget for reconstruction, does the money come from the Education Department rebuilding program, or is there Commonwealth funding? What is the total cost?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I understand that funding for this project comes from the Education Department. I am not aware of any other sources of funding. The interesting thing about this school (and when I visit the area I will be interested to see it) is that it has been built substantially with Aboriginal labour from Point Pearce, and the community contributed to the design. After the fire I received representations from the community and a number of people came to Adelaide to see me. They visited a number of schools in Adelaide and looked at alternatives, and they were very keen to build the school themselves.

I had that matter investigated by the Department of Housing and Construction, and it was possible for that action to be taken. I am sure that all members would welcome that initiative by the local community. That is not the first thing they have built: they have built houses for teachers that were transported to the Pitjantjatjara lands. They really have shown considerable expertise in building construction. They are also pursuing a number of other interesting programs, for example, making trailers and equipment, and those programs have proved to be quite successful. I will be very interested to see the progress of

the school. If there are other sources of funding, I will advise the honourable member.

Mr MEIER: Earlier this year I referred to the future of Wardang Island. What control has the State Government over Wardang Island? Is it purely in the hands of the Aborigines? I ask these questions because in the past few months I have been approached by several people who are interested in developing Wardang Island as a future tourist resort. They feel that perhaps it is a little wasted at present with virtually nothing being done on it.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: The current status with the ownership and management of Wardang Island is that, pursuant to an agreement entered into by the Liberal Government, I think back in 1982, it was vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust and that trust has leased the land to the Point Pearce community. From time to time there have been proposals for the greater utilisation of the island for various purposes. Mr Moriarty advised me that there was one approach to use it as a quarantine station for Angora goats that were imported into South Australia.

Any proposals of that type, or other proposals, should be addressed to the Lands Trust and to the local community. Obviously, they would want to consider any proposition that would bring employment and generate income to that community. I think that they would have quite an open mind on that, and any suggestion would need to be explored thoroughly before it could take place. The island has a number of potential uses and although it has had a chequered history in relation to the alternative uses for the island, it has an airstrip and some buildings, and it is a very scenic island and pleasant fishing area.

Mr MEIER: I have a supplementary question. Is the Aboriginal Lands Trust State administered?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Yes.

Mr ROBERTSON: Recently there has been talk about a renegotiation of title to the Unnamed Conservation Park in the Far West of South Australia. This matter was raised in this Committee before the Minister for Environment and Planning and I understand that there is a possibility of renegotiating the title or some agreement being arrived at to allow the traditional owners hunting and camping rights, and so on. I understand that the view is that it should be leased back as a national park with the proviso that the people who use it for traditional purposes be allowed to continue to do so.

Has the department given any thought to encouraging or facilitating the commercialisation of some Aboriginal heritage? I am not suggesting that the Unnamed Conservation Park is appropriate in this context, but certainly the Flinders Ranges, the Gammon Ranges National Park maybe. In particular, I am thinking of taking European tourists on traditional hunting trips or to the various creation trails that are not subject to the normal strictures of secrecy, and allowing visitors onto the land to be educated in the Aboriginal ways of survival and to be told of some of the Aboriginal creation stories.

I envisage, particularly in the West, extensive trips that would involve looking at creation stories, spending some weeks in isolated areas with the traditional owners and learning something of the traditional survival skills. Has any thought been given to either facilitating or promoting the commercialisation of lands held within the park system by the traditional owners?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: There is a lot of interest in this area. It is of considerable concern that so many tour groups and people who use four-wheel drive vehicles travel through Aboriginal lands. There have been a large number of people travelling through the Pitjantjatjara lands in recent years.

Some of the international promotions of Australia allude to the inland and the lure of travelling through it, which encourages its use. There is already considerable commercialisation of Aboriginal lands. Unfortunately, that has been done to the exclusion of the involvement of Aboriginal people to a large extent and is quite harmful to the preservation of their culture, the very culture that people come to try to understand and experience. The opening up of Aboriginal lands for tourism may well be a commercially lucrative area for non-Aboriginal people in Australia and may well be, too, for Aboriginal people.

It is a very sensitive area indeed and in some areas is actually actively discouraged because of intrusion into traditional Aboriginal lifestyles. Special Aboriginal interpretive study tours have been conducted in the Flinders Ranges, the focus of these tours being for teachers and students rather than for tourists. In areas where tourists have access, such as the Gammon Ranges and the Coorong, Aborigines are employed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service as rangers, as they are in the Flinders Ranges. The opening of other areas may be possible and desirable, but that has to be worked through. The Unnamed Conservation Park is obviously one area currently under consideration. There are the models of Uluru and Kakadu which are areas through which huge numbers of tourists travel. They are most amazing areas.

Some special interest groups, such as the Australian Conservation Foundation, have been given permission by the Anangu Pitjantjatjara to visit areas of special significance in the Musgrave Ranges and other areas in the North West of the State. However, they have stressed that such permission is given only in special circumstances and that opening those lands for commercialisation and general tourism is against current policy for the area.

Mr ROBERTSON: A few years ago a couple of relatively well known pop groups, namely 'No Fixed Address' and 'Us Mob', came from the Aboriginal School of Music under the tutelage of Leila Rankin and other people who were actively promoting western music among the urban Aboriginal people in Adelaide at that time. Both groups appeared to do very well. They stayed together as long as they wished to do so, but I understand that both groups broke up because they felt they had been everywhere and done everything that they wanted to do. Has consideration been given to actively promoting music as a means of cultural transmission of Aboriginal values, thought processes and culture in general to the broader community and are there on the horizon groups similar to those named that we can expect to see on the popular European cultural scene in the next six months or so?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Music is an important aspect of the life and traditions of Aboriginal people. I ask Mr Moriarty to touch briefly on some of the activities in this area.

