

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 10, 1962.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**MITCHELL PARK SCHOOL.**

Mr. **FRANK WALSH**: At the Mitchell Park Primary School, which I understand was built to accommodate about 630 students, there are 494 on the roll in the primary section and 331 in the infant section—a total of 825. The school grounds are about five acres in area and a tremendous amount of subdivision has taken place, particularly by the Housing Trust, south of the school. I understand that some land owned by the Education Department adjoining or near Tonsley Park is reserved (in name only, I understand) for Chrysler Australia Limited. Will the Minister of Education investigate this matter with a view to getting a suitable site south of the school, perhaps on the northern side of Sturt Road.

The Hon. Sir **BADEN PATTINSON**: I shall be pleased to do so. By modern standards, we like to reserve about 10 acres for a primary school and 20 acres for a secondary school. Because of the particular location of certain schools, however, it is not always possible to do this; but from what the Leader says the area at the Mitchell Park Primary School is inadequate by modern standards. I have been endeavouring to secure from the Railways Commissioner land in the locality that I understand is surplus to his requirements.

Mr. Frank Walsh: There may be a couple of acres.

The Hon. Sir **BADEN PATTINSON**: Yes. I have been endeavouring, although not with much success yet, to convince the Commissioner that it would be a generous act to part with it and the Leader's question will spur me on to greater activity.

Mr. **FRANK WALSH**: My information discloses that the headmistress and staff of the infant section have had to forgo the use of a staff room, and that the school is now awaiting a dual-purpose portable building. Will the Minister ascertain whether it is possible to provide immediate relief and whether a portable building will be placed in the primary section and not the infant section?

The Hon. Sir **BADEN PATTINSON**: I shall be pleased to do so. I am not aware of the facts. It may be that a new portable classroom is coming off the line at the building

division of the Public Buildings Department, or it may be that we have one surplus to our requirements. At the Sturt "Back to School" celebrations on Saturday I noticed some surplus portable buildings. I do not know whether they have been allocated already or whether one could be transferred to Mitchell Park. I will see whether speedy relief can be provided.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. **BOCKELBERG**: Can the Minister of Works indicate the water supply position at Kimba and say what progress is being made on the Polda Basin scheme?

The Hon. G. G. **PEARSON**: Without reference, I cannot inform the honourable member definitely regarding the position at Kimba, except to say that I am afraid we shall have to resort to augmenting Kimba supplies by carting water this summer because, although the contract for the erection of two additional 2,000,000-gallon tanks at Kimba is making good progress, we have not received sufficient catchment into the Roorra reservoir to fill the tanks and, therefore, I believe that some shortage will occur this summer. Regarding progress on the Polda scheme, as the honourable member is aware I visited the project two weeks ago, at the weekend, and was pleased with what I saw. At that point the work was progressing well: the camp had been established and the men on the job to whom I spoke appeared to be happy with their conditions; the work of excavation for the underground section of the main was well advanced. Since then I know that arrangements have been made for the supply of the necessary steel plate from the Eastern States to the firm in Adelaide that has the contract for rolling the pipes, and the Engineer for Water Supply states that no hold-up of the project will occur because of the non-delivery of pipes. My present hope is that by about mid-November the scheme will operate (at least partially if not wholly) and that by the end of November it will be in full operation.

BANK CHARGES.

Mr. **HUTCHENS**: Many pensioners, through incapacity, arrange to have their pension payments made by cheque. I have received some inquiries about whether it is within the rights of retailers to charge 3d. for the changing of cheques. I am under the impression that they are simply recouping the collecting charges that will be made by the banks under the new arrangements. Can the Premier say whether my assumptions are correct and, further, if a pensioner were able to present his cheque to

an agency or branch of the Commonwealth Bank, would the 3d. be charged for changing the cheque?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I understand the position, the latest arrangement by the bankers' association is that inland exchange has been eliminated but that other charges have been substituted by the banks. There are now three different types of bank charge: first, there is the normal charge for keeping an account; secondly, there is a ledger-activity charge; and, thirdly, there is a cheque-collecting charge. Without going into detail, it would appear that anyone cashing a normal cheque would be at least 3d. out of pocket by doing so. Not only would his account have to stand the cheque-collecting charge but the ledger-activity section of his account would also be debited, so he would be at least 3d. out of pocket by the normal collection of a cheque. However, I understand that the banks do not charge for pensioners' cheques. Of course, that does not apply to the ledger-activity charges on the account. A specified number of entries automatically involves a charge of 5s. to the person operating the account. I imagine that these cheques could be readily cashed at post offices or any branch of the Commonwealth Bank without the imposition of a charge. Any pensioner who experiences difficulty in getting his cheques cashed should go to a Commonwealth agency.

