

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 1 October 1980

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott
 Mr. Lynn Arnold
 Dr. B. Billard
 The Hon. D. J. Hopgood
 Mr. J. Mathwin
 Mr. R. J. Randall
 Mr. I. Schmidt
 Mr. J. P. Trainer

The Committee met at 11 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I have examined the minutes of 30 September and, if there are no objections, I shall sign them as being a correct record of proceedings. I understand that members have a copy of the proceedings. Yesterday we considered a time table for today. It was not rigid but I am sure that it was helpful and that members would appreciate making such a time table today. The five matters to be considered today are as follows: Education; Education Department; South Australian Teacher Housing Authority; Further Education; and Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I suggest that we devote the whole of the evening to "Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous". That would be where Aboriginal affairs are involved. We would be making a substitution of members of this Committee for that matter. Regarding the remaining matters, I do not think we would want to tie ourselves down, but we perhaps should proceed to consider Further Education not later than 5 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there agreement on that?

Mr. RANDALL: I refer to yesterday's exercise and the commitment given by the other side in respect of a loose time table. We saw members opposite break that commitment. If we make a commitment we should keep it. If we are going to discuss miscellaneous matters this evening, we should do so. I am happy to support the suggestion, as long as we will be discussing miscellaneous affairs this evening and will not get bogged down in any other area to the extent that miscellaneous matters suffer.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I would be quite happy with a decision by this Committee that we proceed to Further Education not later than 5 p.m. and to Minister of Education—Miscellaneous not later than 7.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: If everybody agrees, that will be the time table.

Education, \$371 980 000

Witness:

The Hon. H. Allison, Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. J. Steinle, Director-General of Education.
 Mr. P. Tillett, Deputy Director-General of Education (Resources).

Mr. C. Laubsch, Director of Personnel Education.
 Mr. N. Robinson, Finance Officer.

The CHAIRMAN: In answering questions during the proceedings, I ask the Minister, if he finds it necessary to supply information to the Committee later, to ensure that it is brief and in a form suitable for insertion in *Hansard*.

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes. To what extent were matters involving Education Department loan accounts discussed under the Minister of Public Works vote yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN: I am not aware of that, as Estimates Committee A was involved with that matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Do you wish me to answer that question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member has information about that matter, he is at liberty to tell us about it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Matters relating to primary and secondary school buildings under Loan Account and the Department of Further Education under Loan Account were discussed and disposed of by Committee A. I expressed some regret that there was not an opportunity for the Minister of Education to be present with the Minister of Public Works on that occasion, but my viewpoint did not carry the day.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that satisfy your question, Mr. Minister?

The Hon. H. Allison: To what extent will that matter be raised in this Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: It will be in accordance with the votes "Education Department—School Buses" and "South Australian Teacher Housing Authority—Advances for Capital Purposes", appearing on page 4 of the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed expenditure open for examination. Are there any questions?

Mr. SCHMIDT: In recognising the substantial increase in the funds allocated to education, will the Minister say whether there has been an increase in annual grants to schools this year and, if so, how they are to be divided up?

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes. As a result of a recent Cabinet decision, annual grants to schools have been increased. That involved some slight reallocation of moneys already allowed for within the Budget.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister be able to indicate the appropriate parts of pages 45 and 46 of the Estimates from which this money is taken?

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Except on questions of a general nature pertinent to the subject, I should like members of the Committee to indicate the line to which they are speaking, before asking a question.

The Hon. H. Allison: Regarding curriculum contingencies, on page 45, in the supplies grant there is a 4 per cent increase in the base plus per capita rates for the financial year. In the grounds maintenance grant, there is an increase in the amount paid per hectare but there is no adjustment per capita. That makes a minor increase but nevertheless it is an increase.

In the grant for school purposes, the grant this year will be paid at the full value of the rate. For secondary books and materials grants, there is an increase. Specifically, the 4 per cent increase in the base plus per capita rates means that high schools had a \$4 500 base for 1980 and a \$10·50 per capita base for the year, and for 1981 that will be increased to \$4 700 and \$11 per capita. For area schools, special rural schools, and Aboriginal schools with secondary students, the base for 1980 was \$3 600, with \$9 per capita. That is increased to \$3 750, with a \$9·50 per capita amount this year.

For primary, junior primary, rural, and Aboriginal schools, the base for 1980 was \$750, with \$5 per capita. For 1981, it is increased to \$780, with \$5.50 per capita. In addition to the revised basic formula, the following loading payments from the supplies grant are proposed in 1981:

Special schools	\$95 000
Junior primary loading	9 000
Country postage—secondary \$105	11 000
—primary \$80	19 000
Bottled gas	300 000
Freight	183 000

Regarding the grounds maintenance grant, there is a slight increase in the per hectare rate from \$32 to \$36. There is also a 40c per student allowance, with a minimum payment of \$200. Regarding the grant for school purposes, we have had an overall formula that has not been changed since 1976 but it is noticeable and worthy of comment that in 1979 the available funds permitted only half of that grant to be paid at the approved rate.

In 1980, I reinstated that to 90 per cent, and the grant and the funds we will make available in 1981 will reinstate that to between 95 per cent and 100 per cent of the 1978 total. The base grants and per capita grants to high schools will be \$375 for the base and \$5.60 per capita. For area schools there will be a \$300 base and \$4.95 per capita, and for special rural schools the base will be \$225, with \$4.50 per capita.

The amount for primary/junior primary is \$75 base and \$3.90 per capita. With special schools there are four categories: category 1 is \$180 base and \$6 per capita; category 2 is \$180 base and \$15 per capita; category 3 is \$150 base and \$12 per capita; and category 4 is \$120 base and \$15 per capita. That would represent an increase of some \$72 000 over the 1979 total. With the format that I have referred to, the secondary book and materials grant rates have been adjusted from 1975 through to the current year, with the exception of last year, to match inflation. This year it is proposed to compensate by increasing the grant from \$42 to \$45 per student. So, the total cost of payment of that grant at \$45 per capita will be \$4 318 000 in 1980-81. That represents an increase of \$166 000 over 1979-80.

This, in fact, represents a contribution towards schools, staff, parents and students. It is a transfer of initiative towards a line which I am sure the member for Baudin will recall, having addressed himself to this matter in debate in the House over the past 12 months. I believe that his Opposition group has formed a committee specifically to look into aspects of increased payments being made by parents. What we have done is an act of good faith on the part of the Government to help parents and schools. They will receive substantially higher cheques this year than last year. The Government is also investigating other problems becoming increasingly obvious.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Has there been a special grant towards upgrading school equipment (especially in some of the technical areas), which is so far outdated that some schools find it difficult to replace such equipment as stoves and machinery?

The Hon. H. Allison: This reinstates almost 100 per cent of the schools equipment grant that was severely cut during the 1979 school year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think we should follow this up a little further, as the member for Mawson has opened up this aspect of the Budget. I must say that, in trying to get some sort of picture of where contingencies have gone, the Budget papers are not all that helpful. I gather from the comments that have been made by the Minister so far that his total contingencies line must be

somewhere in the upper \$30 000 000 range. So, there must be other contingency components apart from the \$23 277 000 that we are dealing with here. Maybe I can get on to a matter inserted elsewhere in relation to the utility costs. The Minister and I had one or two exchanges across a different sort of committee when the Budget was being debated last year, involving utility costs and the possibility of savings in utility costs and in water and energy costs of one sort or another. Could the Minister indicate what allocations have been made for that; secondly, whether they are costs that are still to be met centrally rather than at the school level; and, thirdly, what savings, if any, occurred last year as a result of the department's attempt to urge upon teachers and administrators the necessity of saving energy and other utility costs as much as possible?

The Hon. H. Allison: I do not know whether the honourable member is requesting a very substantial background.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No.

The Hon. H. Allison: It can be made available in printed form, and perhaps the honourable member may wish to address himself specifically to individual lines.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am simply interested in the omnibus figures.

The Hon. H. Allison: The actual expenditure in 1979-80 was \$36 123 000 for the total contingency line, and a sum of \$37 504 000 is allocated for the present financial year. We had anticipated that schools would try to make savings within a number of lines. We had deliberately, by policy, intended to make savings on school cleaning, for example, where we undertook to provide contracts for major school cleaning companies, especially in metropolitan Adelaide, and to phase out day labour and petty contracts by attrition only. No-one has been dismissed or retrenched. By attrition, we would replace that type of petty and day labour contract by major cleaning contracts. I think that about \$200 000 has been saved by doing that.

Major new schools and major new additions to schools would be similarly dealt with, where the cleaning would be advertised to contract first. That is achieving some savings, although this is partly offset by the fact that we are still providing new premises, not so much by way of major school construction, which was a major problem for the former Minister, but certainly by way of substantial additions to new schools.

I realise that that matter was probably dealt with yesterday in relation to public works. However, it will be of interest to the Committee to realise that in 1975-76 about 73 per cent of the former Government's expenditure under the Loan Account would have been on new schools and the remaining 27 per cent on additions, alterations, and that sort of thing, whereas during the current year the influence on new schools in relation to savings in contract cleaning is quite changed.

There has been a dramatic swing, with only 15 per cent of the Loan Account money being spent on new schools, the remaining 85 per cent now being directed towards the refurbishing of old schools and the small schools programme. So, there is a chance that, although we are not saving on new buildings, a saving will be made on old schools.

Mr. ABBOTT: Does the comment that you are making refer to kindergartens and pre-school centres?

The Hon. H. Allison: That would apply to a minor extent only. I believe that petty contracts would be the more efficient way of cleaning the smaller establishments. Really, we are looking at major contracts when examining the possibility of effecting substantial savings. We had anticipated that there would be some voluntary savings in relation to power and light, water and telephone charges,

for example. We suggested that there might be more discipline in determining who would use the telephone, particularly for trunk calls.

I believe that the Federal Government, with its recent revision of Telecom charges, may also impinge on those savings, although I am not sure about the extent of them. I will make available for the honourable member the printed sheet which details the whole range of expenditures.

Many of the anticipated savings may not be made. This is speculative and, to that extent, the Budget must be flexible. There is \$20 000 000 in round-sum allowances over and above the \$371 000 000, which will go towards additional costs during the current financial year. The majority of that is for salaries.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the Minister for that information. I seek guidance about where these utility costs are slotted into the Budget. If one subtracts from the figures that the Minister read out—the \$36 000 000 to \$37 000 000—the total for “Contingencies-Curriculum Directorate”, we get remainders of about \$13 817 000 for 1979-80 and \$14 227 000 for 1980-81. There were also some contingency items listed on page 46 as well. Is that the order of the increase in utility costs, from about \$13 800 000 to \$14 200 000, or are there other components of this Budget that have to be taken into account? While the Minister is getting that information, I indicate that I believe that the Committee should have some sort of idea of the trend in utility costs. The Government has committed itself to a system of voluntary restraint in schools. What the Minister is really saying to us is that that has had a mixed reception and mixed success. I believe that the Committee would like a quantitative indication about that. We can partly get that by the drift in the Budget, modified of course by the fact that there are additional commitments this year that were not there last year.

The Hon. H. Allison: In brief, there have been real savings in water, electricity, gas and oil charges in 1979-80. We were unable to achieve savings in the telephone area. We had hoped for that to be a realistic wish, but obviously it was not, and in school cleaning the cash savings were \$484 000 through the contract system, but with an offset amount there, an additional cost for new schools of \$215 000, giving a net saving of \$269 000 in school cleaning.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Regarding specific savings, it may be possible for me to get those figures later. My question impinges on the trend to school-based funding. Are there any matters which in this financial year will be transferred from central accounting to school-based funding?

The Hon. H. Allison: We have had a number of inquiries from school parents and friends organisations, councils and principals over the past several months, and our reply has been consistently that there was no intention on the part of the Government to put any further burden across to schools.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Does the Minister mean in this financial year, or as a matter of policy ever?

The Hon. H. Allison: We are dealing with the current financial year. The matter has not been addressed as a policy decision. I anticipate that we are unlikely to change our minds in the immediate future. I could not envisage doing that.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Earlier the Minister indicated that there would be a reduction of funding to schools, and he listed many grants that have now been made to schools and increases in grants that are being made for specific purposes.

The term “redirection” was used; in other words, a shifting of the basis for the meeting of needs, and that the funding being provided by the department was assisting schools to meet those needs. The Minister is now saying that there will be no further move this year towards school-based funding. How do those two statements tie up?

The Hon. H. Allison: The reference that I made to a movement of funds was really with regard to one specific line. There would be a transfer of some \$30 000 to the schools supplies line. It was not a major transfer. In fact, the grants that I referred to, which are now being specifically made available to schools, had already been included within the Budget lines. It would necessitate a slight transfer of some \$30 000 to \$40 000 from one line to another. That is the transfer I was referring to. It is a minor one causing some redirection.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: We have heard mention of savings on cleaning contracts; various figures have been quoted. I understood the Minister to say that the saving had been \$200 000. Then I thought I heard him say that the net saving was \$269 000. Would I be correct in saying that \$269 000 is the correct figure? I have had some contact with various cleaners who are employees of major contract cleaning companies and they have expressed a great deal of concern that the use of contract cleaning circumvents award provisions. What moves is the Education Department taking to ensure that cleaning companies adhere to the requirements of award provisions?

The Hon. H. Allison: The \$200 000 I referred to was off the top of my head and based on figures we were talking about some weeks ago. A \$484 000 saving, offset by a \$215 000 additional cost for new schools, left a net saving of \$269 000. That is the recent figure. The move to contract cleaning has been carefully considered. In fact, members of the Committee may recall that as long ago as December of last year I first made the announcement that the Government intended to make some swing towards contract cleaning. It was not until February of this year that I was approached by the leaders of two unions involved to discuss the possibility of amending the original decision to some extent. In the course of negotiations we said that the guidelines would be firm and clear and that advertisements would be issued for contract cleaners for new schools, and major additions to existing schools, but that existing petty contract cleaners would be protected; where retirements came through age, or any other reasons, their contracts may be reconsidered for letting subject to tender by a major or minor contractor. We do not automatically give a major contractor the contracts.

We undertook that there would be no retrenchments. That was a firm commitment to the unions, after negotiation. I am not in a position to assess the various conditions under which contractors employ their staff. A contract is a contract, and employer and employee have their own relationship. However, I understand that, irrespective of whether contractors are major firms or petty contractors, or possibly even day labour people, they would be subject to membership of one of the two major unions involved. I imagine that any dispute between employer and employee would be referred to the two union leaders with whom I have had contact in the last 12 months.

There may be some fear by Committee members that the Education Department may approach this matter in an indiscriminate way and say, “The lowest tender is the one for us.” We have on a number of occasions had a variety of tenders and have assessed the manner in which the major cleaning contractors go about their business. We keep a

close eye on the way schools have been cleaned. Responsible officers of the department have on at least two or three occasions recently pointed out to me that some companies that tender very low prices are skimming on the job, and we have opted for a middle range tender where we knew the company was reliable. This would be placing employees under less stress, and it is the rationalisation. On two occasions recently we have dismissed a major contractor for breach of contract in that premises were not adequately cleaned. We have told the unions that we will keep an eye on major and petty contractors, and we are keeping faith there.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am reassured by the statement that the department does not necessarily give the contract to the lowest tenderer, because that would be open to abuse. I do not want a saving to be made at the expense of the workers' wages. I should like to know whether we can have tabled a pro forma contract that is issued for the successful tenderer to sign, presuming there is one, so that we can see how the department has control over these jobs.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister can, if he wishes, forward that to the Committee as an answer to the question. It will be up to the Minister to provide that information if he so desires.

The Hon. H. Allison: I am not quite sure. I will consider the matter, probably during the day, and come back with a more definite answer, but there is a standard method of obtaining a pro forma contract and I am sure that trade unions would be able to obtain this. The matter of cleaning a new school would be advertised, and I expect that the pro forma contracts would be public property. I cannot see a problem there.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Are you saying we can have that for our deliberations today?

The Hon. H. Allison: I cannot see any reason why you should not, but I will think about the matter and come back later.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I hope we may be able to do it before we vote on the line, because follow-up questions may come on that.

Dr. BILLARD: I ask the Minister to comment on the general problem we obviously recognise, that there are declining enrolments at the moment. This poses problems on an overall level, where the overall funds may be static in real terms yet increasing in per capita terms. I should also be interested to know how this affects particular schools. There would be a large number of schools that were established with certain expectations of enrolments. Grounds may be provided to service a certain population and there may now be declining enrolments. Does this pose a funding problem? How is it overcome?

The Hon. H. Allison: That is an extremely broad-ranging question. Perhaps I could single out the school population figures initially, as that was the first question. Since 1975 (and this is directly related to the Borrie Report, which was quite a significant document) it has been obvious to educationists across Australia that the air of optimism, evidenced when the Karmel Report was released in 1970, had become somewhat misplaced. In fact, we were anticipating, under the Karmel Report, that school populations and finances would continue to be expansionary. By 1975 the Borrie Report indicated a decline in student population, and that decline in South Australia is probably quicker and more pronounced than in other States, if only for the reason that South Australia was first on to the quite massive post-war baby boom. We have not only had a decline in birth rates but also, in South Australia in 1979, a net migration loss of about 1 700

people, according to A.B.S. statistics for that year. The Mallen Report, which comes out every year on abortions, has shown a steady increase up to some 3 000 per annum.

There is a whole range of statistics militating against any rapid increases in population. Significantly for South Australia during the current school year, we have had a decline in State school student populations of approximately 5 000, and next year we anticipate a very similar decline of somewhere around 4 700. However, non-government schools' statistics will remain approximately stable at 40 000, give or take a few students. So, the State school decline literally means that there are more spaces in schools. Probably this is advantageous, in that schools are not over-crowded, and it will lead to greater initiatives for the use of space available for school staff. It has other implications in so far as there has also been a movement of students away from the metropolitan area where the greatest decline is and in some cases there is a slight increase in country areas.

There is a trend in some Adelaide suburbs that are growing quite rapidly. I believe that Tea Tree Gully is one, and the southern suburbs comprise another area where new schools, new developments and new holding schools (that is another issue dear to the former Minister's heart) have to be built. By "holding schools" I mean temporary structures which are there before the final decision is made to make the school permanent. All of these things are still to be considered. The implications for the Education Department and for the State are quite obvious. The implications are there for every Government department, and also for the medical, legal and other professions.

I have already referred to one of the examples. Whereas the former Government had to spend \$43 000 000 in 1978, and \$39 000 000 was committed last year for Loan Account purposes for school buildings, this year only 15 per cent of our money must go on new buildings. This therefore means, first, that the existing buildings are less crowded and, secondly, that, as a result of a relatively high maintenance of Loan Account spendings at about \$34 000 000, the maintenance of high expenditure means that more money is being used on refurbishing and rebuilding existing premises.

The honourable member commented on another factor, namely, that the Education Department expenditure was relatively static. We have three points of view, one of which is that last year \$324 000 000 or \$325 000 000 was allocated according to the Budget. About \$348 000 000 would have been expended in cash, including a substantial increase which is automatic in all Government departments in relation to salaries. This year we have increased substantially the cash line. It was not the substantial cash cut that everyone feared; it was a 14.8 per cent increase in cash terms, taking the figure from \$324 000 000 to \$371 000 000. The revenue sum of \$20 000 000 will take that to \$390 000 000 or \$391 000 000, which will be the real expenditure by the time that the financial year is over.

Of course, the Education Department line as a whole did not benefit in real terms to that extent. About \$6 000 000 was transferred to the Education Department line simply to allow for nothing more than the incremental creep. If I do not have a single addition to salaries expenditure because of tribunal decisions, there is still a \$6 000 000 increase because teachers are automatically escalated on the salary scale. That has been the case for decades.

In real terms, the education line was increased by 1 per cent, but, because of the problem to which the honourable member has referred, namely, that we have had a stabilisation of private school attendances, coupled with a loss in Government schools, there has been an increase in

the private school line which, I am sure, all members may wish to question later.

There is a movement of effort from some directions. For example, we have still maintained the student-teacher ratio in primary schools, and have improved it in secondary schools. This is on tentative grounds, because we do not have next year's figures available. At the same time, we have swung money into other lines with the isolated children's allowance. The independent schools have benefited from windfall profits based on the former Government's formula. They have benefited substantially because of the increased cost of educating a Government school student. We have increased allowances for ethnic communities in relation to ethnic languages taught outside Government schools.

Also, there is a range of new initiatives which have been taken by the Government and which mean that, in spite of the 1 per cent increase overall in the education line, the Education Department itself has suffered about a 1 per cent decline. This is evidenced in the reduced number of staff that will be present in schools during the coming year. This is by no means a complete analysis. The honourable member's question was far-ranging, and almost everything to which I have addressed myself briefly could be expanded upon.

Certainly, the impact of the change in school populations, not only on maintenance but also on the increase in education spending and other factors, means that there is a swing in the thrust of educational spending to some extent, although not a major extent, within the present Budget.

Dr. BILLARD: I recognise that, apart from overall trends and the decline in student population, even in Adelaide, there are shifts in population. My district has a rapidly growing population, as is the case in southern areas. There are inner-urban areas, or the middle areas of Adelaide, where the student population is declining and has been declining rapidly in the past. The overall trend may be 2 per cent (about 5 000 students), but the trend within the metropolitan area could be much greater than that. In these circumstances, there may be some primary schools which were once large and which have become so small that one has to question whether it is proper for them to exist, because the administration costs of just maintaining separate establishments grows out of all proportion to the size of the school. I would be interested in the Minister's comments on this problem. Can he indicate whether consideration has been given to closing schools which have become too small, or is it policy to keep them open?

The Hon. H. Allison: Once again, there are a number of aspects to this question. It was certainly policy in 1977, and again in 1979, to try to halt the massive urban sprawl that has developed in Adelaide. If one extends the picture 10-30 years hence, one could envisage a situation where Adelaide would closely parallel Los Angeles, for example, where there is a massive conurbation, a collection of substantial city councils looking for a city centre. This is already evidenced in the metropolitan area extending from, say, Gawler to Victor Harbor, with potential to fill that whole area. It is part of the Government's declared policy to undertake urban renewal.

Evidence is already there that Hackney redevelopment, which was commenced under the previous Government, supports this policy. We have certainly continued that. I notice that the Adelaide City Council has acquired substantial areas of land, including the former Fricker-Carrington premises in Wakefield Street, for conversion to inner-urban living areas. North Adelaide and other relatively central suburbs are receiving attention from

councils to make them more attractive to people.

There has been a specific request from local government for us not to be too hasty in considering closing down schools, and to leave the options open for this programme of inner-urban renewal. I am sure that the obvious impact of increased petrol prices alone, for example, will make it more desirable for people to reside centrally unless they are peripheral to the city or adjacent to work where they might just have a little way to travel. We wish to encourage this trend.

The Government has more than a little sympathy for the teaching profession in wishing to delay decisions. For example, if schools were to be closed down in considerable numbers (say, one in every four or five schools to be looked at, and partly or wholly closed perhaps in the inner-metropolitan area), it would mean that fewer promotion positions would be available. Already we have within the education system a difficult situation applying which I do not claim to have initiated but which I have certainly inherited, involving many teachers who have been trained in the past several years at the same time as we knew, from 1975 onwards, that we had a student decline. The figures were parallel from 1975 to 1980. There has been a student decline from 235 000 in 1975 to 219 000 this year. At the same time we have probably had the greatest number of teachers in training from 1975 to 1978; in 1978 we had 5 500 teachers in training, either in colleges of advanced education or at university. These people are now on the labour market. We already have a problem, and we are not looking to compound it by hasty closures. I do not suggest that it will make a substantial difference, but we are sympathetic and are keeping a number of factors in mind before any decisions are made.

Mr. TRAINER: My question follows the questions raised by the member for Newland. It would be helpful to the Committee if the information that I am about to request had been provided or could be provided. Perhaps if it is provided in an hour or two we could still make use of it. It would be useful at this time next year if the Minister could provide information relating to projected enrolments on a primary and secondary basis, and on a regional basis, since I doubt that that information could be provided at short notice. Perhaps in 12 months we could be provided with it on the basis that the member for Newland requested, that is, in regard to each school. Secondly, could we also be provided with information on the turnover of personnel within the department, especially concerning the varying resignation rates over the past three or four years, which would have much relevance to the general state of the economy?

The Hon. H. Allison: The honourable member was really soliciting statistics that could be difficult to provide accurately, because one-third of South Australia's population is itinerant (it moves from one part of the State to another). That is obvious from figures supplied by the Bureau of Statistics on electoral matters, where the number of new enrolments and changes within each member's district indicates a change of that order. To anticipate demands for next year and the year after would be speculative; nevertheless, on a State-wide basis, we have some indication, and I can give the honourable member statistics dating back to 1978. The August primary school figures in 1978 show 148 483 students within the Education Department.

That figure declined slightly from 145 301 in August 1979 to 141 000 in July 1980; that is a provisional figure, but fairly accurate. The forecast for July 1981 is 137 475 students. We are looking at a predicted change of minus 2.5 per cent, in fact, for next year, following hard on the heels of a minus 3 per cent for the current year. In

secondary schools we had 80 439 students in 1978 and 77 690 students in August 1979. The figure in July 1980 was 76 650 students and the forecast for July 1981 is 74 505. That is a decline of 2.8 per cent over last year when the decline was 1.3 per cent. So, there again, the pattern is consistent, but slightly more pronounced.