Mr Moriarty: The principal body involved in the promotion of Aboriginal music is the College of Aboriginal Studies in Music (CASM), which has been mentioned and which is currently funded by the Commonwealth Government through the Education Department to run courses for music, and so on. In fact, five people from Borroloola are there; they are traditional artists learning modern techniques. This area is a specialist one and it is left to that specialist body to develop. The Aboriginal Arts Board funds them, as well. They are closely linked to that area. Most Aborigines have some link with that institution and, of course, with music and socialise with them in that area.

Mr ROBERTSON: The member for Hayward has drawn my attention to page 446 under 'Issues/trends' and the major underlying plank for that program which states that

ongoing affirmative action procedures should assist Aborigines where deprivation and discrimination exist. The member for Hayward has asked me to ask whether any specific programs exist which will assist Aboriginal women living in traditional societies in their role of maintaining the customs, practices and craft skills which they traditionally pursue, and whether such programs have been designed to promote and maintain the strong and essential role which women occupy in traditional Aboriginal society.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I appreciate the member for Hayward's interest in this area. She recently visited the Pitjantjatjara lands and contacted me about this issue on her return. I understand that she met with a number of Aboriginal women and, in fact, there is an Aboriginal women's organisation on the Pitjantjatjara lands which is active and keen to see the craft industry expanded. A substantial amount of craft work is already undertaken, predominantly by women making artefacts, batik prints, and so on. There are difficulties in marketing that craft work in an orderly way so that there is some wage justice in recompensing the women for their work in terms of their receiving fair value for their work. I believe that it is a fruitful area where some assistance could be given to those communities, particularly to the women involved in the development of that craft industry. I have undertaken to pursue this matter through the Office of Aboriginal Affairs and through the Department of the Arts.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I understand that the Government has withdrawn financial support from the Womma Rehabilitation Farm; if so, what is its future? I believe that it played an important role in the rehabilitation of people needing that service, particularly in the Iron Triangle.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: I understand that funding for that aspect of the Womma program was provided by the Commonwealth. In fact, the Commonwealth has withdrawn funding for a range of Womma programs. I am not aware of when the funding stops and what arrangements are being made to replace that program and by whom. It has been a valuable program which comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Health with respect to State involvement. However, as I said, I understand that it is funded entirely by the Commonwealth.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: While I appreciate that its funding comes from the Commonwealth, it certainly provided a valuable service to the Aboriginal community in South Australia and particularly in that area. Come what may, if that project is allowed to disappear, the community will be much poorer.

The next question that I want to ask relates to the Jubilee 150 Year and, leading up to that, the establishment of Wakefield Press. One of the publications to be produced by Wakefield Press was *Survival in Our Own Land*, which was of great significance to the Aboriginal people. When Wakefield Press was wound up at the end of the Jubilee 150 year a number of publications were virtually put out to tender by the Government at that time. What is the future of that publication? Does the Government intend to ensure that the work is printed?

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: As the Premier indicated recently, the book is now, as I understand it, with the printers and will be published shortly. There has been much misunderstanding about this publication and I would like to put on the record a reply by the Premier in a letter published in the *South Australian Teachers Journal* of Wednesday 8 September 1987. In that correspondence the Premier indicated that the researcher/editor of the work, Mrs Mattingley, had received from the State Government the sum of \$54 000 for her salary towards the preparation of the publication

and was paid through the South Australian College of Advanced Education on behalf of the Aboriginal Executive Committee of the Jubilee 150 Board. Also, the Government met the cost of the production of the book, which is expected to be about \$40 000. So, almost \$100 000 of State Government funds has been provided for the publication. The Premier went on to say:

First, some of the delays to completion of the book have nothing whatever to do with the Government or the sale of the Wakefield Press to the Adelaide Review. The book was not ready for publication in April 1985, as Mrs Mattingley claims, and some delay was caused by her desire to include additional photographs or gain further material.

Secondly, no-one is contesting the principle of royalties from a second edition, if there is one, being paid to a trust fund to assist the publication of writing by Aboriginal people. The final version of the contract which Mrs Mattingley has not signed—

or had not at that stage—

was drawn up by the Crown Solicitor. It contains such a clause and is in fact a better assurance of such moneys going to the cause of Aboriginal writers than the earlier draft. That contract, which was made available to Mrs Mattingley on 24 July, is still awaiting her signature.

Thirdly, it is simply not true that the Government Printer is the only one in South Australia with the production and distribution expertise to sell the book in South Australia, interstate or overseas.

Finally, Mrs Mattingley claims that the treatment of the book shows 'lack of trust in the ability of Aboriginal people to handle what is (theirs)'. As far as I am aware, there is no Aboriginal publishing business or collective in South Australia which could have distributed or marketed the book.

The Premier goes on to state:

I would point out that if the book had remained with the Government Printer there would be little practical difference with what is happening now under the arrangement with the Adelaide Review. In neither case would the book have been handled by an Aboriginal enterprise—private or public—and in both cases profits from the first edition (if any) would be returned to the Government to defray—

the substantial costs that have been put into that publication. So, I put on record those responses to criticisms made in this matter. I hope that the book will be published soon and that that chapter can be put behind us. I am sure that the book will be a very valuable addition to the shelves of many South Australians, particularly to those of us in the education system. It will be a real achievement for the Aboriginal community in South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the examination completed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Wednesday 23 September at 11 a.m.