In special schools the figures are much lower: 1 533 students in August 1978; 1 534 students, an increase of only one, in August 1979; and 1 580 in July 1980. The member's expression indicates that he sees that that is a plus 3 per cent figure. For July 1981 the forecast is 1 550 students, so the decline is, again, part of the pattern and is minus 1.9 per cent. We then look at the number of teachers employed (and I will not go through the figures line by line): for 1980-81 the decline in the primary section is a smaller decline than the student decrease—we have an anticipated figure of minus 2.2 per cent. In secondary schools the figure is minus .5 per cent. In special schools (we have constructed an additional two special schools this year) we have an increase in staffing of .3 per cent. Overall, the net figure for the decline in student population for next year is predicated as a gross total of minus 2.6 per cent, and for teachers minus 2.2 per cent. These figures are probably a little more pessimistic than they might otherwise be, because only this week (and this is a line members might wish to question me on) I made provision through Cabinet for the appointment of another 22 staff members for next year specifically in the migrant education field, which is not reflected in these figures.

The Budget figures were correct several weeks ago, but so far as the Education Department is concerned the matters are still slightly flexible so the predicated figures are there. The answer to the question whether this can be defined from region to region, I believe, might be difficult to give, if only because of the fact that the previous Government removed zoning restrictions only last year and we are still feeling the impact of that removal. I do not have a report on zoning with me. This matter is still in a state of flux. Brighton school springs to mind, because it attracts students from as far south as Christies. Some schools are still gaining in number in the metropolitan area and others are losing quite substantially, so from region to region there may be personalised reasons for changes in the pattern. It would be difficult to predict those changes.

Mr. TRAINER: I have three follow-up questions. First, the zoning impact that the Minister mentioned presents a difficulty in collating data. Is this a transient thing and, once zoning has become well established, will it then be possible to make reasonably accurate projections about enrolments?

The Hon. H. Allison: We are assuming that there will be no substantial change in population trends, and I imagine that, given a relatively short period of 18 months to two years during which parents will determine which schools they prefer, there will be stability. However, given any change in any other factor, such as substantial changes in migration patterns or the birth rate, which is a possibility and another issue we can debate, and given a change in a number of factors, the whole thing could be thrown into the melting pot again, with obvious implications for schools, teacher training and all the rest.

Mr. TRAINER: Secondly, will the Minister provide similar figures for the resignation rate in the teaching profession over the past three or four years, figures which are of particular relevance to the overall turnover?

The Hon. H. Allison: The loss rate within Education Departments, in times when the world economy was burgeoning 10 or 15 years ago, was in the region of 13 to 15 per cent. Over the past few years there has been a marked change in the loss by attrition. In August 1978 the loss in

primary schools was 5.1 per cent, and in secondary schools 4.2 per cent. In August 1979 the loss in primary schools was 4.4 per cent and in secondary schools 3.7 per cent. We do not have the figures for July 1980, but personal observation indicates that the figures would be hardly likely to have improved and, having had discussion with teachers college directors and the Chairman of the Tertiary Education Authority, one wonders just how low the attrition rate can be before it becomes an absolute figure. Some people pessimistically speculate that it might be as low as 2.2 per cent or 2.3 per cent. Others say that we have probably reached the nadir—the very depths. We are hopeful that times are changing and that the attrition rate will not become any worse, but there again that is speculative. I do not have anything more accurate than that.

Mr. TRAINER: Thirdly, would the Minister be able to provide the Committee with copies of the document he has, which I understand is not particularly confidential.

The Hon. H. Allison: It is information I solicited from the Director-General of Education. We can make copies of this document available.

Mr. MATHWIN: Turning to the line "Research and Planning", the Minister explained that new buildings are to constitute only 15 per cent of the allocation this year and that much money is going to renovations and extensions of older schools. I also understand that the statistics situation in the department is difficult, because every year for a number of years what they have thought about Brighton High School, for instance, in the form of statistics has been wrong. It is going against the grain or the thinking of some people in the department that the number of enrolments is improving each year when they were expected to deteriorate.

I ask what are the criteria for the priorities on renovations and remodelling of older-type high schools, and how the priorities are set. I say this deliberately in regard to Brighton High School, which the Minister knows I am very concerned about and have been for a number of years. I believe I have made reasonable speeches in the House on the matter. I have had pressure from constituents and even from other people who send their children to that school from outside the area, knowing that it is a good school. Therefore, enrolments are increasing. Can the Minister give an idea of the criteria, particularly when there seems to be a glimmer of hope that more money will be allocated to improving the older-type schools that are in dire need?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I rise on a point of order. I am as anxious as the member for Glenelg to hear what the Minister says about Brighton High School, but he is asking for information in relation to Loan. This is precisely why, in Estimates Committee A yesterday, I raised the matter of the presence of the Minister of Education there. The Minister of Public Works was not able to answer questions, even though his department services the Education Department, nor can they be answered in this Committee, because we are not dealing with Loan funds for school buildings. We are dealing with current aspects and whether they are going to get new buildings.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for Glenelg to indicate the item to which he is referring.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is "Research and Planning Directorate". I am merely trying to get information on the criteria.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The member commented on the money that would be available, and yesterday in Estimates Committee A we spent a long time pointing out the deplorable trend in Loan funds, from which classrooms are built.

The CHAIRMAN: My ruling would be that money spent in that way comes from the Loan aspect and I ask the member for Glenelg to reserve the question until we consider Loan, which is the next vote.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not want to be difficult, but the Loan funds for the Education Department deal not with schools but with buses, and things like that. School buildings are under the Public Works vote, which was disposed of yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that in this case a question could be asked in general terms but not on a specific case where school buildings would be involved. If the member for Glenelg reframed the question so that it was of a general nature, he might be able to get the answer he desires.

Mr. MATHWIN: With all due respect to the member for Baudin, I was asking for the policy, criteria and priorities, which have nothing to do with the Public Buildings Department. I am on the Public Works Committee, as you are, Mr. Chairman, and you know that the initial approach comes from the Education Department, not the Public Buildings Department. I will reframe the question and ask the Minister what are the criteria for priorities and how they are reached, in the case of older-type schools being renovated in the city of Adelaide.

The Hon. H. Allison: I realised early in the member's previous line of questioning that the key was that he was looking for the criteria by which the department decided how to spend money on school repair, maintenance and refurbishing. Generally, it has been on a needs basis. I believe that that has been the policy of all Governments. The member has drawn attention to the needs of Brighton High School, and I should have remembered that. I think I set a trap for the unwary when I drew that figure out of my head. Brighton High School must have some special attributes if parents have their children in appalling conditions and are still prepared to send them there from various parts of Adelaide.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is a special music school.

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes, it has special features. There is marvellous accommodation for music and the results are excellent. We will look at this matter on a needs basis. I recognise that the pre-fab layout closely resembles that at Renmark. I believe that a five-year programme was given to the member. We will investigate the matter and reply to him later.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I go back to the Minister's comment earlier. Regarding the increase of 22 to which the Minister has referred in connection with migrant education, I note that this is not in the Budget papers. Which line is it on and what is the cost for those 22 people?

The Hon. H. Allison: It would essentially be the salaries provision for primary and secondary and involves about \$200 000 that will be provided for an additional 22 staff members to deal partly with Vietnamese problems and partly with the existing ethnic community problems.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I speak subject to your direction, Mr. Chairman, on whether it is the right moment to do this. The Minister has indicated that those figures are not in the Budget papers. That implies that they are not correct now. I move:

That this Estimates Committee expresses the opinion that the vote for salaries, primary and secondary, should be increased by \$200 000 to make allowance for the increase for migrant education announced by the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that I cannot accept the motion. Sessional Orders provide:

The report of a Committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of the Committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Could you, Mr. Chairman, advise me as to the best way to update the figures? It seems that we are voting on a vote which, by way of announcement, the Minister has already indicated is inaccurate. I do not criticise the announcement, as it is very good and is to be supported. If we are going through the figures in great detail, we should at least be able to discuss figures that are going to be correct and accurate.

The CHAIRMAN: The conditions and conduct of the Estimates Committee were determined by the House of Assembly. They seem definite, and I must abide by them. I suppose that the only way it could be done is by an expression of opinion that it is inadequate.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Are you therefore saying, Mr. Chairman, that I could move a motion that would be along the lines, "expresses the opinion that the vote in relation to salaries, primary and secondary, is inadequate"?

The CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member put that motion in writing?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Estimates Committee expresses the opinion that the vote for salaries, primary and secondary, is inadequate and draws the attention of the House to the amount announced by the Minister for the employment of 22 migrant education teachers not included in the original allocation.

Mr. RANDALL: I rise on a point of order. It is my understanding that the guidelines set down for this Committee are such that we are to investigate the Budget which has been allocated and handed down by this Government. The time for the sort of debate that the honourable member is trying to raise in this Committee is in the House of Assembly at a later stage when the Budget documents are brought back to the House for consideration. Statements can be made at that stage. I seek your ruling, and guidance, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. A member of the Committee may move a resolution or expression of opinion relating to the vote under discussion. As in Committee of the whole House, the discussion must then centre around that motion. All members of the House, including the Minister being examined, may participate in the debate. At the conclusion of the debate the question is put by the Chair. So, the Committee is competent to deal with the motion. The matter that I am concerned about as far as the motion and its wording is concerned is the fact that the Budget is brought down at a certain date. Anything subsequent to that date I believe is not appropriate for this Committee to determine. However, if the motion embraces the fact that what appears in the Budget papers in the opinion of the Committee should be different, I believe that that would be acceptable.

Mr. TRAINER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. On a point of clarification, I take it that the motion moved by my colleague, if carried or otherwise, does not preclude further debate on the education line; such a motion can be moved at any stage during the proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN: That can be done at any time and will not cease the debate on the line.

Mr. RANDALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Should this be the tactic adopted by this Committee (that those motions will be debated and discussed in the time of the Committee, out of the blue, when it is talking about a vote) should not some sort of indication be given throughout the House and the Chamber that a vote is to be taken by the Committee? I request that at least the bells be rung for two minutes in order to summon members back to the Committee in order for the vote to be taken.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. It is quite proper for a motion to be moved, and it is up to the Committee. As to the procedure of ringing of the bells, the Select Committee rules of procedure are such that there is no ringing of the bells before a vote is taken.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I will have to get your advice, Mr. Chairman, as to the wording of the motion. I am amazed that it seems to be an issue of such importance. I had not thought that it was going to be resounding. The Minister raised the matter to the Committee. It became the property of the Committee when such an alteration to the Budget was placed before us. If that was not to be considered by us it should not have been brought to us. It is a simple matter. It is not attempting in any way to undermine the Minister. It is taking information that he has given us and incorporating it into the figures. I cannot understand the tactics being followed by Government members.

The CHAIRMAN: I refer to the statement made by the Minister concerning additional staff, etc. Did I understand the Minister to say that this was in the process of consideration now?

The Hon. H. Allison: No; it has been decided, as have other matters which I have not brought before the Committee at this stage. I make the point that any matter brought into financial consideration after the finalising of Budget figures is invariably not considered at a stage like this but is subsequently considered by the House when Supplementary Estimates appear. Any changes of a financial nature are considered later in the year as Supplementary Estimates. The fact that additional money is made available and additional expenditure incurred is brought to the notice of the House at the Supplementary Estimates stage. That is a matter of formal procedure. Therefore, it is unthinkable that we could allow a vote of this kind, which would be a precedent and would have the effect of changing the whole financial structure, to go through.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is now 12.30 p.m., and the Committee will break for lunch. During the luncheon break, clarification of this matter can be obtained.

[Sitting suspended from 12.32 to 2 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: This morning, a point of order was raised concerning the procedure relating to voting. I have decided that it would be fair to all, if there is to be a vote, if the bells were rung for two minutes. This procedure will also be followed by Committee A. In future when a vote is to be taken, the bells will be rung for two minutes.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Committee expresses the opinion that the vote for "Education—Personnel Directorate" is inadequate, as the amount allocated does not express the actual expenditure that will be involved in the light of the announced increased employment of migrant education teachers.

The CHAIRMAN: According to the rules of procedure relating to Select Committees, it is not necessary for the motion to be seconded. Does the honourable member wish to speak to the motion?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I think that the matter was canvassed enough before lunch and, if I have a right of reply, I do not intend to make any more comments at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like the Minister to know that, although he does not have power to vote, he does have power to speak in the debate.

Mr. MATHWIN: I should like to know, Sir, whether you will invite the Minister to participate in the debate. If that is your intention, it would be the Minister's right to be

the first speaker.

The CHAIRMAN: It is normal for the motion to be moved and, if any member or the Minister wishes to speak, the Chair must receive an indication. Does the Minister wish to speak?

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes, Sir. This is unusual in that, although the aim of the motion is reasonable and the statement is accurate, one must nevertheless realise that budgetary matters are generally before Government departments for several months before they are firmed up to the point of being printed. I know that from the Education Department's point of view these things were being considered as long ago as January in order for the Budget to be finally firmed up for August.

During that time, and indeed during the whole of any financial arrangements, matters are in a constant state of flux and flexibility. To say that any single line or a part of any Budget is inadequate would, I suppose, to a large extent be true of almost every single issue that is raised. I refer, for example, to salaries. We have each year lines allocated for specific departmental salaries. In the Education Department's case, it is broken up into primary, secondary and special schools, and further education.

Each of the lines is to a large extent speculative. It is an indication to the House and to Government departments that a certain sum of money has been set aside for a specific purpose. However, as to its representing accuracy at any one stage of the year, that is largely impossible.

For example, I have been saying today that we have a reduction of 306 teachers, so many in the primary section and so many in the secondary section, with part of that reduction involving seconded teachers and part of it relating to release-time scholar equivalents. Almost immediately, I went on to say that it was probably pessimistic and that a change of 22 teachers had already been decided on.

This is only one part of the issue, because Cabinet had, subsequent to the Budget, and in the light of further facts revealed to it by the Education Department and, indirectly, the Institute of Teachers, decided that some additional money (in fact, \$400 000) would also be made available. This was to ease the transition problems that will undoubtedly face the Education Department and some staff early in the new year.

Were we to decide that staff would be transferred from school A to school B in accordance with the new formula, as students leave one school and other schools gain students, problems will arise; personal difficulties would be in evidence. Cabinet therefore decided to make available not only the \$200 000 for migrant education but also \$400 000 for the Education Department to ease this transition so that some schools would during the first term be over complement, and so that the department would be able to carry on while negotiations were under way.

I suggest that a large number of lines would be inaccurately presented to the House at any stage of debate, irrespective of whether we debated them immediately the Budget was presented, at this stage, or indeed later in the year. The figures that are presented are aims rather than achievements.

We must look each year, department by department and line by line, at the proposed allocations and actual expenditure. We must also look at the proposed provisions for 1980-81 and at the fact that we already have \$20 000 000 set aside in the Education Department alone for salary increments in order to realise that accuracy is probably the last thing that we should be questioning.

Quite apart from that, if we are to allow this motion to be carried, I suggest that every line in every debate that

comes forward during these sessions will also be liable to be questioned should a Minister reveal that certain negotiations have been put in train and successfully concluded at Cabinet level following the conclusion of the publication of the Budget. So, I suggest to Committee members that, reasonable though the motion may appear to be, a principle is involved: we are looking at a set of figures that state the Government's intention. There is no intention of deceit. In fact, the motion has arisen as a result of additional information following a change of heart and as a result of something that will benefit education. Therefore, there is no questioning the motives of any Committee members or of the Government in relation to this issue.

As a matter of principle, I must oppose the motion on the basis that the line cannot be altered. This Committee does not have power to alter the lines. This recommendation is therefore something that is not achievable. It is simply an opinion that the lines are inadequate. We have already acknowledged that, as has Cabinet.

Almost invariably, Cabinets year by year look at the decisions that have been made since the finalisation of Budgets that are put before the House, and they bring up the matter in the form of Supplementary Estimates to make allowance for all these things and to enable the various Government departments to carry through to the end of the financial year. I therefore oppose the motion.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not want to detain the Committee long. There is not a great issue of principle that has arisen here regarding the Budget, but it raises interesting questions as to the Committee. The Minister has just said, this is covered under the normal Budget procedures. But this is something entirely new that we are dealing with. It raises the question of what is appropriate that these Committees can and cannot do. I want to make two points. First, that the Minister rightly says that the Budget is to do with aims rather than achievements. He makes the point that for the most part we simply do not know what the outcome of these programmes will be but, in relation to the matter now before us, we do. We do not know the achievement but we do know that there has been a change in aim.

My colleague's motion draws that change of aim to the attention of the House, which will consider the report of this Committee along with that of the other Committee. We can say that we do not know what the outcome will be—but that is not really pertinent to the point at issue. The Minister has already given us additional information which was not previously available to the Committee or the House when it debated this matter on the second reading. We want to draw the attention of the House to this matter.

The second point I make is in relation to the logical outcome of the argument which has been put forward by the Minister and which will be put forward by members on the Government side of the Committee—that these Committees should not attempt to change any aspect of the matters coming before them on the grounds that somehow that upsets the whole structure of the Budget. Of course it does, but what have we got here? Have we simply a charade, or have we some sort of decision-making body, however constained that decision-making should be? Are we simply here to ask a few polite questions, get a little information which at a subsequent stage in the procedure we can use as the basis of motions, or are we really at the stage where we can make decisions? The Sessional Orders provide that we can make decisions on our own motion. What happens to them subsequently is a matter for the House to determine. Therefore, it is quite within the purview of this Committee to do what my

colleague suggests, and I urge the Committee to support it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I oppose the motion for the good reasons given by the Minister. At no time have I had an opportunity to study the motion. A motion was moved before the adjournment, and now a motion has been moved that I have heard but have not read. I have not seen the motion, and it is most difficult to remember exactly what is in it. The member for Baudin has said that in this case there is little difference in respect to this vote because we know exactly what is the Minister's intention and we know exactly how much finance is involved.

Does the honourable member suggest to the Minister that he cannot spend one cent more or less than the sum set out? The Minister was good enough to give to the honourable member, when he wanted it, more information than he needed to give. The Minister was kind to members of the Opposition and circulated documents that no other Minister has ever done. I believe that the member for Salisbury saw an opportunity because a member from his side of the Committee had to excuse himself to go about another duty, and the member for Salisbury knew the situation. He is not that naive, and surely none of my colleagues or members from the other side are so naive as to suggest that the member for Salisbury did not know that we were one member down when he placed his box of tricks before the Committee. His tactic was obvious.

Mr. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is it in order for the member for Glenelg to impute such motives to the member for Salisbury?

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order, but I draw to the attention of the member for Glenelg that I would like him to keep to the motion.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: Honourable members can get excited because their scheme cracked up and fell apart; that is the situation, and they well know it. The Committee has been asked to express its opinion that an inadequate amount is involved in this area, and that is all I can remember of the motion. It asks that we find that an inadequate sum has been allowed for this line. When the honourable member replies, will he explain to the Committee how it is possible to place a correct amount in such a document? I refer the honourable member to the "Estimates of Expenditure". The honourable member would know what the word "Estimates" means—it is an estimate and not a set amount. It is not a rigid figure, because we are dealing with estimates.

For the benefit of the honourable member I point out that under "Director-General of Further Education" last year \$36 901 was voted, \$35 049 was the actual payment and this year \$39 333 is proposed. The honourable member can see the difference between the sum voted and the actual payments involved. The next line—"Lecturing, Administrative and Ancillary Staff"—in 1979-80 involved \$33 140 289 being voted, \$35 354 665 being the actual payment and this year \$35 999 979 is proposed. I challenge the member for Salisbury—and perhaps the honourable member is smarter than I am—to go through this page and find some figures that balance. I would be surprised if he could find one sum that balanced with what was voted and what was actually spent.

The member for Salisbury believes that, provided a member from this side of the Committee is temporarily absent, it is his right to move for an alteration to a line or for the non-agreement to a line. Every line reflects a difference between the amount voted and the actual payments for the year. Sometimes the amounts vary, but can the member be serious when he says that? There is a

difference, and it was pointed out by the Minister in answering a question, although the Minister had no need to give such information to the member: he gave it through the goodness of his heart, giving valuable information that the honourable member could work on. Because he did that, he has now been taken to task, and the honourable member has used this situation as a good excuse to move his motion.

If the honourable member gets this motion through today, when this vote is passed he could deal with the next vote in exactly the same way. That could go on through the whole of the Budget Estimates debate, with members opposite not agreeing to each vote. These are estimates, and the honourable member knows that: they are not set figures. The member for Salisbury is one of the bright sparks for the Opposition, and he is going to go a long way, but this is not the way he is going to do it. I credited him with knowing full well that when the Budget is brought down there must be an area of flexibility in it.

Looking at the cold facts of this motion, I am disappointed in the member for Salisbury and his intent in this matter. I thought he had better things on his mind than this sort of motion, which he would know was moved only as a tactic. This whole matter is debated in another place after this Committee has finished its task. The honourable member can then do what he wants with the backing of not only three members but the whole of his Party. For those reasons, and the reasons given by the kind-hearted Minister, I oppose the motion.

Mr. RANDALL: I, too, oppose the motion. I do not wish to cover the same ground as that covered by my colleague. I see participation in this debate as an ideal opportunity to express an opinion on how we are feeling our way in this matter. A point of order was taken earlier today, and we are handling the various matters as they arrive, as well as solving the problems that this Committee is coming up against.

I value this debate, especially as it involves a new system of considering Budget Estimates in this Committee, and we are starting to set precedents. The sort of precedent that the member for Salisbury is trying to set, however, is wrong. The Government is elected to govern the way it thinks it should govern, and I do not think that the honourable member has the right during an Estimates Committee debate to attempt to change policy regarding expenditure on education. I was delighted this morning to hear the Minister, in elaborating on this matter, say that we will have 22 more migrant education teachers. It was a joy to my ears to hear that, and I almost leapt out of my seat with gratitude.

I am on the right side, the Government side, and this Government's policy is to help some of the schools in my electorate which need upgrading. To hear that 85 per cent of this year's funds in this category will be allocated to that area was joy to my ears, because it means that in the inner suburbs of Adelaide some of the dilapidated old buildings built over 20 years ago will be upgraded and modified.

I do not want to deviate from the motion, but I point out that the Government's proposed expenditure is quite clearly set out before us, and I believe more can be gained by questioning the way in which the Government will spend its money than by attempting to get this Committee to change Government policy.

The Opposition's time will come in the House of Assembly when this Committee reports to that House. Honourable members can make their points about policy change, but I do not think that this Committee stage is the appropriate place to do that. I think that this motion slipped out. The honourable member was so intent on his questioning that he suddenly found an area of change and,

before he knew it, he had moved the motion. It was obvious that the original motion was not the sort of motion to come before this Committee. Clearly, the first motion that the honourable member tried to move in this Committee was a response to one of the answers given by the Minister.

I believe that, that answer having been given, the response of the honourable member was to show concern. He wanted to have that concern noted, so he took what he thought was the appropriate action. I think that the better way to have done that would have been to acknowledge what the Minister said, congratulate him, and pursue his questioning in another area. Having migrants in his area, I would think that the honourable member would agree with the extra expenditure on migrant teacher education.

Mr. TRAINER: I support the motion, and I thank the member for Henley Beach for being more fair-minded than his colleague about the motives of the member for Salisbury in moving his motion. As the member for Glenelg pointed out, we are dealing with estimates, and there is a certain amount of imprecision. The fact that there is a degree of imprecision, however, does not constitute an argument against trying to be more precise where precision can be applied. The Minister, in his kind response to a question, provided an opportunity for us to introduce a slightly greater degree of precision in this matter. He volunteered that information about teachers for migrant education and we thank him for his openness in volunteering that information.

Once that information had been supplied, however, I think that, rather than being castigated, the member for Salisbury should be praised for his attempt to introduce a degree of precision into our deliberations. In fact, that information having been supplied, he would have been derelict in his duty not to have moved a motion along the lines of the motion he has moved. The member for Glenelg attributed all sorts of incorrect motives to the member for Salisbury and said that we were trying to cook a vote because of the absence of one of the members opposite. In fact, your ruling, Mr. Chairman, makes quite clear that that allegation is completely invalid, because the bells would be rung before any vote was taken. In attributing base motives to the member for Salisbury, the member for Glenelg referred to him as a "bright spark from the Opposition", which is surely preferable to being a burnt out, damp squib on the Government side.

Dr. BILLARD: I oppose the motion. I was most disappointed to see the member for Salisbury continue with the motion after the luncheon break. He had raised the subject matter before lunch and, as the member for Glenelg has said, it was an obvious situation where one of our members was temporarily absent and the Opposition sought to exploit the situation and embarrass the Government by quickly moving a motion. I was present last night when exactly the same technique was employed. The Opposition even moved a motion that the vote be put, to hurry the matter up.

When the subject was raised before lunch, the Minister gave a perfectly reasonable explanation of why it was not proper for the variation to be made at this time. That was that, when the Budget is drawn up at a certain time, it constitutes the best knowledge at that time and, if we started messing around with figures with every decision made from that date on, we would not know where we were. The Minister said that proper procedures are followed to allow an orderly process for subsequent variations to be taken into account. If we had to mess around altering the Budget with every Cabinet decision from the end of June until the Budget went right through the Houses, where would we draw the line? How could we

cope with administrative changes?

The present procedure is reasonable. It does not mean that any more or any less will be spent. The good faith of the Minister's reply was evident, and the only result of carrying the motion would be to try to muddle up the process and introduce administrative problems. I think the administrative process is fair and reasonable, considering the variations. Since the member for Salisbury has chosen to pursue the matter after he was given a reasonable explanation, I can only assume that the Opposition is playing politics. The purpose of these Committees is not to play politics: there are other forms of the House where this can be pursued. We have a Minister present, and we ought to use the time to get detailed information on the running of departments. It is not for this Committee to move motions to embarrass the Government.

Mr. ABBOTT: I support the motion. It is very constructive and one on which the Minister has admitted that this particular line could very well be inadequate. The member for Glenelg has suggested that the Estimates drawn up in June should be flexible. We accept that, but in opposing the motion he is denying the Opposition the flexibility to recommend any alteration. The honourable member also said that the Minister was being very kind hearted by giving us too much information. I have never heard anything more ridiculous.

Mr. MATHWIN: You have never done it while in Government, that is why.

Mr. ABBOTT: That is beside the point. The purpose of these Committees is to probe the Estimates and investigate the expenditure recommended. If a mistake has been made, the Minister should be big enough to admit it. The motion is constructive and can rectify that mistake.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I oppose the motion because I feel that the member for Salisbury obviously has misunderstood the purpose behind decision-making. It is a dynamic process, not a static one. If he were to report that a mistake had been made on 30 June and, because of that, we should make an alteration, he would not be having regard to the fact that we have a responsible Minister and responsible personnel in the department to advise the Minister in his deliberations.

The education system has received a bonus from this decision-making. Whether the member for Salisbury has moved the motion for political reasons or for promotion within his own Party (because we know that Opposition members are battling out how they will get the No. 13 position in the shadow Cabinet), we can only speculate. Only the member for Salisbury can say what his reasons are. We saw a similar example of this last night, when the Opposition dropped some motions because it had been out-manoeuvred, as the full numbers were present. This afternoon, when we are trying to get through as much work as possible, the Opposition is trying to delay. We did not discuss the vote "Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous" last night because the Opposition was filibustering with tactics. We should bring this debate to a close, vote, and get on with the whole idea of what we are trying to find out in this Committee.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I find the debate by Government members astounding. They have discussed all sorts of issues except the one at hand. The member for Glenelg was discussing Estimates and lines, not this motion, and other Government members have attributed cynical motives to me and the Opposition. That is astounding on what is only the second day on which Estimates Committees have operated in the South Australian Parliament.

We are forming a new procedure for dealing with the Budget, and we have had the indication today that changes

can be made to the form. You have given a ruling about how votes shall be taken, Mr. Chairman, and I applaud that change. Members of the Committee can have a say on what is in the Budget. The whole thing is dynamic, not a static approach as the member for Mawson said. I want to touch on some points raised by members opposite. Some of the democratic aspects in forming these Committees have been challenged. The member for Henley Beach is not present (I am not taking advantage of that)—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If you were moving a motion, they would say you were.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. He says that the Opposition does not have the right to have an influence on the Budget papers. I endorse the point made by the member for Baudin, who asked exactly what the purpose of these Committees was.

What is the point of these Committees if we do not have those rights? When the Estimates Committees were first framed, we looked at the areas that they were supposed to cover and believed that they would provide the opportunity for some real exchange of information. I was excited to see how that experiment would take place, and I shall indeed be excited to see what alterations are made to the format and the way the Committees operate next year, and to see how we can get more information out of the Government.

It has been suggested that I am casting all sorts of slurs on the Minister and that I am being unfairly rude to him because he has given us some information and I am not going down on my knees to thank him for it. For the *Hansard* record, I thank the Minister for giving us the information in question, and I am sorry that I have hurt the Minister, as his colleagues seem to think I must have done. I thank the Minister for the valuable contribution he made when he told the Committee where changes had been made. As the member for Baudin mentioned, that indicates a change of policy direction. Is it therefore unreasonable that the Budget, which is indeed a statement of policy direction presented in figures, should be altered to embody that change of policy direction? That does not mean that it has to be dollar-for-dollar exact with the final amount spent. I agree that these are estimates, but they are not "Guesstimates".

We were given information this morning that will enable this Committee to make a more reasonable assessment and estimate of what will be spent on one line, and that will be as a result of change in policy and not as a result of an on-going change of a non-policy matter. I would hope that the Minister here and other Ministers will likewise inform us of changes of direction that have taken place since the framing of the Budget papers. Because this is an Estimates Committee and because we are involved in a new form of this Parliament, let us take a new outlook on everything.

Why does it have to be interpreted with such trepidation by Government members that this motion must obviously be a cynical political manoeuvre and an attempt to see the Government thrown out of office? We will attend to that matter later in other forms of the House and in the electorate. We do not need this Committee for that. The member for Mawson said that it should not be a political forum. I agree that it should be a forum for trying to analyse the full meaning of the Budget. Motions of this Committee should not be subjected to the smears that have been given them by members opposite. The motion that I have moved is designed to enhance the operations of this Committee, trying to analyse figures that have been given to us which the Minister has said involve a policy change. I might also say that the Minister said that the motion, because of that, was well intentioned, and that

indicates a serious policy division with the member for Glenelg, who said that the motion was not well intentioned. However, I will leave the divisions of the Government's ranks aside.

The Budget papers accurately reflect the policies of the Government and, as accurately as possible, embody Government decisions. We are told that this will involve a tremendous train of administrative problems. All it means is that a figure—a line in a printed document—will be changed. In what way is that going to bring the administration of this State to a grinding halt? It cannot possibly do so. We were not trying to embarrass the Government by this motion, although it is obviously feeling very embarrassed about it. We are trying to make sure that the decisions of this Committee, a new forum of the House, give the best possible information to the full House, and to make sure that we have done our jobs, as we are charged to do, which is to analyse the Budget in full detail, as is our right. To suggest any other motive does no credit to Government members.

We have taken a lengthy time on this debate, but I believe that the contributions of Government members have achieved nothing. They filibustered in a way that was most unreasonable. We know that to be their tactics, and I do not want to go on at length. The Minister agreed that the lines were inadequate. He agreed with the intent of the motion and then proceeded to circumlocute his way out of supporting it. I call on this Committee to support the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (4)—Messrs. Abbott, Lynn Arnold, Hopgood, and Trainer. Noes (4)—Messrs. Billard, Mathwin, Randall, and Schmidt.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I seek information from the Minister in relation to the general staffing situation. The Minister earlier in this Committee gave some information, and the briefing documents would give a good deal of information, on the manpower position in which this Budget places him. He has made much of the fact that there continues to be a considerable decline in enrolments in our schools and, in effect, a reduction in the manpower position—the staffing establishment—is in line with that reduction.

Committee members can come only to this conclusion, namely, that the Government is happy generally with the quantitative position of staffing in schools, that it believes that class sizes are not too big, that teachers do not require any additional time off for marking and preparation, and that generally the thrust of teachers and parents, particularly those represented through the South Australian State Schools Organisation, for some real improvements in the staffing position as opposed to a static position relative to enrolments is poorly based and that, in fact, this is not a priority that the Government should accept at this stage.

It is not necessary for me to remind the Minister that the Institute of Teachers is particularly disappointed with this Government's performance in relation to the staffing of schools. One need merely read the front page of the last issue of the *Teachers Journal* to see this attitude. I should like more information from the Minister and particularly an indication of his general attitude on this position.

We are losing a total of 306 teaching positions, including 120 primary and 50 secondary positions. I believe that we are losing 90 release-time positions, about 45 seconded and advisory positions from the metropolitan area, and 85 ancillary staff and Public Service positions. I believe that

of those 85 positions 64 are ancillary staff. Furthermore, although it is not detailed in the document but is included in a larger figure, there is about \$305 000 off the provision for hourly-paid instructors.

Again, the Minister may be able to justify some, although I do not believe all, of these things in terms of the decline in enrolments. However, he certainly cannot argue that there has been any significant improvement in these matters at a time when one would have thought that the decline in enrolments would allow the Government to effect some real improvements.

A long time ago, I put a Question on Notice to the Minister in relation to a survey that I had had carried out in schools quite some time before. Having put that Question on Notice, I assume that the docket would still be available and that the Minister would have access to it. I asked the following question:

Has the Minister access to a survey carried out in five or six high schools detailing their staff deployment patterns and, if so, will he now answer section (c) of question No. 69 of the last session on the assumption that the staff deployment pattern revealed therein is typical of high schools generally and, if so, what is the answer?

There was a second part to the question that I will not go into at this stage. In reply, the Minister said the following:

Yes. The survey in fact covered 12 high and area schools.

If that is so, it could not have been the survey that I conducted. The Minister continued as follows:

In the schools surveyed, only two subject classes averaged more than 20 pupils per class.

I can only say that the surveyors must have been extremely lucky or selective in their survey, because my survey did not indicate that. It indicated a broad range of class sizes, from something like six in a matriculation German language class to 42 at the beginning of a certain year in a general year 9 class. That position deteriorated very quickly, and later in the year there were many fewer enrolments in that class.

The Minister said that only two subject classes averaged more than 20 pupils per class. However, that does not seem to be the pattern. I am sure that hidden within the general figure of 12 pupils per teacher we have a very broad range of class sizes, some of which are unsatisfactory, and this Budget does nothing to correct that imbalance.

These are serious matters that concern people in schools, the Institute of Teachers, the South Australian State Schools Organisation and certainly the people who confronted the Minister at the famous (or infamous) meeting that was held at Thebarton early in the new year. I should be interested to hear the Minister's further comments on the matter.

The Hon. H. Allison: I am not sure whether the survey to which the honourable member has referred is the same one that he commissioned. However, if it is not, we are obviously speaking at cross purposes. The information that was relayed to me by departmental officers was, I believe, firmly based. There are several implications behind the honourable member's fairly long string of questions, and perhaps we will deal with them one at a time.

First, the fact that class teacher to pupil ratios have continued to fall very steadily since the late 1950's when I started teaching and, indeed, when I was teaching an average of 45 to 50 students per class in a secondary school, must surely be very reassuring to the community, even though I said earlier that we all acknowledge that we have a critical situation in relation not to the teachers in the profession who continue to be looked after but rather to those teachers who are outside the profession and for

whom jobs are available in only a small number at this stage.

Of course, we are trying to continue to redress the matter in a number of ways, one of which is a continuation of the former Government's approach towards rationalisation of colleges of advanced education teacher training courses. There will be more of them soon. The former Government went some way along the road, and the Government is continuing, with the co-operation of college principals and staff, in that vein.

I do not know what is the best teacher-student ratio in primary and secondary schools or even from subject to subject. I have seen some marvellous teachers getting on very well with large classes, sometimes teaching a large class and sharing the marking load. There are other classes where a one-to-one ratio or a one-to-three or one-to-four ratio is more desirable. I suggest that the honourable member's trumpet solos would best be achieved early by a one-to-one ratio rather than by group tuition.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I argued with the D.F.E. about that.

The Hon. H. Allison: It has made certain suggestions recently. Perhaps I will refer to that matter later. The situation varies from class to class and from age group to age group, and to a large extent the Education Department has for several years allocated staff to schools in the knowledge that the school principal and his senior staff are in the best position to decide how to allocate staff to the best advantage.

Sometimes, it involves large classes, whereas at other times it involves very small classes. However, generally the distribution of teaching staff amongst schools is fair and equitable. So, the decisions are to a large extent now school based, and the department itself tries to ensure that an adequate number of staff will be provided, bearing in mind that some schools have certain criteria that entitle them to additional staff.

For example, in the migrant education area in underprivileged schools, both at primary and secondary level, there are a number of variations. One of the matters which probably will be the subject of another motion is an amount hidden in the Budget. Last year it was hidden to the extent of \$1 500 000. It appeared in Treasury's round sum allowance. That was for schools to use for teachers who were going on long service leave. Teachers who wanted to go were encouraged to do so on the basis that long service leave taken when it accrues is cheaper to acquit at that stage for the Government, the Treasury and the taxpayer. Really, all of this is the taxpayers' money. We are encouraging people to take long service leave when it accrues. This year there is another hidden amount substantially greater (it is \$2 500 000) so that as teachers go away on long service leave they will be replaced.

The teacher-pupil ratio in schools is, as I mentioned earlier this morning, continuing to improve. Schools are not worse off this year than they were last year or the year before. It is unfortunate that we have a combination of circumstances, which I believe was recognised by the member for Baudin when he recently addressed a meeting at Adelaide University. I understand he said that he had come to recognise, with experience in education, that pouring more money in was not necessarily the best solution. I think that was one of his comments.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Was that with Baden Teague?

The Hon. H. Allison: I thought that was a realistic acknowledgement. If I am misquoting the honourable member, I apologise. Nevertheless, many people will recognise that pouring more money into education and employing more teaching staff within South Australia has

to be weighed against the whole of the State's Budget. Electors and taxpayers will recall that when this Government came into office it did so on the promise that a number of taxes would be taken away from the people, that a number of commitments to develop the State would be kept, and that money would be expended in a number of directions. For example, we hope that a substantial amount will have to be expended on infrastructure for future development in the North of the State. Roxby Downs is one example. These projects must be committed within the life of the Government. One-third of the State's Budget has been allocated to education. It is the single largest budgetary allocation for any portfolio. Health comes second with about 16 per cent.

I do not really believe that any of the staff or children in the State are worse off this year than they were before. The member for Baudin espoused causes earlier this year, for example, the availability of funds for those areas in which parents are repeatedly asked to subsidise education; he said that these should be looked at by Governments. We are doing that and trying to maintain and improve the present situation, but within the very real situation that we have and will continue to have for some time, that is, a substantially declining student population within the Government school area.

This is not an apology but a request that the Committee acknowledge the realities that education is part of an overall budgetary structure, that this Government has in fact allocated a greater amount of money toward education than any Government has ever previously allocated in South Australia. There is a 1 per cent increase in real terms; some people have gained while other people have lost in financial terms. I doubt there are many people across the State who can point out major areas in education where there are major losses. Behind all that is an acknowledgement that this Government came into office with a certain number of promises that the rigged Thebarton meeting certainly highlighted. It pointed out that a number of promises had not at that stage been fulfilled.

I have that criticism before me now, and anyone who examines the number of promises which were made as against the time when the criticisms were levelled at that meeting will find that since then a substantial number of promises have now been kept. I will not go through them all now, but perhaps the opportunity will come a little later. The position is steadily improving. The Government is working steadily towards maintaining its promises. We have three years in office, and I do not think that the complaints that the honourable member has addressed to me are really substantially founded, apart from the one which is, I suggest, of his own making—his own Government was told in 1975 by the Opposition, by the member for Mitcham, the present Minister of Industrial Affairs, by me and by others, and those comments are all reported in *Hansard* from 1975 onwards. I could quote those comments to point out that the then Government was embarking on the wrong track in fostering the Monarto project and other major developments including the Meat Corporation, the Frozen Food Factory, and the Land Commission, with literally tens of millions of good State taxpayers' money being sunk into projects which we believed were wrong for the State and which have been proved in hindsight to be wrong. Many of them have been wound down or are being improved. Our warnings were made from 1975 onwards.

Teachers colleges in South Australia continued to be encouraged to expand and train between 4 800 and 5 500 student teachers a year at a time when figures from the Bureau of Census and Statistics and the Education

Department were saying that the student population was in decline. That is why the Keeves Committee of Inquiry is following on the work done a decade ago by the Karmel Committee.

I have inherited a difficult situation. We are trying to do our best and, to some extent, I am hoping the Keeves Committee, plus the proliferation of inquiries at State, departmental and Federal level, will help to get some rationality into the system. I also acknowledge that amongst the first people in the former Government to acknowledge the dilemma that the former Government was in was the former Minister of Education. He was the first to acknowledge that probably Monarto should not proceed, because he removed the bonding system from C.A.E.'s in regard to teacher students in what I assessed in 1978-79 to be an acknowledgement that jobs would not be available. He recognised the future dilemma. I gave him credit for that when his Government colleagues were probably more tardy. Apart from that, the present Government is acknowledging the work that the previous Minister had started upon. We are working in the same direction. Some rationality will emerge as a result of what we are doing by the mid-1980's.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: While my colleagues and I would be only too happy to take the issue with the wide-ranging areas that the Minister has taken up, I do not know that it will help the Committee regarding this line, although I would like to make the point that there was no encouragement from the Government of the day or from me or from 1972 from my predecessor (Mr. Hudson) to C.A.E.'s to increase their enrolments. The Minister knows as well as I do how indirect are the influences that a State Minister can exert on institutions that are federally funded.

I wish to pick up two specific matters raised by the Minister, the second of which may lead us to a further line of discussion in a slightly different area. Regarding the Minister's suggestion that he and I are moving in the same direction in these matters, I point out that every Hopgood and Hudson Budget increased the number of teachers that were employed. The increases were of varying amounts, but they happened. That has not happened in this Budget at all. So much for moving in the same direction.

Those earlier Budgets were, themselves, predicated against a declining enrolment. That is not something that suddenly magically occurred in this particular calendar year. What I am more interested in at this stage is that we should get on to a couple of problems which those who are in the profession currently face and which are being exacerbated by the fact that there is no real improvement in the classroom teaching situation. The Minister said a little while ago that the critical situation was one which was faced by people outside the profession trying to get in, the youngsters leaving the C.A.E.'s who cannot find employment. I would remind the Minister that there is a critical situation which faces people within the profession at present. It is, in part, related to the age structure of the profession, but it is also partly related to the fact that they are now operating within a declining management, manpower position. I refer, of course, to transfers, and I refer, of course, to the possibilities of promotion.

Nobody is suggesting that the Minister should turn cartwheels in relation to either of those two things, invent new positions, or whatever, in order to make promotion a little easier. However, I do make the point that to have maintained the staffing establishment even at its 1978 level would have provided that little bit more elbow-room for teachers and administrators in these two areas. Surely the Minister has to admit that, whatever is happening to the pupil-teacher ratio, the rather alarming decline in the

absolute number of teachers must be exacerbating these sorts of problem for him.

The Hon. H. Allison: One point which has to be singled out, first, is the fact that, while the former Minister may have recognised the student decline, I suggest that the 5 000 student decline in 1980 and the close to 5 000 student decline in 1981 represents a far steeper rate of decline than was evident in the preceding two or three years. This decline will continue at that rate for a year or two. I recognise the fact that the promotion and transferability of teachers is extremely critical and to that extent I encouraged the payment by the Federal Government of \$40 000 to the Education Department and the Institute of Teachers so that they could conduct the JESIFA inquiry into precisely that. That inquiry is currently under way.

The magnitude of the problem is highlighted by the fact that I do not believe that the inquiry will come up with immediately practicable solutions. It will certainly point out some different directions in which the department may move, but the problem is still there and if the member for Baudin would suggest that this is unique to education I simply ask him to have a look at the medical profession where, Australia-wide, they are being asked to reduce the intake of trainee doctors. Currently, Adelaide University and Flinders University are addressing themselves to that problem. This applies also to banks where the majority of senior bankers, that is, managers, attained that position by the time they were in their early 40's and therefore slowed down the whole of the promotion chain behind them.

Automation, too, has bitten into promotional prospects and into the legal profession. And, indeed, this applies to this highly-paid professional group, and the para-professionals and others, so the situation is simply not unique to education. This is a problem that all of us have to address ourselves to and, therefore, to suggest that one section of the community be dealt with substantially differently from other sections would create, once again, its own problems. The Director-General points out that, in recognition of this problem (and I did mention this immediately before lunch fleetingly when the motion before the Committee was being discussed), apart from the \$200 000 for migrant education, there is also in the pipeline from Cabinet, and I hope not subject to another motion, \$400 000 to ease this problem of transition in term 1 next year. I believe I mentioned this matter, but it is certainly relevant to the question in hand. The Government recognises the problems that are present within the education system and elsewhere and it is, wherever possible, making these post-budgetary decisions in order to try to ease that transition. This may not be the last of them.

I have seen some fine decisions made by the former Minister of Education in the same way. There will be other approaches made, I am sure, to try to alleviate a difficult situation, but these are the initial ones. What the ultimate answers will be, I do not know. We recognise the problem and we are trying in a number of ways to ease the situation. We are promising ancillary staff this year. I was approached by the Public Service Association and the Institute of Teachers regarding the rationalisation programme we have. The former Minister had a similar rationalisation programme in effect in 1978-79 which was quite a painful thing. This time, we said we would not retrench anyone.

The Public Service Association and the Institute of Teachers asked that I give them the whole of the year to work people away from schools where their hours were surplus and into other schools where their hours could be reallocated. The matter would then be achieved co-

operatively before December. In fact, that co-operation has been magnificent and there are now very few schools which have not complied. They have been notified recently that we would like them to help, as was promised by their associations or unions, but the whole thing is being done sympathetically. It is being done in the realisation that the Treasurer has a whole range of different issues to attend to and that the Treasury itself is always ready to listen to a well-based, well-reasoned argument. I have found Treasury, as is evidenced by an announcement I have made today, to be essentially humanitarian in its approach, despite having fairly firm principles about how it expects most Government departments to behave.

Dr. BILLARD: I want to pursue a matter raised by the member for Baudin, the fact that we have a surplus of teachers being trained and a declining number of teachers who are resigning for one reason or another. I raised in Parliament earlier this year a matter raised initially by the Institute of Teachers regarding the possible use of five-year maternity/paternity leave for teachers. Can the Minister say whether that is still considered as a possible option, or what has happened about that matter?

The Hon. H. Allison: There are probably a couple of issues involved here. One is the more recent decision taken by Cabinet that maternity/paternity leave should be available to teachers to encourage them to have time off while being eligible to reapply for admission to the Education Department. This leaves some positions available for those wishing to come into education from that pool of unemployed teachers.

The second issue, the question of five-year accouchement leave, has been put to my industrial officers in the Public Service Board. It is under consideration. It certainly has not been shelved: it has been discussed at some depth with departmental officers. I believe I discussed it with Mr. Laubsch some months ago. There are problems that, if you give people five years leave, that anticipates the problem of to what extent they will be assimilated at the end of that time. There is speculation about whether five-year accouchement leave would not be a rolling thing, because you would have people wanting to start while you would have other people coming back.

I am optimistically inclined to the idea. I discussed it with Mrs. Macnaughton, Acting President of the Institute of Teachers, and there was a question of whether we could implement a scheme for women or one for men also. The father may like to take it. I did not explore that matter too deeply: the real question was whether five-year accouchement leave should be available. That may enable young people in the department to take leave, where I understand at present there is resistance to taking one year off.

In casual conversations, young women in schools have said that they would consider a longer term of accouchement leave. This is good for South Australia and Australia, because we are viable if we have an increased birth rate. If we have a declining birth rate, all the problems in the world occur. It is a potential solution. I thank the member for drawing it to my attention and enthusing me about it some months ago.

Dr. BILLARD: Regarding the administration area, I have noted that regionalisation has been with us for a short time. I wonder whether any assessment has been made of the effectiveness of it, whether it brings savings in terms of staff or an improvement in effectiveness of operations.

The Hon. H. Allison: There are probably two points of view. One relates to country areas and the other to metropolitan areas. I do not think there is any question that regionalisation in country areas has considerably helped in a number of ways, such as communication

between head office and Principals and staff, making communication chains easier, helping teachers with problems in remote country areas by having advisory guidance staff available in schools, and probably by having a greater sense of belonging as a result of the close proximity of a regional officer.

In the metropolitan area the same could apply but probably to a lesser extent, in that metropolitan teachers have far greater access to a wide range of facilities and to head office. Probably a result of that assessment has been, in part, that we have maintained the staff. In fact, we may have increased it slightly in country regions, whereas in the metropolitan area there has been a slight decrease. This is not to say we do not appreciate the work done in the metropolitan area by metropolitan regional officers.

Regional officers have played a very important role in the past several years in making recommendations and helping to arrive at decisions on the construction of buildings where repair and maintenance were urgently needed and on where additional staff was needed to help with staff problems.

Dr. BILLARD: A closely related question is that of co-operation between schools within a region, perhaps within part of a region. To what extent does the department encourage that co-operation? I guess that the simplest level at which it could be used would be common facilities but it could also be used by common specialist staff or in other areas that may be useful.

The Hon. H. Allison: I am wondering whether, by "co-operation", the honourable member means the current practice of encouraging clusters of schools to specialise in subjects rather than have them teaching, say, Latin or specialist courses specialising in one category. If there are sufficient teachers in the schools, one may be encouraged to take music and others to take other courses. This helps children to make a choice and wares can be sold by advertising locally what is being done. We encourage this, because it is a form of rationalisation.

Dr. BILLARD: Either you can get the children to go to the school that teaches what they want, or you can share the teachers out amongst the schools in the local area. Whilst high school students are prepared to travel longer distances, it may be beneficial if specialists in certain areas were shared amongst primary schools so that, instead of the child going to the site, the teacher would go to the site.

The Hon. H. Allison: That has been the practice in the Education Department for a considerable time in both primary and secondary schools. A teacher with special expertise would be appointed to one, two or three schools. The whole music system is predicated on that.

Dr. BILLARD: A question related to this and one that the Minister raised in an answer to me is that of zoning. Part of the benefit of zoning is that parents have freedom of choice. Children can attend a specialist school if they so desire. Apart from the specialisation, the assumption is made implicitly that, if one child does not like his local high school and attends another, probably some child in the other area does not like his school and will attend the first, and it tends to even out.

However, in practice, that may not be the case. Generally, parents may be dissatisfied with the sort of general education their children are receiving at a local school. I wonder to what extent assessment has been made of schools that too few want to attend and whether investigations are carried out to determine from the parents why those children do not want to go to those schools. I think this is an important way to find out whether our educational institutions are serving the needs of the community.

The Minister might also like to comment on the overall

figures. There has been a drift away from State schools to private schools. There may also be a message in that. Perhaps people are simply dissatisfied or maybe they have greater or different aspirations than they previously had. There may also be a message in the way in which people choose which school their children attend.

The Hon. H. Allison: In case, in the honourable member's closing remarks, there is any inferred criticism of the standards within State schools, I would like to say that I have, over the past five or six years both in Opposition and as a Minister, visited several hundred schools and have been delighted with the standard of education that I found. It is worthy of comment that of all the young people emerging from colleges and applying for jobs, either within the education system or within the non-Government system, 80 per cent were adjudged by expert teachers on panels to be either highly commended or commended for teaching. That speaks volumes for the standard of young people emerging from colleges and entering our schools. It is unfortunate that we do not have sufficient placements for these fine young people.

Oddly enough, I detected some slight fear in the honourable member's question that there might be substantial movement from a poorer school towards a better school within the Government system. I admit that, when zoning was first mooted three or four years ago, I did wonder to what extent it would reduce populations in some schools. Figures taken out by the Education Department research and planning branch are very reassuring. First preference enrolments in South Australian State schools were approved for 97.3 per cent of all applications. In fact, 366 students could not be allocated to their first preference.

I will not list the schools that were so popular that they had to reject applications, as they seem to change year by year as situations vary. It would be unfair to single out a few schools on this year's list. Of students living in metropolitan school districts, 67.3 per cent selecting a Government school chose their local district school. This is a slight fall from 68.7 per cent in 1979. While some schools made significant gains or losses, there has been a tendency over a period of two or three years for these to even themselves out. People tend to revert to the school in their own district after a short time of experimentation. That is the main thrust of the honourable member's question.

With regard to non-government school populations, I said this morning that in fact the non-Government school statistics between 1975 and 1985 would, as far as we could ascertain, stabilise very close to 40 000 students, within 100 or 200 students. There will be little change up or down within the non-government school system. It is within the State school system that the losses are quite pronounced.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): I would like the co-operation of all members. It is my intention to always give the call to the leading member of the Opposition. I will then try to alternate between the two sides. I will give each member an opportunity of pursuing a question and I ask for their co-operation. If a question is on a different line, I ask members to co-operate and give other members their chance.

Dr. BILLARD: My question is definitely on the same subject. I think that the Minister made an incorrect inference in answering my last question. I was not implying that people may not select a school because it is deemed to be poorer, or that a school is necessarily selected because it is richer. Many people have come to me and are concerned about what they perceive to be the level of discipline in a school. In my view, if parents make a choice between schools, the primary concern is not whether the school has magnificent facilities or whether it

is housed in temporary buildings: their main concern is the level of discipline. That is an important factor. I seek to reassure anybody who would think that I was implying that State schools are poor or somehow inadequate on that score and that therefore there was a drift away from one area or another.

Mr. ABBOTT: I refer to job experience for students. I understand that it is Government policy, in co-operation with employers and trade unions, to explore ways of increasing job experience for students. Will the Minister say what negotiations have been held with the trade union movement and employers and to what extent job experience for students has occurred?

The Hon. H. Allison: That is not an issue that has been brought to my notice for resolution as Minister. However, I am aware that many schools within the State are encouraged to send their youngsters out in various forms of job experience. Some of them require little expenditure of funds and involve classroom teachers and local employers; others require Federal funding by way of link courses and sometimes involve the Further Education Department, industry and commerce.

A figure seems to stick in my mind that there would be some 68 schools alone currently engaged in programmes involving funded link courses and this is where special money is being made available. However, I am quite sure that the majority of secondary schools in South Australia would be engaged in some form of job experience for upper-school students in years 10, 11 and 12. The only problem, speaking from personal experience, is that some years ago unions were particularly protective of their positions. I understand that in more recent years, however, this problem has been alleviated; there is a recognition that these are our children, whichever walk of life they are from, and there is a high degree of co-operation.

I cannot blame unions if they feel somewhat defensive when many of them are experiencing a contraction of job availability. I believe that the problems are being overcome by parents, employers, employees, staff and students getting together at the local level to make local job experience available, even if only in a limited form. The Commonwealth Government has, over the last two years, entered into the field in a more definite manner. Last year \$2 300 000 was made available to South Australia for school-to-work transition. Some of this money went into secondary education and some into further education: it was roughly a two-way split.

Again this year, the same amount (\$2 300 000) is on offer, and the South Australian State Government has accepted that offer. We already have the same committee that was working on last year's allocation looking at next year's allocation. We hope that we can involve youngsters, both at school and those who are unemployed, in school-to-work transition programmes, with job experience in schools as a part of that.

Mr. ABBOTT: The Minister's comment in relation to the co-operation of the trade union movement is quite accurate. I wonder whether the department holds any records of the number of students seeking job experience and, if so, whether it is possible for the Minister to provide those figures.

The Hon. H. Allison: The department does keep accurate statistics and, although they are not readily available (my not having expected this question to be asked), this information could be located within the departmental records and made available to the Committee.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I have had contact with quite a few students in my district who have had experience of the

work experience programme at various high schools. Knowing as I do the unemployment prospects that face a large number of school leavers in my area and other areas, I am concerned to see ways in which the department can assist those students to have a better chance of getting work. My question relates to the type of programme being entered into by schools. I should be particularly interested to know about the committee that will be allocating the \$2 300 000, and about the sort of parameters that it sets.

I have had some experience of work situations that seem to be fruitful and worth while. On the other hand, I have also had experience of jobs that seem to be not so worth while and relevant. For instance, although I do not wish to demean pumpkin pickers, I know that students from one school spent some time picking pumpkins. Can the Minister say what sort of spread of jobs exists, and what assessment is made of the way in which students perform in those jobs? I know that the department has a research and planning section, which is probably examining this aspect.

Will the Minister also say what sort of evaluation that section undertakes of the performance of students and the way in which employers are able to provide these positions? Further, will he say to what extent experience opportunities are offered by State Government departments? I refer also to the conditions that apply to students involved in a work experience programme, and ask about the safety aspect, as well as about essential transport and lunch costs, for example. How are these costs met? Does the \$2 300 000 cover part of that, is it an *ex gratia* payment that is made by employers, or does it come out of the students' pockets? Generally, will the Minister say what parameters have been set down, who is responsible for this, and whether any changes are contemplated?

The Hon. H. Allison: The school-to-work transition programme was federally funded this year to the extent of \$2 300 000, and it will again be federally funded next year. It is also backed up quite substantially by about \$475 000 for the Education Department and by \$550 000 within the Department of Further Education. So, the State Government has spent about \$1 000 000 of its own accord on similar programmes. We are not therefore simply following the Federal Government. We have a substantial programme of our own and, judging by what he has said, the honourable member is obviously aware of that.

Some concern has been expressed by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and me regarding the worthwhile nature of these programmes. I was criticised by a number of people for failing to make a public announcement late last year, when Senator Carrick first offered the money to the State, that we had accepted the money. In fact, the State Government declined to accept the money quickly because it felt that funding of that nature might possibly encourage young people in secondary schools to leave school in order to participate in the school-to-work transition programme but without having a guarantee of a job being available at the end of it.

We therefore felt that to that extent it was possible that the programme, well meant as it obviously was (a recognition by the Federal Government of its own role to try to resolve the unemployment situation), could contribute to the unemployment pool. We therefore requested that the Federal Government consider the scope of the funding and the nature of the programmes, and suggested that a very careful programme should be entered into to decide how effective the whole thing was and that some form of assistance might be given to youngsters. I refer to the Special Youth Employment Training Programme and to those youngsters who would leave school and enter into full-time training, and to those

who might be reluctant to do so because they were receiving unemployment benefits and might not thereafter be eligible for those benefits because they were moving into education.

The South Australian Government tried to negotiate these various conditions with the Federal Government, and I believe that as recently as yesterday the Prime Minister may have indicated that he has taken some notice of our requests, as he has made provision in the platform for funds for precisely those things. We therefore felt that we were justified in expressing concern, as well as saying "Thank you" for the offer of the money.

To that extent, the programmes that were introduced in the first school-to-work transition scheme were experimental. I am not suggesting that we will have the same programmes for the next \$2 300 000. In fact, we have already highlighted a whole range of job opportunities that are currently available for young people who are sufficiently skilled.

It is appropriate for me to refer not only to South Australia but to the rest of Australia and the whole of the Western world, where a redevelopment tends to be under way. There are vast investment programmes where major reconstruction works are under way. Australia has probably three or four major aluminium smelters being constructed, for example. There is an immediate shortage of people in the welding and metal trades generally, as well as in the construction industry and the fabrication industry. There is also a shortage of accountants, and vacancies exist in other skilled fields of endeavour where we could quickly employ young people.

Members of the State sub-committee which is already in existence and which is chaired by Mr. Max Johnson of the Department of Labour and Industry, will be critically re-examining, in collaboration with the Ministers, the past successes of the scheme referred to earlier and determining what direction we should be taking. I think the honourable member is thinking exactly along the same lines, that we should be training people for jobs which are immediately there and which are already obvious rather than speculating about jobs. Within the education system, too, we should recognise that young people are studying academically and that there are a number of things that employers automatically look for.

These different characteristics can be isolated: neatness, tidiness, punctuality, and loyalty are simple things that all employers attach importance to. If these points can be impressed on youngsters as well as other things that they learn at school, then such training will help youngsters to present well and be in the running for jobs. There are many other things, some of which may be considered to be less useful than others, and we are trying to evaluate which are good and which are bad. To some extent it is experimental.

I can remember as far back as 1970 that the high school where I taught was engaged in job opportunity. It has been going on for a considerable time. We are using that pool of expertise and drawing it together largely because of this infusion of funds so that State and Federal moneys are being used to what we hope will be good purposes. I know that the honourable member's questions ranged wider than that and, as I did not write his points down, I hope that this indication of the Government's general approach will help him.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I refer to appointments within Government departments. What opportunities are available? Secondly, the Minister referred to the metal trades and other related industries concerning opportunities. Obviously, the committee is looking at work experience opportunities being offered in such industries. I refer to

safety conditions and the like. Who takes responsibility for those matters and certain related financial matters?

The Hon. H. Allison: I am not over-familiar with the precise details solicited by the honourable member. This matter would probably have been more appropriately canvassed within the lines of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, because he has been closely involved with the wider ramifications. Government departments certainly do provide job opportunities. The Education Department does. To some extent Government departments have been helping out quite a few employers where problems have arisen with regard to apprenticeships. Some departments have helped apprentices to complete their apprenticeships in those departments without necessarily providing a guarantee of a firm job afterwards, but at least helping them to complete their training. I can obtain that information, perhaps not today, but I will make it available to the honourable member in the House, and I will make a specific note of it.

Regarding safety and who guarantees the student employees' safety this, too, has been a problem for some time concerning who was to undertake insurance. I am not sure, but I believe that some arrangement has been arrived at whereby the youngsters are insured either through the Government or, alternatively, they are just not allowed to go out into job training experience until the local school and parent council has entered into some private arrangement. I know that the matter is covered but I am not sure how.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I am not sure whether my query relates to "Personnel Directorate" or the same heading under "Contingencies". I refer to page 222 of the programme papers. In 1979-80 the amount available for release-time scholars was \$2 712 000. The amount proposed for 1980-81 is \$2 244 000. In 1979-80 this allocation provided for a manpower component of 163 persons yet for 1980-81 the same component allows for 71 persons. The amount per head in 1979-80 was \$16 638, yet for 1980-81 it is about \$31 604 a head. Can the Minister explain what are release-time scholars and why has the amount per head increased so considerably?

The Hon. H. Allison: Release-time scholars are teachers who are already employed within the service and who make application to be released either on a full-time or part-time basis in order to complete a course of study which may lead to formal accreditation with a degree or to follow some other specific course of study which will ultimately be of benefit to them and their students. The department decided that it would reduce the number of release-time scholars, partly because of the strong possibility that, by being able to be as selective in employing new young teachers, the specialist skills may be more readily available from within that pool of persons rather than having people already in the service leaving to undertake studies to acquire those same specialist skills.

For example, we could say that 20 people may be allowed to take part-time or full-time study leave in order to obtain music skills. In fact, 22 young people presented themselves for employment last year with specific training in music. All of those people were employed by the department as specialists. The Sturt/Bedford Park complex produced six speech therapists, all of whom were taken on within the department rather than allowing existing teachers to go and train as release-time scholars.

Mr. TRAINER: Has the proportion of half-time scholars been reduced?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): Order! I ask that questions come through the Chair. It will make it easier for *Hansard*.

The Hon. H. Allison: The honourable member was

drawing my attention to the second part of the question, which concerns a discrepancy and which is apparently a small reduction in the funds between 1979-80 of \$2 700 000 and 1980-81 of \$2 244 000. This apparently small reduction in funds for release-time scholars, when compared with the substantial reduction in numbers (there is a reduction of about 90) is due to the fact that the reductions will occur from the beginning of 1981. While we are dealing with a full financial year in the Budget, we are in fact reducing the release-time scholars only from the beginning of 1981. We are considering a large number but for only half a year.

Mr. RANDALL: This morning the Minister spoke of an amount of \$5 800 000 shown on page 45. The note at the bottom of that page states that this amount was previously provided under the Round Sum Allowance and goes on to explain how that amount was previously provided for. As this amount is now shown separately, how was that \$5 800 000 calculated and what increment does it cover?

The Hon. H. Allison: I referred to this \$5 800 000 this morning (I probably said "\$6 000 000") when I said that this was simply to cover incremental creep. Every Government department experiences the same problem whereby, irrespective of whether you employ more staff or not and whether there are any salary award increases during the year, provision has to be made for a greater salary payment because the majority of Government full-time employees are on a structured salary scale; they have annual salary increases. The \$5 800 000 is a close approximation of the amount required in the Education Department to cover that annual increase in salaries throughout the whole range of teachers.

Previously this amount has always been within the Treasury lines along with what is referred to as the "Round Sum Allowance". This year, I believe that the Round Sum Allowance will be \$70 000 000 or \$80 000 000, a substantial amount. This is simply a machinery movement to place within the Education Department a substantial amount which really belongs there. It presents a true picture. It does not present the whole picture, because there is still the \$20 000 000 which I referred to earlier in the day and which is to cover contingencies such as increases in salary awards.

Mr. RANDALL: Are the increments we are talking about to cover non-teaching staff, or are they applicable only to teaching staff?

The Hon. H. Allison: This is specifically for teaching staff.

Mr. RANDALL: Under the Personnel Directorate heading the line "Primary" an amount of \$120 047 000 appears. How is that figure derived?

The Hon. H. Allison: It is an approximation based upon an assessed number of teachers who will be present within the department during the course of a financial year. I think I stressed when opposing the motion introduced before the Committee earlier today that the entire Budget represents an aim. Therefore, the \$120 047 000 is money set aside for a certain number of full-time equivalents whereas, in fact, the actual employees will comprise quite a considerable number of part-timers who, together, will make up a number of full-time equivalents. It is a reasonably accurate calculation but it is an estimate only of money required for a specific number of staff members.

Mr. RANDALL: I am trying to tie this up with the Estimates of Resource Allocation, which also speak of the Round Sum Allowance at page 208 and mention a figure of \$79 000 000 for wage increases with an increase of \$8 000 000 for price increases as the need arises. How is that round sum calculated, and how does the Education Department claim amounts from the Round Sum

Allowance?

The Hon. H. Allison: I think the honourable member would find as he went through the Estimates and as he went through the Estimates of Resource Allocation that there are, in fact, quite a number of discrepancies between the two documents. Here again, this highlights what we were saying earlier, that this Budget document we would have normally debated and the Estimates of Resource Allocation are really provisional estimates. This is subject to more specific allocation of funds within the departments, but, once again, represents an estimate and there may have been a change between the one document and the other. This highlights the problem we had in connection with the motion before the Chair earlier today, the fact that every line can be construed to be inaccurate in some way.

Mr. RANDALL: Obviously there is concern about discrepancies. How does Treasury verify the claims put forward for this Round Sum Allowance?

The Hon. H. Allison: I would assume Treasury receives what we might well refer to as "bids" from Government departments. Every department has a look at its intended programme. The Minister and Director-General would confer over quite a long period and determine the direction policies have to take and the direction the department has to take simply because of the nature of the work it undertakes. Then, a bid is placed before Treasury. The whole range of bids is then considered by the Premier, who is the Treasurer, in conjunction with his officials. Then there is a whole range of negotiations set in train between the Minister's departmental heads and the Treasury officials. It is a whole process of negotiating.

As we have said before, at any one stage in any financial year a Government department might be overstaffed or understaffed, but Treasury is really saying that this is the amount of money that can be made available for a department and therefore within that range if that department overstaffs at the beginning of the year Treasury will expect it to understaff to compensate later. In fact, there is constant movement. The honourable member can imagine the problems we would have in the Education Department if the Treasurer said, "You will employ 15 000 teachers every day of the year." In fact, we find that the programme fluctuates because we have part-timers and full-timers and there is constant movement. It is a living thing, so to arrive at a single figure is what the Treasury aims to do. It is up to the department to make that work. You then have to contend with costs, pricing, indexation, varying rates of inflation for petrol and oil, salaries, and foodstuffs in catering in further education, for example. They are inflatable at different rates, and this is an overall calculation. The honourable member can imagine the magnitude of the job.

Mr. TRAINER: I refer to the Government's policy on access of non-government schools to Government school facilities and the nature of the facilities available. In co-operation with personnel from the Public Buildings Department to carry out the work, provision is made for special Education Department grants to cover certain aspects of construction and maintenance of schools. I raise this matter because I tried previously to get the information on these special projects. Perhaps if I had got the Minister in a corridor I could have got the information, because he is congenial and co-operative when you have him backed to a wall. I wrote to the Minister in April regarding the availability of the scheme for a non-government school in my area, namely, St. Anthony's, but have not had a reply. I would like information on the nature of these special projects and whether they are accessible for non-government schools, particularly as,

when one school applied in response to an advertisement in the *Central Southern Regional Newsletter*, it was informed that this facility was not open to it.

The Hon. H. Allison: I do not recall having seen the member's letter. I apologise if it has come in and I have not answered it. The question would not have been too difficult to answer. I have a detailed list that I keep fairly current on services that we make available to non-government schools. They are numerous, and this is in addition to the non-government schools per capita grant made available because of the formula. That is currently \$12 000 000.

I think it fair and accurate to say that the South Australian Education Department has for a long time enjoyed probably the best relationship with the non-government school sector of any Education Department in Australia. For non-government schools to be refused point blank access to a service without good cause would be the exception rather than the norm. Non-government schools participate in a number of ways and we have advisory staff available for a wide range of matters such as botanical gardens, museums, art gallery, and many other matters.

If the member gives me the letter to which he has referred, I will make sure that he gets a prompt reply. A few examples of ways in which non-government schools benefit is shown by our cash and credit grants. For the secondary book and materials allowance, at \$42 per capita, an amount of \$738 888 was provided in 1979-80. For primary text books, at \$11.30 per capita, \$250 000 was provided. We paid \$76 145 as payment to swimming instructors. Non-government schools have access to specialised services and facilities in the Education Department. They also have access to the facilities of the Angle Park Computing Centre, which is an important centre.

The Publications Branch of the department supplies sample free copies of all relevant publications. The school libraries branch collection is available for borrowing by non-government schools. Educational Technology Centre video and audio tape services and curriculum material produced by the centre are available, also. The member would be aware of that, having taken part in the system. Curriculum materials produced by the Wattle Park Teachers Centre are made available. We provide the same help for non-government schoolteachers as we provide for those in Government schools.

Resource centres at the Transition Education Unit and the Multi-cultural Education Centre are available to be used by teachers from both sectors. Technical studies workshops are being used by non-government schools at a number of centres. Art centres are used by teachers from non-government schools, as are the facilities at Goodwood Orphanage. That orphanage is available to non-government schools for conferences, and those schools can use its facilities on the same basis as Government schools. The list goes on. What I have said is not exhaustive but I think it is sufficient to let the member know that we provide material service to the non-government school sector, apart from the substantial per capita grants that we give.

Dr. BILLARD: The Curriculum Development Programme is referred to on page 216 of the programme papers. What strikes me immediately is that about three times the number of people are devoted to human studies as are devoted to any other area. Last year 53 people were devoted to that, and this year there will be 48. I ask what the term "human studies" covers and why such a large team is devoted to curriculum development. It may also be useful to know the philosophy of curriculum development. Would these people be expected to concentrate on one

area for a time and then to shift on?

The Hon. H. Allison: The majority of staff in any of the various forms of curriculum development are teachers who are engaged on that part time. Most of their time would be spent in the classrooms and they would be seconded to curriculum work and writing during a financial year. I think the member is echoing the concern that I expressed when I was in Opposition and referred to the English and Mathematics programme that the Director-General has informed me over the past 12 months is under way. I have seen the programme in schools and have had good comment from teachers who have been waiting for it.

I think that the member's comments about the apparent top-heaviness of expenditure in the humanities area reflects the present stress being given during the current financial year. Within the human studies section, we have a range of curricula that have been developed and these will give way in the 1981-82 financial year to a range that I think probably would be more like science and agriculture. They will have a different orientation. There is a different curriculum. That was a reassurance to me, too.

Human studies include ancient studies, early childhood education, adaptive education, health education, religious education, commerce, curriculum and learning unit, history, physical education, economics, and a range of other subjects that are essential on the humanitarian side, as opposed to science and technology.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: With regard to the matter discussed this morning, involving the savings from contract cleaning—

Mr. SCHMIDT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wish to continue pursuing the line under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: I have called the member for Salisbury, who earlier indicated he wished to speak. The member for Mawson will have an opportunity shortly to pursue the other matter.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: If I could be given some undertaking that the question would not be a long one, I would be happy to wait. I intend to move a motion which needs to be debated. I can defer that to allow the other matter to be discussed first, with your acceptance, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mawson.

Mr. SCHMIDT: In connection with page 216 of the programme papers, I refer to some of the curriculum studies that have been going on in certain suburban areas where persons employed in teaching are also used in trying to develop these curricula, a matter that seems to go on *ad infinitum*. The figure allocated for curriculum development is \$2 243 000, involving 108 persons. Does this include teachers at schools and, if so, how many? Are the staff of curriculum committees included and, if so, how many persons are involved? Also, what is the total cost of operating curriculum committees?

The Hon. H. Allison: The detailed analysis of actual committee costing would be difficult to obtain at short notice but I will make sure that the honourable member gets some detailed information. The 108 staff would, I believe, include quite a number of regional staff who would be otherwise occupied and who are chairmen of committees. There is a substantial range of committees, and I acknowledge that. It is a question that I have been discussing with the Director-General. Decisions have not yet been arrived at, and curriculum development is essentially within the statutory field of the Director-General of Education. The matter is being discussed, and the Director-General is keeping me informed, having undertaken to obtain more information for me.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Minister make that information available to the Committee in a brief form suitable to be inserted in *Hansard*?

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: We had some debate this morning on savings in contract cleaning, and we were led to believe that those savings would amount to \$484 000 and in net terms \$269 000. I was a little concerned about the conditions that we asked successful tenderers to sign, and the Minister undertook to provide the information to the Committee. He did that quickly and I thank him for that and ask the member for Glenelg to note my thanks. In regard to this matter, however, I move:

That, with reference to anticipated savings by the use of contract cleaning, Estimates Committee B expresses concern over the wording of the "General Conditions" co-signed by the Education Department and successful tenderers for such contracts with particular reference to clause 11 inasmuch as that clause makes no reference to the relevant laws, regulations and awards applying to wages and conditions under which such labour should operate.

Under the heading "Supply of Labour", clause 11 provides:

The contractor shall supply all labour necessary to carry out the work specified in this agreement.

That is an important matter for us to discuss at this time, because the Government has indicated that savings are to be achieved by this new mode of contracting out the cleaning and has quoted a substantial figure. I do not believe that anybody on either side would scorn efforts to cut Government expenditure where such cuts are made reasonably and fairly. I think, therefore, that the task is on us to make sure that those cuts are achieved reasonably and fairly and that the cuts are not made at the expense of employees in these situations but, indeed, are made through the ordinary competitiveness of such business and the tendering system.

Therefore, I was concerned that clause 11, which indeed is the principal one concerning labour in such contracts, makes no reference at all to the laws, regulations and awards that apply to employees of such companies taking out these tenders. The only other clause in the entire set of conditions that refers to employees at all is clause 13 which makes reference to the supplying of names and addresses of employees so that the department is aware of who has access to departmental property, and that matter is not relevant to this motion. The relevance of laws, awards and regulations to the Education Department should, I believe, already be accepted without having to say it. Surely any Government department must be desirous of enforcing the laws and regulations of the State, making sure that where laws exist they are adhered to by anyone within the employ of companies contracting to the department.

Indeed, in the tender form that contractors have to complete when they submit to the department, it is implicitly recognised. In part 5 of that tender agreement the applicant is requested to fill out the category of labour proposed to be employed. It then states underneath that the positions must be in accordance with the category stated in the *South Australian Employees Federation Incorporated Wage Bulletin* as issued from time to time. That is clearly a recognition that there are laws, regulations and awards applying to this industry in particular, and that the department is not prepared to accept those contractors who are not prepared to delineate their employees accordingly.

So, the department has to that extent accepted that responsibility, and I congratulate it on doing so. When it comes to the selection of contractors, the awarding of a

tender and the signing of an agreement between the Education Department and a contractor, we do not again see that mentioned. This is the document or agreement that is signed between the department and the contractor and, therefore, surely it is the place where such a reference should be made.

There is much evidence around the place that employees of cleaning contract companies are being employed not in accord with laws, regulations and awards. I have had contact with cleaners who have given me information with regard to contractors that contract for Government departments and who have indicated just how badly off they are and, indeed, just how much shortfall there is in their conditions and pay compared to what is provided for in the award.

I think, therefore, that we are in danger of seeing the savings we are achieving, which are indicated in the Budget and which the Minister made much of this morning, in fact, being achieved at the expense and the exploitation of the people employed by the contracting companies. I believe that none of us would want to see that, and I am sure that none of us want to see Government savings made through the exploitation of a few employees. I am sure that the Education Department would be quite happy to amend its contract and quite happy to listen to the expression of concern from this Committee in that regard. I hope that all members of this Committee will see the natural justice of that situation.

The Hon. H. Allison: I am not prepared to support this motion, for a number of reasons. In the first place I think it is far too short notice for us to arrive at a conclusion just on having looked at the contract and then having received the motion and being asked to deliberate upon it.

I am not prepared to support the motion without extensive investigation. However, I point out that it is 10 months since representatives of the unions in question, namely, the Australian Government Workers Union and the Miscellaneous Workers Union, saw me. It appeared to me that the major point then was that one union might gain while another lost. However, by and large, the unions would still cover the entire field of school contract cleaning.

The honourable member may know one or two cleaners who have expressed opposition to what is happening, but, if he is really interested in the abuse of labour (and I am speaking personally), I would refer him to contract cleaners who not infrequently engage in family operations. In fact, mothers, fathers and children who go to work in schools on the petty contract cleaning system could be singled out equally for abuse of labour and of the regulations. The fact is that we have two forms of contract, and the major contractor is far more likely to be compelled to comply with the regulations than is the petty contractor who does it as a family concern. To suggest that that does not happen is to ignore reality. That is not to say that it is bad for families to work together and to enter into contracts. That has been encouraged by the Education Department and Governments for far longer than I have been in office.

However, the system appears to be functioning reasonably well, in that I have not received any complaint, either major or minor, from either one of the two unions involved, other than to stress that I should not be forcing people out of petty contract cleaning into major contract cleaning. We have agreed to protect the people in the industry and, therefore, this motion is ill conceived. Indeed, it will present problems of which I have not been made aware, and I am not prepared to enter into union disputes at this stage.

Mr. RANDALL: On a point of order, I am concerned

that twice today Opposition members have launched into a motion off the cuff without telling Liberal members.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr. RANDALL: I ask whether we can adjourn for a certain time so that honourable members can do some sort of preparation. Obviously, the member opposite knew about the motion and has had someone prepare his material. Now, Liberal members have no time in which to prepare an argument, but must vote on the matter immediately.

The CHAIRMAN: The rules of procedure merely state that the Committee has the right to introduce a motion, resolution, or expression of opinion. Nothing is outlined regarding notice that must be given. That matter rests with the Committee. The Chair has accepted the motion, and it is now being debated.

Mr. MATHWIN: I oppose the motion. It is obvious that the member for Salisbury is cutting his teeth here, because he has had a couple of lively goes today.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Why don't you address yourself to the argument instead of patronising people?

Mr. MATHWIN: I cannot help it if I am upsetting the honourable member.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It does upset members when you are patronising.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am trying to be kind to the member for Salisbury, who is a new member and who has moved two motions today. It was only as a result of the Minister's good nature that these documents were given to the honourable member in good faith for perusal, yet the member for Salisbury has obviously sent the documents to the back-room boys, who have come up with what they believe is something special for him.

The member for Baudin can huff and puff as much as he likes. However, the honourable member's colleague is holding up the whole procedure of this Committee, whose members have a right to get information from the Minister. However, already today we have had two solid interruptions caused by the ridiculous motions that have been moved. The honourable member has said that his objection is to clause 11, which provides:

The contractor shall supply all labour necessary to carry out the work specified in this agreement.

The honourable member says that much more information should be furnished for the employees who work in this area. However, the honourable member did not give any examples of where this type of information is given in other contracts. If the honourable member knows anything about subcontracting, for instance, in the building trade (of which I have had experience), he would know that nothing definite is stated about the union to which a person should belong. True, certain pressures were applied in this regard by the former Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo), who said that a person had to belong to a trade union in order to be employed. We all know about that sort of nonsense.

Mr. ABBOTT: You're a union basher.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, I am not. I merely hate people being forced into joining a union or starving if they do not do so, the situation that obtained when the honourable member was a Minister. If one wanted a job then on any Government work, one had to belong to a trade union or starve.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: On a point of order, surely the honourable member is getting well wide of the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order. However, I advise the honourable member for Glenelg that he is on the borderline. According to the Committee's rules of procedure, the discussion must centre around the motion. Although I accept that the member for Glenelg is

associating his remarks with unions, I ask him to keep his remarks in line with the motion.

Mr. MATHWIN: The motion provides, in part:

This clause makes no reference to the relevant laws, regulations, and awards applying to wages and conditions under which such labour should operate.

I bow to your ruling, Sir, and will not mention the word "union" again in this debate. However, I ask the member for Salisbury why, if he is so keen about this matter, he did not think about the schedule of duties carried out on daily operations, where a wet mop must be used with disinfectant in ablution blocks. The honourable member might as well pick out a few more items if he is going to refer to them at random. I remind the honourable member that the following appears in the tender form, which is the final form that goes to the department:

I undertake to complete the work in all respects according to and under and subject to the general conditions. I declare that I will not, without the prior approval of the State Director-General of Education, sublet any part of the work to any person or persons except those hereinafter mentioned.

This gives control completely, so far as the department is concerned. It can get the information, and it can police it if it so desires. The department has the power to do that, anyway. I presume the honourable member has moved his motion in the hope of winning some publicity. Even if that is the reason, it is unfortunate that we are expected to debate the motion within minutes of its being moved.

Mr. TRAINER: Why can't you?

Mr. MATHWIN: I can.

Mr. TRAINER: Then do not complain about it.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all right for my hairy member for Ascot Park to say that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must refer to the member for Ascot Park as the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: The point is that we have little time for proper debate, yet the motion must be debated within a few minutes and then be dispensed with. It is a pity that the honourable member has seen fit to waste the time of this Committee when he can raise such matters before the House and obtain satisfaction there. By moving his motion now he is hindering the Committee's progress and hindering the opportunity of members on both sides of the Committee from asking questions of the Minister, which is what this Committee is all about. I oppose the motion for those reasons.

Mr. RANDALL: On a point of order, I seek clarification regarding the undertaking given by members on both sides of the Committee this morning that we would move at 5 o'clock from the discussion on this matter to the Department of Further Education provision. Is that undertaking binding or are we still permitted to ask questions after 5 o'clock on this matter?

The CHAIRMAN: The time table agreed to this morning was flexible. Questions can be asked on this matter after 5 o'clock. The time table is in the hands of the Committee and, if there are still questions to be asked by the Committee, that right will continue to exist.

Mr. TRAINER: I support the motion of the member for Salisbury. I am astounded by the attitude of members opposite to the Opposition's attempts to use this Committee in the way it is intended, as a forum in which parts of the State Budget can be analysed and where members can make constructive criticism. On both occasions when the member for Salisbury has attempted to carry out his duties he has been abused by members opposite, particularly by the member for Glenelg. Earlier today when the member for Salisbury drew attention to the possibility that something imprecise in the Budget

could be made more precise, he was abused and again just now. When he drew attention to what on the surface seems to be an omission on the part of the Government, the Minister declined to support the details embodied in the motion. Yet the motion does not demand anything of the Government. There are no exhortations in it; it does not demand that the Government redraft these guidelines or general conditions; it does not insist on any wording being inserted; all it does is draw attention to what the member for Salisbury, myself and my colleagues on this side see as an apparent omission. The motion expresses concern. If the motion is carried, all it implies is that we hope that the Minister will find some sort of suitable wording to cover the possible exploitation mentioned by the member for Salisbury and at the same time make allowance for the type of family operation that the Minister alluded to as perhaps being of significance.

I am astounded by the reactions of members opposite, and I am disappointed with the Minister because of his reaction to the member for Salisbury's motion. Above all, I am disappointed with the member for Glenelg and the personal abuse that he hurled at the member for Salisbury and myself. But, if he wants to start that sort of abuse, I will take him on any time.

Mr. RANDALL: Members on this side still have some valid questions to ask. We are concerned to ensure that the Committee works as best it can in order that we can gain information. I only wish members opposite would do the same thing. Much time has been wasted twice today with what I believe are not so much pointless motions but motions that are of no assistance to this Committee in obtaining information. I indicated earlier to the member for Salisbury that the best place to make such a point is in the House. The honourable member is entitled to express such opinions in the House, yet he comments in this Committee about a piece of paper that was gained through the Minister's courtesy—it was not included in the Budget Estimates. The honourable member has picked a small point from that document in order to express an opinion.

What does the honourable member believe? Does he believe that every employer has to bow to the Government? Does he believe that the Government, because of its relationship with a private contractor, has an overriding power over employees? If that is what he seeks, I disagree. Does the member for Salisbury believe that the Education Department is the employer of those private contractors and their employees? Does he believe that the employees are employed by the Government, or are they employed by employers who have built up companies and submitted tenders to the Government? Does he want the Government to state in the guidelines in respect of daily operations that employees must belong to a union, as my colleague pointed out? The former Government made strong recommendations to all private contractors that their employees should belong to appropriate unions. I am not union bashing; I believe unions have a role to play, and they have a role in this issue. It is up to the union and the employers, who are not the Government, to work out the problem. In no way has the Government any control.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am amazed at the attitude of members opposite. It is a pity that the member for Glenelg is not here, because he would not want a vote being pushed through without all members of the Committee being present. What is this Committee about? The Sessional Orders that were distributed to us provide that members can move motions and give expressions of opinion.

This afternoon, in response to that sort of directive by the Sessional Orders, I was told that the Opposition had no right. We are told now that we have no right to express

concern. If the member read the motion he would see that it states, "That Estimates Committee B expresses concern", as in the Sessional Orders. I suggest he read them. All the way along it seems to be an attempt to straight jacket the Opposition in giving these opinions, because there seems to be a deadly fear lurking in the hearts of Government members opposite that any suggestion of any alteration from the strict Government line can have no other consequence but the total defeat and resignation of the Government. That is just not what these Estimates Committees are about. These Estimates Committees are supposed to be for the rigorous analysis of the aims of the Government. Therefore, any right thinking, reasonable person must accept the fact that opinions can be given and that there can be variance of opinion, and that there can be alterations of views. If not, then the very concept of the Estimates Committees must be a bogus one if it cannot operate in that particular framework.

It has been mentioned that people have not had sufficient time to investigate and analyse the motion before us. What do they want? Do they want to suggest that the Sessional Orders should provide that one can move a motion only if a week's notice has been given, which would be a totally ludicrous thing to operate within. We are supposed to be operating within it on a to and fro and a parry and thrust basis such as used in the House. We have been told that the debate arose because it is able to alternate across the floor in a cut and thrust situation without predetermining things. Yet when we attempt to offer that type of situation, Government members acknowledge that they are not able to respond to that particular kind of debate, that they are not able to come up spontaneously with responses. We know that to be so. We had this morning a situation where a point of order was raised against me. We had been sitting in some sort of monastic silence for about five minutes while some matter was being sorted out at the table and then, after this monastic silence, suddenly one of the Government members raised a point of order—the most unspontaneous thing I have ever seen. Government members are indicating this again here now, because they are not able to think on their feet, to think quickly and to analyse things in the heat of this debate, which should be what is going on.

There has been mention of petty contracts and the family situation, and I agree that there has been much wrong with that. I think that there should also be moves to correct those situations, so I do not believe that there is a point of disagreement between the Minister and myself in that regard. I would also say that the Minister indicated that he is not prepared to accept this motion without an extensive investigation. Well, Sir, this motion, in fact, gives the Minister the opportunity to conduct such an extensive investigation. It is, as we have said, an expression of concern by this Committee to the House. It is not a directive. It cannot be a directive, but it is an expression of concern which the Minister, in full right, can say, "I take the expression of concern from the Estimates Committee and I, therefore, will conduct an investigation into this matter and see what report can be brought down."

I think that, Sir, would be a right ordering of things. Again, I have been accused of misinterpreting or abusing the good faith of the Minister. The Minister had offered to give us this information, and he had done so, and I thanked him, and the member for Glenelg heard me thank him. Further, I asked when these documents would be tabled before us because I said there might be further action. I advised the Committee of that. I did not delude

the Committee into thinking that that information was going to be placed on my table and shoved to the back of my table. It would have been ridiculous to ask for the information and then totally ignore it. I, in fact, lived up to the Minister's good faith in this matter and returned the good faith with good faith in an effort to bring to this Committee the question of subcontracting, an area we must look at. I draw members' attention to the fact that I thought we were on the Minister of Education's line. We had lots of discussion about all sorts of other lines from members opposite, but I would prefer to keep the matter in the education area. We had the question of awards and we had mention of compulsory unionism. Awards are determined by an arm of the Judiciary, and I hope that no member is trying to challenge the Judiciary in its setting of legal and binding award agreements. The "schedule of duties to be carried out" is one reference that is a lengthy and interesting document, but it is not a document that is obliged to be signed. Therefore, it is not relevant to the debate at this point. We are talking about a contract that is obliged to be signed. I close on the fact that I hope that members will join with me in expressing concern so that the Minister can undertake investigations that he said would be needed in this particular instance.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes—(4) Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Hoppgood, and Trainer.

Noes—(4) Messrs. Billard, Mathwin, Randall, and Schmidt.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote to the Noes. Therefore, the question passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Dr. BILLARD: Page 62 of the Auditor-General's Report discusses grants made for school purposes. For example, an amount in 1977-78 of \$632 000 was allocated for primary schools. In 1978-79, in the last Budget introduced by the former Government, the allocation was almost halved to \$340 000. In 1979-80, which was the first Budget introduced by this Government, the amount doubled to \$583 000. I would like to know whether those figures can be calculated for this year from the various figures given in the Estimates?

The Hon. H. Allison: I referred to this matter some time ago when I quoted the grants for school purposes, which have been restored to within almost 100 per cent of the 1977-78 figure, so the \$1 171 000 appearing for 1977-78 was reduced to \$623 000, but was largely reinstated to \$1 048 000 in 1979-80. That is close to the \$1 171 000 and in real terms it will be about \$1 090 000, which is approximately 95 per cent of the 1977-78 figure. It is not meeting inflation, but it has gone a long way to restoring the grants which were decimated by the previous Administration.

Mr. ABBOTT: I refer to the mention in the yellow book of school ancillary staff, which shows that there was a reduction in manpower of 60. Can the Minister explain the department's policy on replacement of ancillary staff who are absent on sick leave? This is a matter of real concern to me. I have received a number of complaints from schools in my area, and school councils also are concerned about it. In a reply I received from the Minister in May this year, he stated:

The Education Department Revenue Budget 1979-80, as approved by the Treasury Department, does not provide funds for the replacement of school assistants absent on paid leave, including long service leave. Only in exceptional circumstances, where Principals are able to demonstrate that extreme hardship would be experienced if a replacement is not provided, can consideration be given to replacements

during periods of paid leave . . . However, the Education Department is currently preparing estimates for the 1980-81 Budget and a submission is being prepared to the Under Treasurer seeking funds for the replacement of ancillary staff absent on long service leave.

I ask the Minister what measures are being introduced to overcome the problem and what consideration he has given to the matter.

The Hon. H. Allison: We have given this matter substantial consideration but I think the Committee will appreciate that there are two quite different issues under consideration. One is the fact that we have a professional staff, a teaching staff, with a surplus of trained teachers who were specifically trained for that job over the past few years. We made available \$1 000 000 last year, and we are providing \$2 500 000 this year, for the replacement of teachers who were being encouraged to take long service leave.

The ancillary staff generally are not professionally trained. If the Minister's shorthand typist should fall sick, it takes some effort to replace that person. If a typist or clerk in another section falls sick, there is no guarantee that a replacement would occur there. It happens from the top to the bottom levels. There is no provision for replacement of staff in the Public Service.

Generally, the work is performed by someone else or it waits until the person comes back. In the case of ancillary staff, we have considered the circumstance where students may be experiencing disadvantage through the absence of an ancillary staff member, but we have not changed the *status quo*. If there is a specific case of hardship the officers will consider that and make a recommendation. Generally, there is no replacement for ancillary staff. This has been an issue with the Institute of Teachers and it is one with which we are sympathetic but, once again, the economic matter has taken precedence and we have not the funds.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I refer to the provision for terminal leave payments under "Management and School Services Directorate". Last year an amount of \$2 440 000 was voted and \$2 962 244 was spent. This year \$2 962 000 has been provided. I cannot find in the other sections a terminal leave item for teaching staff. This provision seems to be for only other staff and management. Has any provision been made for teaching staff and, if so, has sufficient been provided in terms of the amendment to the Act allowing retirement at 55?

The Hon. H. Allison: I understand that that item is all-embracing and includes all staff.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I refer to the policy of retirement at 55. Does this provision allow for that fact or do you think that the figure will remain static compared to last year, considering the amount spent then?

The Hon. H. Allison: Government policy is to encourage people to take terminal leave and to retire as early as possible. This is general policy, not only policy in the Education Department. It is speculative whether the incentives offered will attract people to retire. If more people accept the recent legislation that gives both Education Department and Further Education Department officers the right to retire at 55, with compulsion to retire at 65, there will be an increase. It is a letter of intent and the money will be provided if people take up the present conditions.

Mr. TRAINER: In relation to the money under the free book scheme, how is it intended to allocate that within a school? What will it cover? A school in my area sought clarification (I do not know whether it has obtained it) on whether the students on the free book allowance should receive free entitlement to all school excursions, including

excursions of the nature of a ski trip to Victoria, which would cost about \$150 and which would cut a fair slice out of the allocation. They are also concerned about the waiving of the \$10 book deposit.

The Hon. H. Allison: It was the intention of the \$30 book allowance to cover those essential books and materials, and there is no entitlement to cover school excursions. I know that a number of schools do use funds to help free scholars. This has been a matter of concern, particularly where there is a high proportion of free book scholars. When we consider that the Australian average for broken homes is about 30 per cent, we realise that 30 per cent or 50 per cent of children come from those homes.

That allowance was not intended to cover excursions and I believe that an instruction to Principals has pointed that out. I have noticed some embarrassment to parents whose children cannot go on all excursions. I do not know how you would get around that. Some parents seek more excursions, whereas some believe that too many excursions are being encouraged. We must achieve a balance. The problem is not easy to solve.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw to the attention of the Committee the time. It is not rigid that we should finish at any time but times were suggested this morning. There are other members who are not members of the Committee who desire to ask questions and they will get the opportunity when Committee members are finished.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Is special provision made for the free book scheme to schools? The number of children in schools requiring that scheme is escalating. There are schools in my area which, due to the unemployment pattern in the area, had to suddenly allocate more money for that purpose.

The Hon. H. Allison: Where there is a sudden change of that nature, there is a review mechanism within the Education Department to consider cases of hardship. That will be dealt with as a matter of course.

Mr. Peterson: During the debate I did hear some discussion of page 216 of the programme papers. The points I raise are in relation to transition studies. On page 215 there is a definition on the development of curriculum. On page 216 there is no allowance for either 1979-80 or 1980-81. At page 236 an allocation has been listed for 1979-80 for \$983 000, and the amount proposed for 1980-81 is \$1 993 000. What I cannot understand is that, if there has been a commitment to this type of education, why has there not been any curriculum work done on it? There is no entry at all on one page for curriculum development, yet there has obviously been the expense of some 41 people involved as listed on the other page. How can we have a programme without a curriculum?

The Hon. H. Allison: We are progressing into Further Education on page 236 but I will answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Further Education will be attended to later.

The Hon. H. Allison: I will answer the question as there is a direct link. The money, which has been provided by the Federal Government recently for school-to-work transition, that is, over the last two years, is for full-year programmes backed by Education Department finance. The Education Department money, which I quoted earlier as being \$475 000, covers a whole range of programmes for which there has been no specific curriculum development. I do not know whether the honourable member was here, but I explained to the member for Salisbury that the matter was still in a state of flux, that it was experimental and, from detailed evaluation and analysis, we were hoping to work out a more structured programme for the future. That is in spite of the fact that school-to-work programmes and job experience pro-

grammes have been under way for 10 years. One may be critical of the fact that no curriculum has been developed in that period but it has been experimental and has been on an *ad hoc* basis, often on a local level.

The other money referred to is to be discussed later, as it comes under Further Education. There is a substantial allocation in development there, and curriculum development is a substantial part of education work. From memory, I believe that the amount of money referred to covers a substantial allocation for either the E.P.U.Y. scheme (which is the Education Programme for Unemployed Youth) or the SYETP scheme (which is the Special Youth Employment Training Programme). The only federally funded scheme last year was in Mount Gambier when \$20 000 was made available for a special link course programme, which was part of the scheme.

Mr. Peterson: Was that the only one?

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes, there was a special curriculum allocation. It has been used to evaluate the implications of the whole scheme.

Mr. Peterson: As we are on transition education, I assume that it is in order to continue.

The CHAIRMAN: As long as it does not go into the realms of Further Education, as it is a separate line. Honourable members should keep their questioning on education at primary and secondary levels.

Mr. Peterson: Are we allowed to make comment or must we ask questions?

The CHAIRMAN: Honourable members can comment and then form their comments into a question. The honourable member may proceed on that basis.

Mr. Peterson: I want to object to this system of discussing the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN: That is out of order.

The Hon. H. Allison: The honourable member has already expressed his feelings to me. He feels excluded.

Mr. Lewis: Under the heading, "Contingencies—Curriculum Directorate", we see the line "Transport of Students" with the amount of \$475 000. Over the page in the Estimates of Expenditure we see again under the heading "Management and Schools Services Directorate" the line "Transport of Students". Could the Minister explain the reason for the apparent double entry and the purpose for which the funds are being appropriated in each case?

The Hon. H. Allison: There are in fact three entries under the heading "Transport of Students". One is under "Management and School Services Directorate", which is staff payments to the value of \$1 547 000. "Transport of Students" under the heading "Curriculum Directorate" is for the amount of \$475 000 and represents payments made for the transport of handicapped students in taxis and small buses. The major entry is to the value of \$5 289 000 and represents expenditure on the services generally for the 416 buses currently in service and for the 250 private bus proprietors who provide services to the department. That figure may be slightly high, but it is well over 200.

Mr. Lewis: May I then know how many people are engaged in determining bus routes over which those buses travel, compared with the State Transport Authority, and what the likely distance is that is travelled daily by departmental buses?

The Hon. H. Allison: The Committee may be surprised to learn that the whole routing for the hundreds of thousands of miles that are covered by the 416 departmental buses involved and by the 200-odd private contractors is planned by two staff members in the Education Department. It is quite a fine enterprise, which is very economically run. In fact, it is quite remarkable.

Mr. Lewis: How are the buses that belong to the

Education Department maintained?

The Hon. H. Allison: The buses are called in for general examination twice a year in the Government Garage, where I believe there are three full-time examiners. A number of minor repairs would be carried out at the local level.

Mr. Lewis: So, parents need have no fear whatsoever about the safety of the buses on which their children travel to and from school each day?

The Hon. H. Allison: Two aspects are involved, one of which is the Education Department's own bus service. These buses are replaced on an eight-yearly or nine-yearly basis, as they become subject to substantial wear and tear. Also, fairly stringent requirements are placed on private contractors. In fact, we recently terminated the contract of one private contractor because of the state of his buses. The department is also aware that children at times do irrational and irresponsible things that are a part of the exuberance of youth. Certainly, the buses must be safe, because they are indispensable to the system.

Mr. Lewis: Will the Minister also say whether any of the buses which belong to the department or which are provided by private contractors are used by schools in the metropolitan area on a regular basis and, if so, in what circumstances that occurs?

The Hon. H. Allison: There are some schools within the metropolitan area whose students must comply with the formula that is laid down. Ten students must reside within 4.8 kilometres or more of a school, and half of them must reside more than 11 kilometres from a school in order to qualify for a service. Obviously, some metropolitan students do not comply in this respect. We have a number of discussions over school bus services in the honourable member's electorate.

Mr. Lewis: I take it that the Minister can assure the public that finance is not provided through the Education Department lines to supply and service buses to carry metropolitan schoolchildren to and from schools when there is not a genuine need for it, which is somewhat comparable to the circumstances that prevail in country areas where the majority of services exist?

The Hon. H. Allison: There are occasions when schools are adjudged by the Education Department's transport officers as no longer qualifying for a service, and I assure the honourable member that, in such cases, before the service is withdrawn, there is generally considerable negotiation. The provision of metropolitan bus services in no way impinges on the provision of country bus services.

Mr. Lewis: Exactly the same yardsticks apply in all circumstances, regardless of whether or not the children carried on departmental buses happen to attend school in the metropolitan area. Is that the case?

The Hon. H. Allison: Yes, the same criteria would apply. There are a number of borderline situations. For instance, in the past 12 months I would have been called in to adjudicate on 20 or 30 different cases, some of which were won by the complainants and others of which were lost by them. This is generally done after careful consideration, using the same criteria.

Mr. Lewis: I have pursued this line of questioning so that I can get on the record what I have tried to assure the parents in my electorate who have had foisted on them a mistaken belief that there are privileged children who do not need school bus services but who have been getting them at the expense of people in, say, my electorate, and who feel that, because they live in isolated circumstances, they have been disadvantaged accordingly. I am grateful to the Minister for the information which he has provided and which corroborates what I have told these people.

I now refer to the school-to-work transition programme.

I do not know to which line the Committee wishes to relate this inquiry. However, I should like to know whether, in the whole of that programme, any emphasis is placed on the alternative to the conventional view that, once one leaves school, one is either able to get a job or one becomes unemployed. That is the conventional view.

The alternative view on which I seek information is that, once one has finished one's formal education or has had sufficient education according to one's judgment or that of one's parents, one considers self-employment as a real option in life. Is that point of view then put through that programme?

The Hon. H. Allison: This matter might better have been addressed to the Minister of Industrial Affairs because, although both he and I are directly involved with the school-to-work transition programme, there is not a specific provision within the \$2 300 000 allocation for such a scheme.

However, there is another independently financed scheme (and I am not now speaking in relation to my own portfolio) which offers, I think, either \$2 000 or \$4 000 as a form of capital grant and which is used as assistance for someone wishing to set up on his own.

Recently, one of my electors decided that he would like to set up a fruit and vegetable round, collecting vegetables from Berri and Renmark in the Riverland, and bringing it back in a car and trailer, which he purchased cheaply, to my electorate, where he could sell it as a door-to-door salesman. That man was encouraged in this, as he was not competing with an existing service.

Any number of schemes exist; it depends on a person's initiative. The schemes are put to the Government and are assessed by a responsible panel. Decisions are then made, and private enterprise is encouraged generally with a guarantee that funds paid to the person will be supervised by a responsible local person such as, say, a bank manager. Roughly, those are the terms of that exercise.

Mr. Lewis: I thank the Minister for that information. Further, I would like to know whether in this curriculum the notion of becoming self-employed is not excluded from all the ideas and options open to children and young adults who are leaving their formal education, or whether such a curriculum can only contain the notion that, once one leaves school, one seeks employment with an employer only. Is there such an inclusion? Is there a stimulus from that expenditure to consider the option of becoming self-employed?

The Hon. H. Allison: As I told the member for Salisbury, the new allocation of funds for the 1981 school year and the Further Education Department school year still has not been determined. The committee has only within the last 48 hours been advised through Cabinet that it should now be examining ways of spending such a \$2 300 000. I would be pleased if the member for Mallee contacted the Minister of Industrial Affairs or myself and set out what he has in mind so that the committee can assess the merits of that suggestion along with other ideas. We will be moving along substantially different lines in the current year from those followed last year. We are trying to make the scheme a positive one, as all Governments would do.

The CHAIRMAN: I have allowed much latitude in this debate. As the Minister has agreed that both he and the Minister of Industrial Affairs will give information, I ask the honourable member to terminate his questioning on that matter.

Mr. Lewis: I have no further questions on that matter. I note that the total expenditure (page 46) in 1979-80 was \$348 000 000, and I believe that there were 192 300 students in schools. From my mathematics, I believe about

\$1 814 was spent on each student. In this Budget about \$372 000 000 is proposed to be spent, and there will be only about 186 000 new students, which means that we will be spending about \$1 930-\$1 940 on each student. That represents a substantial increase, especially when a specific deflator of 9.8 per cent is used to allow for the effects of inflation in the education sector. That is not an unreasonable percentage and results in the same amount of money being spent as was spent for each student last year. Does the Minister agree that there has been no cut in education on an individual student basis, and that assertions to the contrary, both presently and during the early part of this calendar year by a number of people and bodies, have been mistaken and misleading?

The Hon. H. Allison: The honourable member's deductions are all too correct. His mathematical formula might be more appropriately based had he said how the voted line compared with the proposed line and then alternatively taken last year's actual payments against next year's actual payment, which will be about \$390 000 000. Irrespective of the mathematics, a completely different formula is used by the State and Federal Governments when working out the average cost per student, and the accuracy of the member's comments are certainly evidenced by the fact that the non-government school sector in South Australia has been in receipt of what might be termed in the financial world windfall profits as a result of the greatly increased cost per student.

In fact, the formula has been used for many years and has led to the non-government school sector receiving a considerable increase in funds. Only \$600 000 of that increase is the result of the present Government's policy to increase from 20 per cent to 21 per cent this year the percentage proportion to be paid. The honourable member is correct and the formula, irrespective of how it is worked out, shows similar results.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Minister believe that the most important yardstick by which we judge whether or not funds are being spent appropriately should be the benefit to the children receiving the education?

The Hon. H. Allison: This question has been raised in a number of different ways by the member for Baudin and his colleagues. The matter is complex. The simple question about the amount of money per student is irrelevant to the quality of education and cannot be answered in just a few minutes in this Committee. There are many other factors impinging, including the quality of instruction and the amount of money currently that parents have been asked to contribute towards education. These hidden factors are not brought into calculation at all: they vary from school to school and neighbourhood to neighbourhood. There are many factors which make it a complex issue, depending on where a school is located. Generally, the problem is there; costs are escalating, and the cost of staffing schools is escalating at a more rapid rate. For example, the Catholic school sector which used to have a substantial number of its staff in religious orders now has 15 per cent of its staff in religious orders and the remaining 85 per cent come from members of the lay community. This is just one aspect of a very complex problem confronting all schools.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further questions, I declare the examination of this vote now completed.

Education Department, School Buses, \$1 400 000

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no questions on this vote, I declare the examination of the vote to be completed.

South Australian Teacher Housing Authority, Advances for Capital Purposes, \$980 000

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott
Mr. Lynn Arnold
Dr. B. Billard
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood
Mr. I. P. Lewis
Mr. R. J. Randall
Mr. I. Schmidt
Mr. J. P. Trainer

Witness:

The Hon. H. Allison, Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. J. Steinle, Director-General of Education.
Mr. P. Tillett, Deputy Director-General of Education (Resources).
Mr. C. Laubsch, Director of Personnel Education.
Mr. N. Robinson, Finance Officer.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There appears nowhere in these Budget papers any mention of any cash to go to the Teacher Housing Authority from any Government source. In other words, its income for this year will be, first, the Loan income which is set out before us, and, secondly, the rents which it receives from its tenant teachers. I was well aware of the fact that some time ago the Teacher Housing Authority was in some financial difficulty and would almost certainly need some cash subvention from Government sources in order to put it on a firmer basis. I hope I am not in breach of privilege when I suggest that the recently received report of the Public Accounts Committee has not really extended that debate far because, although it has made some useful suggestions as to the future administration of the authority. I believe that there are some fundamental mistakes in the report and some fundamental misunderstandings of the nature of the exercise which was begun by the Hon. Hugh Hudson and myself when we set up the committee in question which eventually reported to this Minister. It made clear that there were financial problems that would have to be solved one way or another. There are only two solutions that seem to be possible: one is to increase rents; the other, to provide a cash subvention from Government sources. Now, of course, the Minister has recently announced that the anticipated rental increase which would have applied from September, or it might have been August, will not take place.

I am given to understand that, probably irrespective of the merits of that problem, that represents an additional \$400 000 in revenue forgone by the Teacher Housing Authority so, whatever the benefits to teachers might be, we are in a situation where an authority which was in a shaky financial position a while ago is going to be \$400 000 shakier, and the effect of the expansionary programme that we have here will be to add further to those quivers.

I fully expected that somewhere we would be asked to vote an additional cash amount to the Teacher Housing Authority to offset, at least, the effect of this deferred increase in rents and, possibly, to do something further about the situation in which the authority was before this deferral occurred. Can the Minister either point to something I have missed in the Budget papers or,

alternatively, indicate generally how the Government intends to take account of this issue?

The Hon. H. Allison: The honourable member's concern is certainly reflected in the attention that the Government has given to this matter over the past many months. In fact, there is yet another committee which is investigating not only the teacher housing problem but the whole question of Government accommodation. This committee was established by the Minister of Industrial Affairs many months ago. The Public Accounts Committee decided on its own initiative to report early. The other committee is not due to report back to Cabinet for several weeks. The matter has been given quite a deal of attention by both the former Government and the present Government.

The honourable member's assessment of the continuing and deepening deficit being experienced by the Teacher Housing Authority is correct. The recent rental absorption will add another \$400 000 to its indebtedness and is a result of the several inquiries which were being conducted. No firm decision has been arrived at by the Government on how best to fund the Teacher Housing Authority or, indeed, any other authority. We have not, in fact, considered the Public Accounts Committee report and will not be doing so until we have the final analysis of all Government accommodation to hand. The problem is serious in so far as there are two widely different estimates, for example, of the amount needed by the Teacher Housing Authority simply to bring its houses into an adequate state of repair.

The T.H.A., from memory, got 1 066 houses from the South Australian Housing Trust when it became a separate authority, and I believe it now has in the region of 1 984 houses currently under its control. The Public Accounts Committee, at its widest estimate, said about \$16 000 000 would be needed for repair and maintenance, whereas the conservative estimate is around \$4 000 000. There are others who would say that even \$4 000 000 is an exaggerated figure. Even so, the authority is going to be hard pressed to meet the substantial expenditure required on maintenance alone, so it is obvious that considerable action will have to be taken in order to help the authority out of its present dilemma. No firm decision has been arrived at; hence, there is no figure other than the Loan money allocated to the Teacher Housing Authority, but the authority has, month by month been keeping me apprised of this and a number of other matters, and I have been taking that information to my colleagues.

Mr. LEWIS: Whilst it does not appear in any of these lines, because the Teacher Housing Authority is one of these dreadful QUANGOES that does not have to have public funds appropriated for it other than those shown here, I am concerned to know, as regards each teacher who lives in a house controlled by the authority, what the deficit is in respect of revenues collected and the expenditure incurred that has to be met by the taxpayer.

The Hon. H. Allison: I cannot give the deficit in cash terms, but several rent increases have recently been absorbed. They vary from the March South Australian Housing Trust rent increases through to the March 1981 rent increases, over more than a 12-month span. It also includes T.H.A. houses which are rented from private landlords, caravan rentals and the general rent review due in September. A number of things have been absorbed by the T.H.A. The overall effect of that is that rentals charged to teacher tenants are being subsidised: first, the South Australian Housing Trust rent is 20 per cent below market rental value, and the Government is further subsidising that by a 20 per cent teacher housing rental. The result of the recent absorption of rent increases takes

the best teacher housing rental, I believe, to approximately 56 per cent of the current market value. In the case of accommodation rented from private lessees, it will simply keep it at the current market value less 20 per cent. This varies, depending on the nature of the accommodation.

Mr. LEWIS: Subsidies provided in this way effectively increase the disposable income of teachers who enjoy the benefit of accommodation provided by the authority.

The Hon. H. Allison: Teachers were advised that there would be a rent increase in March, which did not come off. They were advised there would be another one in September, and that was absorbed. The money that they anticipated having to pay is not payable, because the T.H.A. has absorbed that increase, so teaching staff have experienced, in real terms, a decrease in rentals. South Australian Housing Trust rents have gone up and the T.H.A. has absorbed that, so teachers benefit through the T.H.A. absorbing the rent to the extent of \$400 000.

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

Dr. BILLARD: The Auditor-General's Report, at pages 340 and 341, indicates that during 1979 there was a deficit of \$1 160 000 and in 1980 a deficit of \$299 000. The difference was due to a reduction of \$772 000 in expenditure on repairs and maintenance. That is the dominant difference. I was wondering why there was this large shift in repairs and maintenance.

The Hon. H. Allison: I think that mainly the difference was that the Teacher Housing Authority has been erring on the side of caution. Before the dinner adjournment I said that the Estimates varied from \$16 000 000 downwards as to the gross amount that would be required to settle all Teacher Housing Authority residences into a really excellent state of repair. A conservative estimate was \$4 000 000 but, because of the annually increasing deficit, the authority has been cautious about the amount of expenditure.

The Public Accounts Committee Report, as I recall, stated that there were unusual problems associated with the authority's affairs, in that one tap washer repair cost \$67, simply because no-one in the house had a new washer or the inclination to replace the washer.

Mr. TRAINER: Or the ability.

The Hon. H. Allison: I do not think anyone would be so inadequate as to be unable to repair a washer.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If the person was not mechanically minded, he might flood the laundry.

The Hon. H. Allison: Perhaps I am a Jack of all trades type. There is no doubt that the authority, because of the remoteness of a large number of its residences, experiences a lot of problems. To construct a house in a remote outback region, the authority has had to pay as much as \$90 000 for a unit. There is a possibility that it might have been able to construct remote houses for one-third to half of that amount if it had gone through a different construction agency. The Ernabella people have their own housing construction division, which uses independent assistance, through church groups, and they would have constructed teacher housing for about \$35 000.

Had different means of construction been employed, perhaps the authority would not be in the difficulties that it is in. Another thing that came to my notice was that the Housing Trust had been selling houses to the authority at the gross Housing Trust sale price, whereas, if the authority had acquired, it might have purchased at \$10 000 less. I have brought these matters to the attention of the General Manager of the trust, who is Chairman of the

authority, and these are just a few of the issues involved.

Mr. RANDALL: Bearing in mind your statement that we should stand and speak loudly so that others can hear, Mr. Chairman, I think it is also necessary that conversation does not take place while the Minister is answering, because *Hansard* has problems when members are speaking.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will decide that. Yesterday and today, a few members have been moving about and talking to other members, and it has been accepted. If it got to the stage where it was interfering with the Committee's procedure, the Chair would take action.

Mr. LEWIS: I take it that the Government sees itself as being responsible to ensure that there is no continuation of the gross waste through mismanagement, or whatever, of taxpayers' money in the authority and that the Government will ensure that management techniques are reviewed to ensure that decisions are made relevant to the circumstances.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is assuming there was any in the past.

Mr. LEWIS: There was \$67 for a tap washer.

The Hon. H. Allison: I think the member may be confused by a false assumption that I initially agreed that there was gross waste and mismanagement. I am not in a position to pre-judge the situation. The Public Accounts Committee has made a report. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has a separate committee examining the whole of Government accommodation and, when I have read the two reports in conjunction and made an assessment, I could make a pronouncement. I am waiting for the second report before I come to conclusions, and Cabinet will have to decide ultimately the best method of solving the authority's problems.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions? I declare the Committee's examination of the vote completed.

Further Education, \$48 303 000

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott
Mr. Lynn Arnold
Dr. Billard
The Hon. D. J. Hopgood
Mr. I. P. Lewis
Mr. R. J. Randall
Mr. I. Schmidt
Mr. J. P. Trainer

Witness:

The Hon. H. Allison, Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. L. A. Kloeden, Director-General of Further Education.

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

Mr. P. Fleming, Director, College Operations, Department of Further Education.

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I seek your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to ask a double bungler. I wish to link two things to the same matter; that is, the capacity of the Minister to sustain certain programmes with the money voted. I am requesting information as to that capacity, in terms of page 74, dealing with salaries and related payments, regarding stream 6 courses and the rural studies course.

So far as stream 6 courses are concerned, I do not think there is any doubt that this area is likely to suffer as a result of this Budget. Other areas will see modest growth. It seems to me that there will be fears of the Government's increasing charges for the stream 6 programme. I have been told that a bulletin has gone to the Colleges of Further Education indicating that the affiliated groups scheme, under which certain groups can affiliate *en bloc*, is now at an end.

No further groups can affiliate. Those who are already affiliated can go on to the end of the year, and in 1981 there will be no affiliated group scheme. This is of considerable concern to the people in the various artistic, cultural and craft areas who have taken advantage of this affiliated scheme in the past. So, in relation to the stream 6 course my concern is that, because of the inadequacy of the funding before us, the Minister is going to have to substantially increase fees in the stream 6 area. If he is able to give me some assurance in that area, I will be more than pleased.

Secondly, in relation to the affiliated group scheme, if my information is not correct and the bulletin has not gone out and if the Minister is prepared to countermand what is in the bulletin or rethink the policy direction behind the bulletin, I will be more than happy. So, I seek information from him on those two points.

The second matter that I raise is the rural studies course which has been lauded in many areas because of the way in which it is designed to fit in with the needs of young men and women in rural areas. It is not overly academic: it is very practical in its application. The problem seems to be that it falls between all of the stools in that none of the students involved in the course—mature age or late adolescent though they may be—are able to obtain sustenance from any area to enable them to continue the course over and above what they provide for themselves or what their parents provide for them.

They are not eligible for a TEAS payment or the sort of sustenance that is available to apprentices; they are not eligible for anything. Unless the means are there from their own personal or family resources, they have a great deal of difficulty in entering the course. My concern in this case is not so much the adequacy or otherwise of the subvention which we are voting to the Minister on this line but rather whether he will be able to spend all his money, because he may not get the number of starters in the scheme that he anticipates, because of this problem. I apologise for ranging over a couple of areas and I thank the Committee for its indulgence.

The Hon. H. Allison: That was more than a double bungler—it was a Chinese fire cracker. There were several minor explosions. Music would be one of the major group participation schemes which D.F.E. currently handles, and the honourable member is correct to some extent. Because of inflation, we are constantly looking at revision of charges for courses, and music is one of them. We are not orphans in that respect, because the Elder Conservatorium is currently reviewing its charges, and there is a link which the honourable member was associated with between the Elder Conservatorium and the Department of Further Education. The department's charges are still, and will continue to be, behind those of

the Elder Conservatorium students. I am currently considering placing before Cabinet a suggestion that the charges be increased slightly by 10 or 11 per cent for single students—students taught in isolation or on a one-to-one basis.

We find that the charge over \$50 will be below the Elder Conservatorium charges. We are considering making it slightly more expensive to study in groups of two or three in order to discourage that size group in favour of a group of four, which we believe to be an economic unit. That has not yet been passed by Cabinet, as I am still considering it, but it will go before my colleagues in the near future. I do not anticipate any problem in getting it through.

The stream 6 activities we believe to be essentially enrichment courses, as opposed to the 1 to 5 stream vocational and semi-vocational courses, and should be encouraged to keep pace with inflation. If we were to offset the cost of all part-time instructors as opposed to permanent full-time instructors, for the part-time instructors engaged in D.F.E. stream 6 we need to charge \$1.13 per hour. The charges were increased last year from 82c to \$1 per hour, which again was slightly below the break-even point. What we have already decided, and what was approved by Cabinet last week, was that the charges be standardised at \$1.10 per hour and that those people already eligible for remission of fees (pensioners, unemployed and in receipt of unemployment benefits or other similar pensions such as sickness or invalid) would still be eligible to study free of charge with the proviso that a certain number of such participants would be admitted to the college courses.

We have allocated a final fixed sum of money through the Department of Further Education lines. I believe that that is \$250 000 for provision of free courses for pensioners. We believe that that is a fair sum, based upon the expenditure of the last couple of years. So, stream 6 is expecting to be reasonably self-supporting. We will still encourage those who are unable to pay for themselves to attend the stream 6 courses.

Regarding the comments which the honourable member made about the affiliated groups, there has not been any substantial change for the last 10 years or more. Groups have been able to affiliate with the Department of Further Education, for example, theatre groups where members would pay an affiliation fee to the department of \$10 to cover cleaning costs. In some cases in the past I know that \$10 per term has been paid to the department for affiliation and for use of a college room or theatre. So, there is no real threat to the affiliated groups, which, for the last 10 years or more, have been accustomed to using college facilities on that basis.

Regarding the question which the honourable member posed regarding the stream 4 courses, the rural studies and allied programmes, I am not sure whether he was referring to stream 6 or 4 when he said that we would not have people to fill the courses and would have surplus funds. So far, we have had plenty of inquiries even with the increase to \$1.10, and we think it is realistic. We are not expecting a major drop-off in participation in the Department of Further Education.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It was initiated on the West Coast.

The Hon. H. Allison: That was the on-farm training scheme. We had five or six of those going. There were four to start with, and two more applied to join in.

These schemes have, if anything, been oversubscribed, and we have rural and allied programmes to offer in all streams, from stream 1 to stream 6. There are 14 certificates in the stream 2 category, including the rural studies certificate, with 63 different subjects already

offered in 20 different colleges, and that is very well subscribed. From personal observations, welding is one of the most popular of all the courses. It seems to be used for work and for enrichment purposes.

However, to obtain a rural studies certificate, one needs to undertake nine subjects, and the certificate in farm practice is currently offered in four colleges. The certificate in horticultural practice is offered in the Riverland, and the certificate in wool is offered by the Marleston College of Further Education. We also have equine studies, and four more certificates for the dairying process industry. So far, areas not included are horticulture, health, animal care, veterinary science (although I am certain that it is included to a lesser degree in some of the rural study certificates) and meat inspection.

So, we have the whole area fairly well covered, and there is no shortage of applicants at present. This is in spite of the fact that there is no Commonwealth allowance. This is an area where, as an individual in Opposition and in Government, I have been asking the Federal Government to assist, but so far without any luck. However, that does not mean that we will not carry on appealing. We feel that we have had some success with the recent Federal Government offer of funds for the unemployed. Perhaps this will be something on which we may break through. Meanwhile, there are plenty of applicants, and college courses are quite viable.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am somewhat reassured by what the Minister has said. I am sorry that I misled the Committee by my choice of term. If, as the Minister says, he has made representations to the Commonwealth authority about this matter, it is clear that the Minister is aware that there is some sort of a problem for at least some young people in country areas.

My follow-up question is in relation to the affiliated groups. My informant is fairly reliable, and I do not wish to suggest that there was anything improper in the way in which the information was given to me. It related to an affiliated group in my district, and the information that the Minister has given me does not quite accord with my understanding of what happens. The Minister more or less implied that the \$10 a term applied only because of the use of D.F.E. premises. I understand that the sum is \$13, and that it applies whether or not D.F.E. premises are being used.

The specific group of which I have knowledge is the Noarlunga City Choir, which for a couple of years has been affiliated to the D.F.E. I am not aware that it hires D.F.E. premises. In fact, I think that it has its rehearsals in the local Anglican Church. However, the D.F.E. provides an instructor, and it is understood that the \$13 per person per term goes towards the costs of what is, I assume, the hourly-paid instructor.

I want to tie this matter down. Is the Minister saying that that specific scheme in which this group participates will be continued without any change, except possibly for a revision of the fees in line with the general revision of fees of which he is speaking?

The Hon. H. Allison: The instance that the honourable member specifically quotes has been considered by the department, and in the case where a choral choir has previously contributed a nominal fee, and at the same time, received an instructor, it has been a conscious decision of the department to charge fees equal to those paid by other students. So, there is an exception in that case. It is therefore probable that the honourable member's choir, instead of using no facilities, would be using a D.F.E. instructor. It has been decided to change that situation.

When I was quoting the example of a group paying \$10, I was thinking of theatre groups, which are completely self-supporting and which do not rely on departmental instruction but simply use the premises. In this case, where a departmental instructor is provided, the department has decided that a fee should be paid.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Is the scheme of affiliation taken advantage of by the group to which I have referred now at an end?

The Hon. H. Allison: No.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Is there some modification and, if there is, what is it?

The Hon. H. Allison: Where there is no teaching, and where, for example, a theatre group may wish to use departmental premises, it would be an affiliated group and would pay the \$10 a term, use the facilities and have no formal instruction. However, where an affiliated group is partly dependent on the department for instruction, irrespective of whether or not the premises were used, that group would be treated more as a sub-branch of, for instance, the music group in the case of the choir. They go for one term.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: So, that continues?

The Hon. H. Allison: The recommendation is that that scheme will continue.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I should like to read a memorandum that was circulated to stream 6 students at Elizabeth Community College. It was written by the head of the School of General Studies who wrote to the students in the following terms:

There has been a change of policy regarding the administration of stream 6 courses. For this college a return to revenue of 83 per cent is required. That is on the average for all classes fees must cover 83 per cent of the instructor's salary.

Interpreted into a class situation, this means that on the average a course needs 10 or 11 fee paying students. Many classes are likely to be delayed at the beginning of term III as classes are organised to meet this requirement.

On the face of it, that memorandum seems to suggest that, over the whole spectrum of classes run by the college, the total sum should come from 83 per cent of the fees paid. However, the last paragraph tends to indicate that there is a greater demand for each individual class to meet the 83 per cent subject requirement.

I am concerned about the implication that this will have. Given the number of students that attend not only the Salisbury branch but also the Elizabeth branch of the Elizabeth Community College who are unemployed or in receipt of a pension of one form or another, can this be legitimately taken as discrimination against them in relation to their right of access to those classes?

The Hon. H. Allison: That would be incorrect. The conditions to which the member refers will apply from the beginning of next year to stream 6, the enrichment courses, and it will certainly not be necessary for each individual class to reach the 83 per cent target. If some classes are well over, that will be used to compensate for classes where there are more pensioner applicants, for example, who are unable to pay fees. The fears expressed by the person who wrote to the member are incorrect. I understand that the Elizabeth Community College is one of several colleges that have already decided to start implementing next year's policy now, and it is erring on the side of caution. It realises that it must earn a certain amount of revenue through the stream 6 course and is probably over-counselling people. I suggest that that is the case, rather than the college simply having every course self-sufficient; it is really its insurance.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The last paragraph of the letter states:

Many classes are likely to be delayed at the beginning of term 3 as classes are organised to meet this requirement. Is the Minister saying that that is part of the insurance commitment that the college is taking, and that the instruction is not coming from the department itself?

The Hon. H. Allison: I imagine that that is the case. The emphasis is that we have already allocated \$250 000 towards the non-fee-paying section of the community, that individual colleges are being advised already by the Director-General and his officers of the amount that will be allocated to colleges and that, in some cases where there are probably more non-fee-paying applicants traditionally than in other areas, we would have a weighting. That is the case. If there is a higher proportion of non-fee-paying applicants in that college, the chances are that they would have a better allowance than others where traditionally fees are paid from the community. These matters are already being advised to heads of colleges. I suspect that they would be building in insurance by trying to make certain that they can get courses off the ground next year without having to delay them.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the Minister for his answer. It is coming through that many of the decisions are left with the colleges themselves. I appreciate that the Elizabeth Community College receives a weighting in regard to disadvantaged students. I acknowledge and applaud that. Is the Minister able to say clearly that the memorandum that has been issued to students could not be taken in any way as interfering with the rights of disadvantaged students, and if it were to be applied in that way the department would direct the college otherwise?

The Hon. H. Allison: I would like to be more specific and say that Elizabeth is one of a few colleges that have already expressed special problems. It has already advised the department of special problems, and a committee has been set up specifically to investigate that matter on my behalf.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I understand that the child-care course at Elizabeth Community College has been eliminated altogether. Concern has been expressed to me about this for a couple of reasons, the first being because of the large number of young children within the northern suburbs who need child care. I have had from many other sources requests for assistance in the provision of child-care facilities, and these constituents are lamenting the fact that the training of child-care personnel has now apparently been eliminated from the college. Partly reinforced by the need within the northern districts, a large number of students who were previously trained in child-care courses at the college have already obtained employment. The course did have a high employability record. In fact, it was meeting a community need, and the question has been asked why it has been cut.

The Hon. H. Allison: There have been traditionally four colleges involved in the child-care field. Kensington and O'Halloran Hill have provided part-time courses, and Elizabeth and Croydon have provided full-time courses. The decision was probably made 18 months to two years ago. There was a recommendation that I took up with the former Minister regarding the possible relocation of courses, and this has again been reconsidered by the department. While Elizabeth will continue to have core subjects in that area, the full-time course will be at Croydon.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I wonder why that decision was made, in the light of the growing population in the northern districts. This has been referred to by the member for Newland, whose district would cover students

attending Elizabeth Community College. I am aware of the large growth rate in the number of young children in certain areas of my district. It seems that this is the area from where demand stems. Why was Croydon chosen as the college to provide full-time training in this area? Are core subject students at Elizabeth now required to alternate their studies between two colleges to obtain full training, or are they required to transfer to Croydon and thus undergo a greater travel component than would ordinarily have been the case?

The Hon. H. Allison: I am told by the Director-General that 98 per cent of students at Elizabeth do obtain employment but that, on investigation, the majority of them are obtaining employment not in the full-time professional field but with qualifications less than those which will be available at Croydon. This is a departmental assessment. Whether they obtain employment because they are over-qualified is another matter that I am not sure has been investigated. Perhaps that is something that we should look into, and I will undertake to do that on behalf of the honourable member now that he has brought it to my attention.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the Minister for his commitment to bring me that information. I would appreciate any report and statistical data being provided to me, because concern is great in my district and neighbouring districts. Similar concern has probably been expressed to the member for Newland. A full explanation and the statistics used in arriving at the decision would be much appreciated.

The Hon. H. Allison: I will undertake to obtain a full report for the honourable member, the member for Newland and the Committee.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I should like to follow up that question in relation to O'Halloran Hill. About 12-18 months ago a number of child-care workers in the southern area approached the O'Halloran Hill college to seek a course in that college because of the difficulty of travelling from the southern areas into the inner-metropolitan area. A course was provided by the college, but after a year the course was again discontinued. These students now have to travel either to Kensington or Croydon or some other college. More importantly, over the period the course operated several child-care workers approached me—I am involved with a child-care centre—and referred to dramatic course changes over the years. Students seem to get used to one direction and then are confused by the direction a new course takes.

As I have said, that has resulted in confusion, particularly if the students do the course on a part-time basis, because it takes about nine years to complete.

The Hon. H. Allison: I have been aware of that for some time. I do not think the facts can change over the years. The number of applicants for the full-time course has been insufficient to warrant duplication of courses over the metropolitan area. It is not within the reach of the department economically to mount full-time multiple courses.

Mr. ABBOTT: In view of the fuss over the Government's decision not to appoint a Women's Adviser to the Department of Further Education, is the Minister prepared to reconsider this matter?

The Hon. H. Allison: The matter of the appointment of the two ladies, formerly under the title Women's Adviser and now Equal Opportunities Adviser, has gone to advertisement in the *Government Gazette*, the Institute of Teachers journal and, I believe, State and possibly interstate newspapers. The advertisement will appear soon.

I approved the advertising recently and the title is Equal

Opportunities Adviser. The job specifications indicate that there is a very strong bias towards women's affairs, just as was the position with the Women's Adviser.

As I said on Parliament House steps when I missed a division, we anticipate that the Government departments operating in the minority fields will be strongly supportive of these new appointees. I was accused of having interfered Ministerially, particularly in the Department of Further Education appointment, but both the Education Department appointment and the Department of Further Education appointment were at Ministerial discretion, and I was entitled to take more than passing interest in the matter. As a result of requests from a number of organisations, I undertook to make these two positions Public Service appointments. That means they are outside Ministerial interference.

More significantly, should the worst fears of those who have been counselling me through the press and other media be realised, there is opportunity for work value cases to be initiated by the Public Service Board, and both the Premier and I have undertaken to see that additional staff would be appointed. I think the fact that the legislation under which these people operate is administered by the Equal Opportunities Commissioner makes this line up appropriately. I do not think that women in any of their fields of endeavour will be short-changed when we have two appointees, where there was only one.

Mr. ABBOTT: Who will be on the selection panel for the positions? Who will be the members?

The Hon. H. Allison: The names have not been given to me. I do not know whether they should be but I believe that there would be a member of the Public Service Board and a representative of the Institute of Teachers. Therefore, two appropriate people may be Mary Beasley and Miss Ramsay. I imagine they would be nominated by those two bodies, and there would be representatives of the Education Department and the Department of Further Education respectively.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am interested in the Minister's comment about the future movement of the position of Equal Opportunities Adviser from direct Ministerial action. I wonder whether the Minister accepts that there was direct Ministerial action that should not have taken place and whether he is now making sure that it will not take place again.

Regarding the selection panel, I wonder whether, by mentioning the names he has mentioned, the Minister is not prejudicing the names that may come before him. I wonder whether, since they were clearly guessed-at names, it would have been better if they had not been mentioned.

The Hon. H. Allison: The member misunderstood. The names mentioned were of people who would be on the panel to select appointees. That is speculating. It could comprise anyone nominated by the Public Service Board and the Institute of Teachers. I do not have to approve the selection panel. I have no discretion there. The other point made was about the allegation that there has been repeated Ministerial interference only in the appointment for the Department of Further Education.

I repeat my statement made in the House on a couple of occasions that the only interference by the Minister was interference in good faith. Before Christmas last year I was advised that a young woman had been recommended by the selection panel for further interview. She was in the United States and they were asking me to approve the payment of about \$2 000 for fares to and fro and, should she be the successful appointee, to pay further travel expenses, plus the cost of bringing her goods and chattels over.

I pointed out that, since I was travelling to the United States with my wife and children on a personally-financed trip, I would be happy to interview this woman, as I did on the seafront in San Francisco. The outcome was that, when we met, the young woman said "I think I have been rumbled, because I intended to go there anyway." There was a saving to the department of a couple of thousand dollars. I understand that the young woman is employed in South Australia. I do not know whether she will be an applicant for the positions.

That was the extent of the Minister's previous interference. The subsequent delay in appointing someone was related to the termination of a contract of the appointee in the Education Department. That was Miss Denise Bradley, and then there was the suggestion from the Education Department that the title be changed. That was not a Ministerial decision, but I supported my Director-General.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Does the Minister have final right of veto?

The Hon. H. Allison: In the case of Ministerial appointees, the Minister would have the final right of veto. Under the Public Service regulations, there will be benefits in that the board will make the recommendations and the jobs themselves will no longer be impermanent—they will be a permanent part of the Public Service structure. I see a considerable advantage for appointees.

Dr. BILLARD: Will the Minister comment on the trends in enrolments in D.F.E.? I note from page 71 of the Auditor-General's Report that between 1978 and 1979 enrolments in metropolitan colleges were steady with perhaps a slight decline, but there was a substantial increase in country colleges. Will the Minister comment or offer an explanation?

The Hon. H. Allison: There has been a trend towards stability in the metropolitan area with some increase in rural areas, probably because some rural colleges have been upgraded and have attracted greater attendances. However, generally throughout the Department of Further Education over the last couple of years the attendances have tended to stabilise. Over the preceding years there was a steady transition from the enrichment courses (that is, stream 6) towards the more vocational and semi-vocational courses (streams 1 to 5).

I suggest to members of the Committee that recent developments, which are in train, may assist the Department of Further Education with its enrolments in some way. The \$2 300 000 allocated by the Federal Government for school-to-work transition may next year reflect in greater attendances because of the nature of the courses which we bring to the colleges. The Minister of Industrial Affairs also intimated that he would bring legislation into the House to change the apprenticeship system of training with implications inherent in his speech that the Department of Further Education again might be more involved in the training of people other than simply the traditional apprentices and that the scope might be widened. That is something to look forward to in the future but, in the meantime, a stable situation exists.

Dr. BILLARD: Does the department have, looking further than one year ahead, any plans for future expansion of the programme in the city? The Minister mentioned some specific programmes coming up this year but I would be interested in the longer-term plans.

The Hon. H. Allison: That is a very interesting question. This is one to which a number of people have been addressing themselves over the last couple of years. A number of groups are connected with labour and industry, further and tertiary education, and the Education Department itself, which has been engaged in manpower

predictions. Since the Further Education Department has to retain a substantial amount of its capital funding from the TAFE (Technical and Further Education) Commission in Canberra, we have submitted a tentative forward plan for the next five years which does involve some consolidation within the metropolitan area and which also involves some expansion in country areas.

There are obvious implications that the State Government would be expected to make recurrent grants to those programmes. I suggest that the State Government is optimistic about the industrial future of South Australia and, as that optimism is realised, obviously we will have to be critically involved in training more people. This applies throughout Australia. Western Australia and Queensland are already reflecting United States and European trends in so far as they are experiencing the shortage that I talked about earlier in metal trades, accountancy, boilermaking, welding and a number of associated trades where rapid industrial expansion is accompanied by an acute shortage of semi-skilled staff.

Once again, I point out that Australia, within living memory, has never really caught up with the rest of what we refer to as the Westernised world in so far as America, Britain, Russia and Europe are concerned. They traditionally have, to each person with a degree, between five and nine people to back them up. Those people backing up are to be technologically skilled but need no degree or qualification. In Australia, for some considerable time, at least for 10 years, it has been known to myself and many others that we had only .9 or one person with technological skill to back up each person with a degree. We have a dual shortage: we need more people with full tertiary qualification and we need more people with this technological skill.

I suggest that that problem has been further heightened over the past five years when a whole range of unskilled occupations have disappeared. Now, in the technological area, it is increasingly important that we train people for the new jobs which are emerging in this field. We had that problem before, and it is increasingly apparent now. I brought with me some background information listing the number of jobs. I had the department do some research for me and I point out that Western Australia has already reported shortages of boilermakers, fitters, electricians, welders, riggers, and cranedrivers between 1980 and 1985. Queensland has already reported that the aluminium smelting plant to be built will create a great drain on the existing labour force. New South Wales, with its rapid expansion, is confronted with difficulty. Victoria is already reporting similar problems with the petro-chemical, metal and motor vehicle industries and, in particular, the aluminium plant at Portland. South Australia's developments that we envisage will naturally reflect that shortage.

There are a whole range of companies that have advised that they could employ people almost immediately, and it is therefore common sense that with any transitional training, whether it is school-to-work or unemployment-to-work, we look at these jobs which are already on offer. I can assure members of the Committee that that is precisely what the job prediction teams in South Australia are doing. They will be advising both myself and the Minister of Industrial Affairs. The matter is certainly not being neglected either at a State or a national level.

Dr. BILLARD: I am delighted to hear that the Minister is concerned about manpower forecasting. Obviously, the D.F.E. can play a dual role. The enrichment programmes respond to student demand, to a large extent, in terms of the type of courses available and the number of places at which each course is held. In these other areas where

people are being trained to have skills for jobs, it should not simply be responding to student demand. To what extent is it a recent innovation to take this manpower forecasting into account? How would this be implemented? Would the employability of the graduates of each course be assessed and the number of places then allocated? Would the number of students believed able to get jobs at the end of that course be accepted, or what would be the approach?

The Hon. H. Allison: The machinery of the operation has not yet been worked out. I attended an Australian Education Council conference when this matter was discussed only six or eight weeks ago. The Minister of Industrial Affairs also attended a conference of State Ministers and the Federal Minister only last Friday week, which meeting also addressed the identical problem.

There is a solid realisation across Australia that this problem exists, and the State Ministers are currently applying themselves and appointing committee structures to give advice. So, the conclusions are still to be arrived at. I referred to this matter earlier in response to a question from the member for Salisbury. I said at that time that the Committee was already in existence and that we had been analysing critically what we had done during the current financial year. This is one of the reasons why we questioned the Federal Government's initiative in making available \$2 300 000 to South Australia, and why we, in turn, had been criticised for being a little slow in accepting the money, simply because we analysed the pitfalls.

Next year, we will be in a much better position to have concrete achievements, particularly if we train people for the jobs that we know will be available, rather than praying for a crystal ball to advise us about what will happen five years ahead.

Mr. TRAINER: In reply to the question immediately preceding the one that the Minister has just answered, I thought I heard the Minister refer to a consolidation within the metropolitan area as part of a five-year plan to be submitted to TAFE. Does that reference relate predominantly to vocational courses?

The Hon. H. Allison: Essentially, although some stream 6 courses would be involved in at least one of the concepts.

Mr. TRAINER: I understand that there is some overlap with the Workers Education Association in some of the non-vocational courses that are being offered by the department. Have you any plans for a rationalisation to eliminate part of the overlap where it could be proved to be desirable?

The Hon. H. Allison: Essentially, the consolidation in the metropolitan area would bring together sections of the D.F.E. that are currently fragmented throughout the central metropolitan region. For example, the School of Hairdressing would be one, and business studies would be another. The total Adelaide D.F.E. involvement within the central metropolitan region would be involved.

So, we are looking at the possibility of some consolidation there. Probably, in the longer term, the savings in rentals currently paid, plus the fact that the Commonwealth Government would be involved in the capital funding, would make the whole thing viable, with a minimum amount of recurrent costs accruing to Government subsequently. This is critical when one looks at the project in the longer term.

At present, about \$186 000 rental is payable annually in one office block just for one branch of the D.F.E. If one takes away that rental and puts it into a consolidated project, obviously savings will accrue to Government. I am told that the total rental at present paid in the metropolitan area is over \$500 000.

Mr. TRAINER: Can the Minister give the Committee any information on whether there is any overlap of non-vocational courses with the W.E.A., as I understand that this is a point of contention in some circles?

The Hon. H. Allison: It is obvious that the demand for a number of courses is quite considerable and that there is room for both the D.F.E. and the W.E.A. to be jointly involved. A number of organisations compete with one another. The colleges of advanced education and the D.F.E. have a grey area. Also, W.E.A. and D.F.E. have another area where they are in competition with each other. However, generally, there is a recognition that the two can co-exist and that there is a demand for both of them to provide courses. We are not looking to put one out of business by a rationalisation programme.

Mr. TRAINER: I am not trying to imply anything in that direction; it is just that there may be an overlap and, as part of a rationalisation, you could reduce costs by eliminating that overlap.

The Hon. H. Allison: The honourable member will realise when he looks at the line that, in recognition of this, the W.E.A. has been stabilised at last year's allocation. There are other areas of competition, and we think that one of them should step aside.

Mr. RANDALL: I refer to the line "Transfer to deposit account—salaries suspense", for which \$50 000 was voted for 1979-80, but during which year nothing was spent. I see that the sum of \$50 000 has again been proposed for the 1980-81 financial year. What is this amount for, and why was the \$50 000 voted last year not spent?

The Hon. H. Allison: This problem is similar to that experienced by the Education Department generally, as in August or September last year the whole of the department's salaries payments were transferred on to the new A.D.P. computerised system. The departments are given one day per fortnight in which to programme their own accounts, and members will recall that a few months ago I had to put a considerable number of additional staff into the Education Department's pay-roll section in order to help overcome a major problem.

Here again, we have a specific line now set aside by the D.F.E. to provide for the contingencies that have recently arisen in the Education Department, namely, that the A.D.P. system could break down. This provision is made in case cheques have to be drawn manually. The sum of \$50 000 is provided, and that money will be drawn against the suspense account.

Therefore, this line involves a recognition of problems which have arisen in the past and which will probably arise again. I am not too happy about any computer system that gives the massive Education Department, which has one-third of the State's Budget, only one day in which to programme the salaries of 21 000 employees. That is quite ridiculous and is a criticism, although I do not know to whom it is addressed.

Mr. RANDALL: I refer to "Hourly Paid Instructors (Personal Enrichment Programme)". Last year that provision was shown under a different allocation, and \$1 500 000 is now allocated. Why is it necessary this year to show this provision as a separate allocation?

The Hon. H. Allison: The department has speculated about the amount that it may be allowed for stream 6. This year there has been a conscious decision of Cabinet to stipulate that \$1 500 000 will be available so that the department knows exactly where it is, and it can allocate an amount to colleges depending upon their previous requirements. It merely tells the department what it should spend. It is an exploratory move and, if there is any substantial disagreement, either from the public or other sources, in the next few months, we will certainly find out

and be flexible next year. It is an attempt to give the department some firm direction regarding stream 6 courses. I stated earlier that there had been a considerable transfer of students from stream 6 to streams 1 to 5 (vocational and semi-vocational) over the past five years.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I refer to "Colleges and Branches—Equipment, material, services, general education expenses and costs of operation" in relation to the Salisbury branch of the Elizabeth Community College and the concern many people in the local area have for that branch. There seems to be evidence that the branch is being wound down because it is sited within an area being considered for future retail development. What action has been taken within the department regarding the branch? Is it intended to wind down the branch? If it is not, what moves and expenses have been provided for shifting the branch to another site, and when will such shifting take place? Its present site is in the middle of what is locally known as the "Bermuda Triangle of Salisbury" where a major shopping centre will be built and will swallow up the small businesses in the community. This has implications for the businesses and for the students undertaking courses at the college. Special reference has been made to me about matriculation courses at the college, about how they are being wound down.

The Hon. H. Allison: The last comment would be incorrect. Most of that is more speculative and fearful. It is unfounded. I made a press release unilaterally some months ago when this matter was first brought to my attention. I believe that I am the designated owner of the property in question. No firm proposition has been put to the Department of Further Education by any organisation. Inquiries have been made in conjunction with other developments proposed for other parts of Adelaide by major Australian retailing firms. The point that I made upon receiving the initial inquiry was that Salisbury needed a branch of the Department of Further Education; it already had one, and to replace or reinstate the department on an alternative site would require two things to happen. One was that an alternative site appropriate to the needs of the department would have to be provided, and the other was that the cost of reinstating the college on another site would be about \$1 500 000.

I advised the member on this matter in reply to a question that he asked of me in the House many months ago, and the story is still identical. Nothing further has developed as far as the Minister or the department is concerned, and there is no indication on my part to wind down the affairs of the college. I recognise its importance to the district; and probably more significantly the local council and ratepayers and shop proprietors are currently in some dispute as to the ultimate decision. I understand that some people are very firm on their decision and other people believe it may be changed. Until such time as a recommendation is made to Cabinet by the local council, we will not be entering into any further negotiations.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I refer to "Adult Migrant Education Programme" because last year \$756 000 was voted, the actual expenditure was \$894 582 and this year \$883 640 is proposed. Does this increase represent incremental increases in the salaries of persons involved in the programme, or does it provide for an increase in staffing in this area?

The Hon. H. Allison: I recall that there is an amount of about \$883 000 provided on that line. Again, it is not a final sum. There is provision for expansion of services, for example, should a considerable number of refugees arrive from overseas. We have had Vietnamese people arriving in South Australia and the initial amount of \$883 000 is a provision that the department can anticipate being able to

use. In the event of further funds being required, Commonwealth funds will be available. We can apply retrospectively and we can spend funds and then apply to the Commonwealth for the amount that we need. This is the amount we believe we will require but, should a further sum be needed for migrant education, that would be provided.

Mr. SCHMIDT: In regard to the same matter under "Contingencies", last year \$90 000 was voted, \$69 000 was the actual payment and \$69 000 is allocated for 1980-81. I presume that that amount would fluctuate with the number of migrants involved.

The Hon. H. Allison: That, too, will depend upon Commonwealth decisions. The Commonwealth has made it clear during the last several months and in the Budget that migrants will be given special priorities. The department can take advantage of that additional funding.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Although we have this allocation for adult migrant education, which is basically a course providing literacy skills to migrants, in what programme is the department engaged in providing literacy skills to our own people who are illiterate?

The Hon. H. Allison: As part of its normal course of instruction, the department has an adult literacy programme, both in its own right and utilising Commonwealth funding also as an integral part of the school or unemployment-to-work transition programme. In fact, they are bound closely to the two programmes.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I refer to the lines "Director-General of Further Education" and "Lecturing, Administration and Ancillary Staff". I ask the Minister, first, whether the extraordinary arrangement of which I heard some time ago (the filling of the Deputy Director-General's position whereby one position was currently being occupied on a rotating basis between four officers of the department) still obtains. Secondly, if it does still obtain, does that indicate that the Government is seriously asking the Keeves Inquiry to consider whether the Department of Further Education should continue to be a separate Public Service department and, thirdly, why? Briefly, it is my belief that there have been real gains to the TAFE sector in this State by the department's having been set up as a separate department from the Education Department. I have argued this matter with Ministers and public servants from other States and can recall one gentleman, who may be well known to the Minister as a result of A.E.C. meetings, constantly asking me when I was going to correct that dreadful mistake which my predecessor made. My reply was to say that we were proud of what happened on that occasion and that we had seen real benefits from it in this State. I asked when he would get himself into gear and do the same thing in his State. I can understand why the Government has established the Keeves Inquiry. To a certain extent it is being used as a lightning conductor for whatever static is around the place, but I am not opposed to the concept of, from time to time, having a fairly fundamental and wide-ranging inquiry into education in this State. I really am disturbed if, in fact, there is some serious contemplation that the Keeves Committee of Inquiry may come down with a recommendation for reamalgamation. As to the merits between a Government department and a statutory authority, I do not think that that matters too much. In any event, I do not see that that should preclude the filling of these two Deputy Director-General positions in what would be regarded as the normal way, because any transfer to a statutory authority would still require people who are second in command.

In view of this rather extraordinary position, and I am not even sure whether Dr. Mayfield has been confirmed

permanently in the one Deputy Director-General position (and perhaps the Minister can enlighten us on that), the Minister can hardly be surprised if there is a good deal of speculation that the Government expects the Keeves Committee to look at this specific question very seriously indeed.

The Hon. H. Allison: Of the terms of reference which were given to the Keeves Committee of Inquiry (and there were five separate terms of reference), one quite specifically requested that that committee address itself to rationalisation within the entire education system: that is, Childhood Services, Kindergarten Union, Education Department, Pre-school, primary and secondary schools, and further education. I have no personal desire to attempt to pre-empt or influence any decision which the Keeves Committee of Inquiry may bring down. I had not, for example, considered one of the alternatives—making the Department of Further Education a statutory authority. I had not given that suggestion serious consideration, any more than I have any other suggestion.

The fact that we had two Deputy Directors-General leaving the Education Department and the Further Education Department almost simultaneously placed the Director-General in a difficult position. He is a hard working, most industrious man. He is a worrier, a terrier, and one of the considerations I had in mind was for his personal health when I immediately appointed an Acting Deputy Director-General, Dr. John Mayfield, until 30 December with the possibility of that appointment being extended. The other decision to appoint an Acting Deputy Director-General on a rotating basis was one which I, again, arrived at after having given it some considerable thought over the short period allowed to me. I was pleased and surprised when I received a deputation from Department of Further Education college principals supporting the move and emphasising that they appreciated being able to come into the head office for a while for what is virtually an exchange of expertise—expertise from the field—and the realisation that work in head office was probably quite different from what they had envisaged. I believe that the department will be the richer in the long term for that decision.

The Keeves Committee of Inquiry will come down with whatever decision it ultimately decides upon. If it is any reassurance to the member for Baudin, I have been in receipt of a number of copies of submissions which have been sent to John Keeves and his committee, and the vast majority of them have been strongly supportive of the work that the Department of Further Education is doing and of keeping it as a separate identity even if to some extent there may be individual arms of both education and further education which might work in closer co-operation. The Keeves Committee may be in receipt of far more submissions than those I have seen, and I can only comment on the few I have in my possession. I look forward with great interest to the findings of that committee, but I am not too fearful for the Department of Further Education.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Minister's expression was that, in fact, this rotating arrangement for one of the Deputy Director-General's positions has been well received by the college principals and can be justified on grounds other than simply that there may be some air of uncertainty over the future configuration of the department. Is the Minister considering this as a more permanent feature of the administrative horizon in the D.F.E., and is he suggesting that this is an innovation that the D.F.E. may continue with indefinitely and that may, indeed, spread to other Government departments?

The Hon. H. Allison: That was not a suggestion; it was

probably a realisation that both head office and the field may have been unduly critical of each other within that department, at least from expressions I have had brought to me since the move was made. There have been some quite happy associations between the college principals and the head office. I am not suggesting that, in the long term, that would be a desirable state of affairs. Obviously, under the Public Service Act, it would not. We would have to see about filling the positions on a permanent basis, but as a temporary measure I am quite happy with the results and I do not think that there is a deal of ill-feeling which was gloomily forecast when the decision was first made.

Mr. LEWIS: The preceding questions were of interest to me, because it seems that the department has discovered by accident a practice which has been well researched and documented for more than a decade now among management experts. It is otherwise known as "action learning". Perhaps the department might be encouraged to consider it as being appropriate in other areas and Government departments.

I note that on page 47 of the Estimates of Expenditure there are two items, one under Salaries and Wages and the other under Contingencies called the "Wardang Island Project". I have correlated that to an item on page 70 of the Auditor-General's Report. I see that the project is referred to there as an "outdoor education centre". What need (not otherwise met by any other facility in the department) will this unique centre meet, and why is it regarded as necessary to establish it in such a remote location?

The Hon. H. Allison: This island has had a chequered career. I am not sure why originally the lease was entered into, but I believe there was some suggestion that a private entrepreneur was anxious to acquire the island to convert it to some sort of holiday camp as a means of protecting the Aboriginal community at Point Pearce from abuse. Whatever the reason, the Government decided to take up a lease. Subsequently, the Department of Further Education was asked to investigate an appropriate use for the island. An unusual feature of this lease was drawn to my attention several weeks ago.

The lessor, the Aboriginal community at Point Pearce, had the right to dictate to the lessee that he should renew the lease at their pleasure, so, whilst in Opposition I was critical of the fact that the Wardang Island project seemed to be absorbing increasingly large sums of money, as Minister my hands are relatively tied, in that I had to sign the lease because I was invited to do so by the Point Pearce community, and the previous Minister had agreed to accept their invitation.

There were other factors. As Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, I have a general responsibility. After having paid a couple of visits to the island, one recently to the community itself, I was quite impressed by the prestige that a number of Aborigines gained from direct association with the island. They were employed on the island and had a living that they took back to the community. They had the standards by which they were employed and took them back to the community.

Further, the community spoke to me strongly requesting not only that the island be leased again by the Minister but also that the relatively small number of people from the Aboriginal community at Point Pearce continue to be allowed to attend the school on a full-time basis. That was because that took them away from the problems with which they had been associated on the mainland and gave them a different form of motivation. They are learning skills from Department of Further Education instructors. They are living an isolated life and they are all young men.

It is discriminatory in favour of the Aboriginal male population, but it was a combination of circumstances that encouraged me to make a further sum available so that the Aboriginal training course could be continued and so the Aborigines could continue to be employed.

At the same time, I was given correspondence from a large range of schools in South Australia where staff and students had visited the island and enjoyed the unique island environment, studying the fauna and flora, and doing so cheaply. I think the charge is \$2 a night for accommodation in the housing and \$1 a night if they camp on the island.

There are problems. We have to get water there by barge, and there is no loading ramp. It is semi-adventurous to visit there, and there are features that make it different from the normal holiday attraction. Despite previous criticism that I have levelled at Wardang Island, I was pleased to extend the financing for next year and to extend the lease for a further three years. The Director tells me that 100 Boy Scouts are booked for the island next weekend.

Mr. LEWIS: What techniques does the department use to determine its priorities in allocating funds for various training courses? If we acknowledge that there is a propensity of the total population to make time available for study, that is quantifiable. That it may change is also quantifiable in statistical terms by market analyses. How does the department identify, in manpower planning programmes, the need for training? Where such need is identified, how will the department decide in which other areas to cut down expenditure?

The Hon. H. Allison: I think one feature of the colleges over recent years that will be perpetuated by the present Government is that they have become known as local colleges, or part of the local scene, and councils have been encouraged to take a prominent part in decision-making by colleges. There has been close communication between councils, staffs of colleges, curriculum committees at head office, the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, and, more recently, the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I am not sure what pertained previously.

The local colleges, to a considerable extent, reflect local needs, and the planning is not predetermined by an authority that is remote: it is designed to meet local needs. I think the member would realise from what I said in reply to the members for Newland and Salisbury that more recently the Ministers of Industrial Affairs and Education have attended national conferences where national and State needs have been defined, and the facilities of colleges of further education will be used increasingly to fill needs in the industrial community.

There is no rubber stamp that we will say exists. A number of different processes will be involved in decision-making and, in my view, for some time it will continue to be in a state of flux. We do not know that there is any hard and fast model for colleges of further education. They have moved away from enrichment and fairly light courses towards vocational and semi-vocational courses. Perhaps this transition will be reflected in what the local community dictates. I think it would be unwise to set a model. It would be appropriate to keep a firm sense of direction in so far as the Government knows what will happen in the State.

I think that industry will have to work towards a common goal of training people for jobs available. The latter is one of the key aims of the Government. We will have educational facilities working directly towards providing skilled people who are trained and retrained as they become available. The flexibility in the use of colleges

is very important. I discussed that issue with the Technical and Further Education Commissioner when he came to South Australia recently. There is a realisation that times change quickly. Jobs that were available five years ago have disappeared, and I am sure that the department must be involved in a new range, as a result of technological change. I am optimistic about technological change, not pessimistic, because I think the primary and secondary fields give way to other fields.

Primary industry used to account for over 20 per cent of the State's employment; it is now less than 2 per cent. Secondary industry in itself is declining as an employer, and unions are defensive about that. So, we have to be flexible in approach. I think that the mood within the Further Education Department and within the Government is one of flexibility.

Mr. LEWIS: I thank the Minister for that answer, especially for the additional information he provided. I thank the member for Salisbury, too, for drawing my attention to the frivolous manner in which certain remarks made in this Committee might be misconstrued by some people. Over the time that I have been a member of this Parliament, I have attended a number of meetings in my electorate and elsewhere in connection with the matter to which the Minister has referred. Indeed, the local community has been ostensibly involved in identifying a need. The specific example that I give of this is the on-farm training courses. The way the meetings have been conducted indicates that the community itself has not identified the need but that empire builders are doing it for members of the community and encouraging them to use the tax dollar, which will otherwise go to waste since the officers and the equipment presently being used will not be utilised.

It distressed me to hear that, knowing that most of the people involved in preliminary discussions in those communities have asked me whether we really need this. They said that we have agricultural science being taught not only at Urrbrae Agricultural College at the secondary level but also at other secondary schools and Roseworthy College. We also acknowledge as farmers that we can teach our own sons a lot, as well as anybody else's son who wishes to work as a jackeroo. In terms of practical experience and management skills, there are excellent branches available to the Department of Agriculture.

Why do we have to supplement this not only with what is spent at Roseworthy and universities but also with money spent through the Department of Further Education on courses which have been developed by people who seek to project their apparent effectiveness in the organisation to which they belong rather than meeting the needs of a changing work force in the rural community?

The Hon. H. Allison: I am not sure whether the honourable member is being critical of the on-farm training scheme which already exists. It was introduced with Federal funding some years ago into four areas, and it was expanded into six areas. Over the last couple of years, both in Opposition and in Government, I have received strong representations from the United Farmers and Stockowners Association and from local areas requesting that the scheme be extended rather than restricted. Probably it is because of the localised nature and the fact that it is not a full tertiary course and relevant to what is happening in a local area that enthusiasm has been generated.

I do not think that a series of courses with D.F.E. is a threat to what is happening in the secondary schools specifically allocated to agricultural studies or colleges such as Roseworthy, because almost invariably the people

who join in the on-farm training schemes are in no way prepared to leave their local environment to study. They regard this as taking education to them. Nevertheless, I am well aware that there have been some allegations of duplication of courses between the Department of Further Education and the C.A.E. not only in this field but also in other areas. To that extent I believe the Keeves Committee of Inquiry and other inquiries being conducted at both State and Federal level indicate where we should be rationalising rather than duplicating.

It is a question of proper allocation of resources. I know that the honourable member is concerned, because he has mentioned these things to me repeatedly. The Government will be in a better position to make firm decisions towards early or middle 1981 than it is now. We do not want to pre-empt any recommendations from various committees of inquiry. At the same time, we would express concern in so far as we know that a lot of people are sufficiently interested to make substantial recommendations. If the honourable member believes that he, too, can contribute to any committees of inquiry, I am sure that they will be delighted to receive his comments and consider them.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the Committee that we have only 43 minutes left and there is another vote. Perhaps we can keep the comments brief in seeking information.

Mr. LEWIS: I regard the curiosity I have about these figures to be equally as relevant as that which has been demonstrated by any member of the Committee. It is indeed curiosity that motivates me to ask the Minister about that matter of training to which I have been referring as an example of my concern about how decisions are made. I am not opposed to the on-farm training scheme, and I reassure members of the Committee of that fact. I am merely concerned to determine how these decisions are made to allocate funds to these programmes. It seems that the area of intellect that can be developed and trained in this regard is finite and measurable. By throwing more and more dollars at that prospective goal, that is to develop the intellect in the community to the greatest possible level and ensure maximum productivity from all of us (and that must be the object of education), it must be possible to quantify the effects of spending money in these areas. If on-farm training schemes, as an example, are better than spending the money in secondary schools and at Roseworthy, then can we measure it? If we can measure it, do we so measure it, and, if we do not, why not?

The Hon. H. Allison: The question of analysing to what extent on-farm training schemes, secondary training schemes and further education training schemes are improving farm management skills is not quite as straightforward as the honourable member may believe, in so far as the very best of farm management is still unable to cope with the vagaries of the weather. A few months ago record wheat harvests were predicted. However, because of the early drying off in the season, we now find that people are extremely pessimistic about the record crop, which looks like being much below par unless we get very quick heavy soaking rains to finish off the grain.

We used to have over 20 per cent of the population engaged in primary education, but now only 2 per cent is so involved, yet primary industry has never been more productive. So, the onus is on those who remain in the industry to become far better trained, irrespective of whether it is at the full tertiary or subtertiary level. To that extent, we should be making available this variety of courses for those people who can and those who cannot travel away from home, in the realisation that better education must surely relate to better productivity.

The honourable member, being a researcher of these matters and an expert adviser, would realise the increasing importance of skills in this area. We are simply trying to respond to local demands to help what is, after all, a major provider of revenue to the Australian nation through export trade alone, apart from making Australia one of the leading nations in relation to the world's food basket.

Mr. LEWIS: I agree with the department's opinion in this regard. I want to identify the way in which the department is quantifying the number of skilled tradesmen that will be needed in future as a result of the expanding demand in this area. I should be pleased to have that sort of information, whether it is statistical or straight-out expressed reason, and, at the same time, I note that it is in direct conflict with the opinion of Mr. John Scott, the Secretary of the Australian Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union, who has said publicly that any such opinion was a con job by industry to bring in cheap scab labour from overseas. If the department has information which indicates that we need to do that kind of training, I would be interested to get it, because the record should be put straight, if for the benefit of no-one else but Mr. Scott.

The Hon. H. Allison: Probably, the best rebuttal to that sort of criticism would be to refer the critic to the New South Wales Governments initiatives. It is training under pressure-cooker conditions, through the D.F.E. and industry, several thousand people who are in the school-to-work transition or are currently unemployed, in order to meet the massive demands being placed on the system in the metal trades alone. I was assured of that at a recent conference, and the Minister of Industrial Affairs had a similar exchange of ideas at a conference recently.

This is repetitive of what I said earlier: that it is better for the department and employers to ascertain quickly what jobs are available and to train people quickly and efficiently so that they can fill those jobs. I believe that the Minister of Industrial Affairs quoted in the House a couple of weeks ago a figure of about 325 to 350 people in boilermaking alone who might be absorbed almost immediately if they were available.

Surely, with our State and Federal funds, we would be better advised to move into that sort of programme, with the help of employers and the D.F.E., in order to fill employment needs. Looking five years hence is too speculative. We can do something concrete for the industry and young people now. I do not think this is a con job to get people trained and into work.

Mr. Hemmings: I refer to the line "Colleges and branches—minor equipment and sundries", and to the previous question asked by the member for Salisbury regarding the child-care studies course at the Elizabeth Community College which, I understand, will be discontinued in 1981. I was rather surprised at the Minister's rather cavalier attitude to the problem, which was referred to most admirably by my colleague.

It seems inconsistent that, dealing with projects that have got off the ground in my district, the Minister can talk about the degree of excellence of courses. I refer to the opening of the music suite at Fremont High School. However, when dealing with the discontinuation of the child-care studies course at Elizabeth, the Minister seems to have no idea (I do not know whether he asked his directors any questions) about what the discontinuation of that course will mean to the people in my district.

The Minister said that he thought that some part-time employment had been gained by people who had previously gone through the course. One would have thought that, if it was going to be decided to discontinue that course, the Minister or his directors would have more information about it. The Minister has agreed to supply

the member for Salisbury and the member for Newland with information in this respect. Perhaps I could offer the Minister some information so that he will not have to ask his public servants to get it. So far, 50 people have gone through the course, 42 of whom have obtained full-time employment. The Minister seems to be nodding his head, yet he had to tell the Committee that he would supply that information.

There is also the problem of transport. Some people who are now or will be in future undertaking that course at the Elizabeth Community College will not be able to travel to Croydon to do the full child-care studies course. For the Minister to offer some sop to the people in my district by saying that core subjects are available is not good enough.

The member for Salisbury said that there is a real need in my district for these kinds of course. There is a high rate of unemployment there; the Minister may be interested to know that the rate is about 17 per cent of young people. It will not do those young adults much good to go to Croydon to do this course, which is now being provided at the Elizabeth Community College.

The Minister has talked about consolidation and savings. If he is going to be frank and to give this Committee the correct answers, the Minister might come out in the open now and say that the course is being transferred to Croydon solely to save money and to consolidate courses in the inner-Adelaide metropolitan area.

I will admit that under the previous Government many courses have been closed at Elizabeth Community College on various grounds and Ministers have stated in the House that there was no real reason for courses to be continued at the college, claiming that they needed to be consolidated elsewhere, at Croydon and other areas. The only people suffering are those living in my district. Not only will students be denied courses but positions will be abolished at the college. I do not expect the Minister to justify his decision tonight to discontinue that course in 1981, but I would like him to say how many positions will be abolished at the college when that course is abolished in 1981.

The Hon. H. Allison: There would be some possible transfers of staff from Elizabeth to Croydon. Certainly, there would be no retrenchments, and there would be some retention of staff to cope with the core subjects that would still be provided at Elizabeth. Perhaps the honourable member could provide me with the sort of information that I require. It would be in conflict with what has already been provided to the department, but there is some acceptance by the department that there is high employability of students from the course.

I acknowledged earlier that 98 per cent of people who have been trained have been employed. I said that of the group that has been employed, many of them were taken on with less than the full course behind them, so that the core training that they receive at Elizabeth would still make them employable; whether the number of people who might expect to train and complete the course and would in turn be employable with their full qualifications is another issue.

It is possible that those who have received core instruction would be able to obtain employment as aides, as ancillary staff, rather than going out as much more highly qualified people but less employable, because there is a limit to the amount of staff to be taken on within the State. Once again it is a reflection on the old system where we have the possibility of training more people than the State system can absorb. I refer to the situation concerning teachers, the medical profession, the legal profession and others. If the honourable member could give me some assurance that these people wish to be fully trained and

that in the event of their not being fully trained that they would not be anywhere near as employable as they would have been in the past, that would be of inestimable value to the department. It has arrived at its own conclusion and, if those conclusions could be corrected, if the honourable member has concrete evidence, we would be pleased to look at it.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no further questions on this vote, I declare the examination of the vote to be completed.

Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$35 372 000.

Chairman:

Mr. E. K. Russack

Members:

Mr. R. K. Abbott
 Mr. Lynn Arnold
 Dr. B. Billard
 The Hon. D. J. Hopgood
 Mr. I. P. Lewis
 Mr J. Mathwin
 The Hon. R. G. Payne
 Mr. I. Schmidt

Witness:

The Hon. H. Allison, Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr. J. Steinle, Director-General of Education.
 Mr. N. Robinson, Finance Officer.
 Mr. H. Cox, Executive Officer, Administration and Finance, Childhood Services Council.

Dr. BILLARD: To save time, I will ask three questions together. What policy is there regarding placement of child-care centres in regard to whether they are on primary school property or attached to it, or whether they are physically separate? That is important, because in some cases savings can be achieved in administration and with playground equipment. My second question relates to the number of different agencies under which child-care centres could be set up. It seems to me that it is six of one and half a dozen of the other whether they are set up under the department or under kindergartens. The third question relates to the Government's policy on extending the availability of pre-schools to children 3½ years old and to how and when this programme will start and which would be the priority areas for that programme to start.

The Hon. H. Allison: I will take the last question first. That is the extension of childhood services to the 3½-year-old group. I think some members of the Committee will realise that already there would be a couple of thousand 3½-year-olds absorbed in the system quite happily, and it was part of the Government's policy at the election last year to extend childhood care facilities to those of that age and upwards. Approximately \$110 000 is included in the provision for the Childhood Services Council of approximately \$17 100 000, and that money would be made available for expansion of facilities for 3½-year-olds in South Australia.

I have not given a firm direction to the Childhood Services Council but I will soon submit to it a written request that the \$110 000 should be made available to the

Kindergarten Union, the Education Department and possibly to the Catholic system, so that they, at their discretion, can select needy areas of which they must be aware. The Childhood Services Council has given me a list and I think it can implement this matter of the 3½-year-olds as quickly as possible. I expect that over the next few months the council would make reports as to the efficiency of its administration.

Then, for the following year, we can have a look at the whole situation in greater detail.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mathwin): Before calling on the next question, I remind members of the time and the time limit. I am attempting to give each member an opportunity of asking a question, as the time is getting short.

The Hon. H. Allison: The honourable member was referring to the proliferation of agencies through which childhood services are offered. Here, again, I simply refer him to the Keeves Committee of Inquiry, one of whose terms of reference is that rationalisation of educational services should be reported on, and childhood services is at the junior end of that structure, where we have two major organisations, the council itself and the Kindergarten Union, both with considerable administration expenditure. There is certainly some possibility that the rationalisation may be achievable. I am not going to preempt the committee and guess what it may recommend, but certainly the childhood services and the Kindergarten Union, plus the Education Department, and plus a fourth entrant into the field—direct funding from the Federal Government itself—are all competitors in the childhood services area, quite apart from any private enterprise ventures that are looking for funding. Obviously, the matter needs to have some over-view, and I am looking forward to recommendations in the new year.

Mr. ABBOTT: Under the line "Aboriginal Co-ordinating Committee—Fees and expenses", \$99 300 has been proposed, which is an increase of \$41 382 on the actual payments during 1979-80. This is not quite double the amount that was voted last year, but it is a substantial increase. What is the purpose of this increase, and how many additional staff have been added to the co-ordinating committee?

The Hon. H. Allison: This sum would include the replacement of a motor vehicle; I think that it has already been acquired, and one additional member has been appointed. He is Wilbur Wilson, the Aboriginal footballer. He has been appointed recently to a position on the Aboriginal Co-ordinating Committee. He is a fourth employee. We also have Mr. Brian Headland, Mr. Les Nader, and a clerk-typist. I repeat what I said earlier: these people are there essentially in a co-ordinating role, and we have not usurped the powers of any other Ministers who look after housing, community welfare, education, further education, etc. We are to advise them where we believe there are shortcomings, but we are not there to act. We are a negotiating body.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I intend to call again the member for Spence. The lead questioner has given his opportunity to the member for Spence to ask a second question, and the next call will be the member for Mallee, followed by the member for Mitchell, the member for Salisbury, and the member for Mawson.

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister say what amount of grants was recovered from the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs last year, and has he recovered or been advised of the Commonwealth grant for this financial year? Can he advise also what projects and special facilities were provided for Aborigines in South Australia last year over and above the usual services, and

what new projects are planned for this financial year?

The Hon. H. Allison: Initially, I suffered some embarrassment as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs because of under-expenditure of Commonwealth funds in health and education to the extent of about \$180 000 to June 1979. This meant that the amount of money which would normally have been available for training officers in the health field under the Minister of Health's line, was denied to the State. Because we have not spent the initial \$20 000 allocated in that financial year, the funding to have been made available in the succeeding two years was denied this State, a sum of \$60 000 for each of the years.

Currently, I am renegotiating with the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs for reinstatement of that line. I say that because it is evident that there had been some laxity on behalf of both the Health Commission and the Education Department in not spending the funds. The specific question which was asked about current grants to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs from the Commonwealth funds is answered by the following figures: housing, \$2 206 000; health, \$1 331 000; education, \$1 235 000; further education, \$440 000; welfare services, \$607 000; training (specifically for employment), \$279 000; and, community facilities, \$53 000; a total of \$6 151 000. In addition, other Commonwealth departments have provided special scheme funds to assist Aboriginal people, and there have been Commonwealth education grants, employment and youth affairs training programmes, and general purpose housing grants made to the Housing Trust. That was in both 1979-80 and 1980-81. This year, for example, \$1 600 000, is set aside for Aboriginal housing. The second funding includes grants in aid which have been made from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to Aboriginal organisations and communities. Those grants are made on what we would term an *ad hoc* basis rather than with any formal structure. I could itemise these grants in detail, but perhaps it would be more appropriate if I supplied the figures in printed form to the Committee so that the honourable member can analyse them at his leisure. Does that meet with the honourable member's approval?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes. The line "Aboriginal Housing—Contribution towards administration and maintenance" amounts to \$305 000 proposed. Under this line during 1979-1980, \$5 000 was provided, and only \$4 499 was spent. There is a vast difference here. How much is allocated for administration purposes and how much for maintenance? Funds to purchase an extra 40 homes in the metropolitan area were received in 1979-80. How many of those homes were purchased? Perhaps the Minister can explain this huge increase in housing programmes that are contemplated for this financial year. I understand that there are more than 600 applicants awaiting housing allocations from the South Australian Aboriginal Funding Unit.

The Hon. H. Allison: I do not have that specific information here. I had assumed that, since the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs had a fairly modest role, each of the relevant Ministers would have been questioned individually on the lines specifically relating to Aboriginal funding.

If that was a false assumption, I am prepared to provide the information on request to the Ministers who administer these funds. I said in the House when my Ministry was formed that each individual Minister would have responsibility for Aborigines as part and parcel of his or her portfolio, and that it was considered desirable by the Federal Government, which tended, I think, to regard Aborigines increasingly as a State responsibility, that we

should not renege in the provision of State facilities while we use Federal funds.

Mr. ABBOTT: But this is a line under the Minister's portfolio.

The Hon. H. Allison: It is provided specifically as a line for administration, and the assumption was that this was administration. The honourable member specifically asked questions regarding the number of houses to be provided and quoted the number of applicants for houses. I would have thought that that was more the territory of the Minister of Housing. I will provide that specific information. The total of D.A.A. grants to South Australia falls into two categories: \$6 151 000 in State grants, and \$9 406 000 in grants in aid, giving a total of \$15 557 000 from Commonwealth funds.

Mr. LEWIS: I note with some pleasure the increased allocation that the Government has provided for Roseworthy Agricultural College, but nevertheless I express concern about the future of that institution. To accurately describe and justify that concern, I think it is imperative to outline to the Committee exactly how important is the institution in this State. It has been there for 100 years, and there would not be a dry-land farming technology applicable to the majority of the South Australian wheatlands had it not been for Roseworthy Agricultural College.

The main reason is quite simply that the amount of soil erosion which overtook much of this State, as a result of over cropping, over stocking and over cultivation in the 1920's and 1930's, would have taken huge areas of what are now productive farmlands, and they have become productive farmlands again after that initial foray into excessive productivity only as a result of the soil management techniques displayed by many of the old collegians from Roseworthy Agricultural College, as well as extended to the rural community by other graduates from that institution.

This State has had a number of prominent citizens who have obtained their fundamental tertiary training at that institution, including several Ministers of Agriculture, the present Speaker and myself, all of whom have benefited from attendance there.

I make these points and support them by referring not just to the dry-land farming technology, but also to contributions in the development of management techniques for livestock husbandry and breeding in the stud area, for sheep, and cattle, whether dairy or beef, for pigs, or in areas of animal production, in terms of poultry, wool or meat, or in plant breeding. We would not have the wheat varieties we have now had it not been for the institution first breeding them and then adding the rust resistance that keeps this State's economy going.

Roseworthy's misfortune is that other such colleges, in areas where the soil is more productive because the climate is kinder to agriculturists, find that they do not need to have such a large area to ensure that adequate farm training facilities are available within the institution.

Furthermore, they have not at present, nor have they ever had, the same tradition of research and contribution to the training of people in applied research that Roseworthy has. Acknowledging all that and acknowledging the contribution that the college has made not only to South Australia's position as the leading wine producing State in this Commonwealth but also to Australia's now recognised high standard of wine, I wonder whether this increase is in recognition of Roseworthy's special purpose and relevance to this State. Will the Government give an assurance that that institution, which provides the facilities to train people in practical farming, as well as in academic

technology of agriculture, will continue to survive in this way?

The Hon. H. Allison: The Roseworthy issue has been before both the former and the present Governments for some time. It was brought to the former Government's notice that the indebtedness of the college had been increasing quite steadily. In fact, it was obvious through the annual reports to the tune of some \$750 000 by the time that this Government came into office.

Subsequently, a number of negotiations were entered into, one of which was the offer of the Government to make available to the college Mr. Trumble, Deputy Director of Agriculture, to assist in financial administrative duties. The situation is that the college has retrieved its position to some extent. It is certainly under no threat of closure and its present *modus operandi* will not be changed. It is, after all, an autonomous body, and the Government has been more advisory and of more assistance over the last 12 months. However, the financial position has improved to the extent that the indebtedness will be about \$600 000 by the end of the present year. In addition, the Director of the college did ask the Government to make additional funds available for research. Last year the vote was \$140 000, and the actual expenditure was over \$150 000. This year we are making available over \$270 000, part of which is for Mr. Trumble (\$40 000, including a number of sundry expenses) and the rest of which is available for research grants.

It was not quite the amount requested by the college, but it is certainly a substantial increase over previous years. We do acknowledge the work of the college in research, which has been of value to the State, and this amount is a recognition of that work. We are doing all we can not only to keep the college on an even keel but also to help it improve considerably its formerly fairly parlous financial position.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Has the Minister made any approaches to the Minister of Transport in regard to the prices presently charged for concessional bus passes which have increased by 100 per cent? Has he submitted to the Minister of Transport that they should not have gone up by any more than 25 per cent?

The Hon. H. Allison: The short answer is that I have not made any direct approach to the Minister of Transport on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The time having expired, the examination of this vote is concluded.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the Committee adjourned until Thursday 2 October at 11 a.m.