WATER PUMPING.

Mr. COUMBE: Yesterday, the Minister of Works supplied valuable information regarding reservoir intakes following the welcome rains we have had. Can the Minister inform the House what reduction in the pumping of water from the Mannum-Adelaide main will be involved and the possible savings to the State in pumping charges? Is the pumping being conducted at off-peak periods or is it suggested that it should stop temporarily?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not had an opportunity this morning to check with the department to ascertain what additional intakes have occurred overnight over and above those I reported yesterday. According to the press, a departmental spokesman is reported as having said that savings in pumping could amount to about £100,000. I accept that figure although I did not check the statement. I presume the spokesman was reliably informed. Pumping has proceeded for several weeks now on an off-peak basis and there has been no suggestion from the department that we should vary that programme.

The honourable member will appreciate that it is necessary to have a certain amount of pumping almost every year, and provided the pumping intake is restricted so that it will not be wasted because of later rains the programme will continue on that basis. The department has not suggested that we should either increase or decrease our pumping activity at this stage.

PEA CROP PAYMENTS.

Mr. BYWATERS: I have been informed that the harvesting of peas in the O'Halloran Hill area is in progress, but that growers and others interested in the industry are greatly concerned that it has not been possible, up to the present, to obtain any contract in writing for the sale of the crop. I have also been told that the only market available at this late date is with Foster Clark (S.A.) Ltd., a company which has received substantial financial backing from this Government and at whose request the peas were planted. It appears, from what I have been told, that this company is managed from England, and scant regard is given to the interests of growers and others engaged in the industry in South Australia. The company has agreed verbally, after a long delay, to carry out the conditions which applied last year; that is, an overall payment of 8½d. a pound, less certain expenses. Of this, 4d. a pound is for the grower and the remainder for harvesting expenses. However, the company has not been prepared to put this in writing.

Can the Premier say, first, whether the Government has given Foster Clark a guarantee for seasonal finance; secondly, whether its throughput of processed peas is part of the production programme for which this guarantee has been sought; thirdly, whether he will take steps to see that the growers and those engaged in the harvesting of the pea crop are paid on the due date; and fourthly, whether he will negotiate to see that the seed is ordered for the next season in order that this industry will be retained in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The question of a seasonal grant to finance purchases is at present being negotiated, so the latter part of the honourable member's question is at the moment inapplicable. I will inform the honourable member later when any conclusions are reached regarding it.

METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Following the lifting of the overtime ban at the Metropolitan Abattoirs last week, can the Minister of Agriculture supply any information about the present position

there? Is there any congestion, and are there any restrictions on producers delivering stock for slaughter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The abattoirs worked a full shift last Saturday and Sunday, which enabled it to clean up the back lag of export lambs. By arrangement with the Government Produce Department, 15,500 additional lambs were brought in for slaughter yesterday and today. Of these, 6,263 were slaughtered yesterday, and it is expected that 4,320 will be slaughtered today, leaving a carry-over of about 5,000 to add to the intake from today's market. There were some restrictions on today's market but I shall not detail them because the market is now concluded. I have obtained this report from the abattoirs management.

HOUSING TRUST ACT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Acting Minister of Lands say whether consideration has been given to the request from the Whyalla City Commission that the Housing Trust Act be amended to empower the trust to purchase business sites at auction?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I put this request to Cabinet as I undertook to do. The Government has decided not to vary the present conditions: in other words, not to transfer to the Housing Trust the powers suggested by the honourable member but to let the present conditions remain whereby the Minister of Lands actually disposes of the sites.

MYPONGA RESERVOIR.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Minister of Works say whether it is the Government's intention to have an official ceremony to commemorate the completion of the Myponga reservoir? If so, will it take place this session, and could a visit to Port Stanvac be arranged on the same occasion?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is the Government's intention to have an official opening of the Myponga reservoir, and His Excellency the Governor has kindly consented to perform the opening ceremony. Plans are in hand for the function and invitations will be issued soon to members and to the public to attend the opening, which will be held at about noon on Thursday, November 8. As far as I am aware, it has not been suggested that this occasion should include a visit to the oil refinery. I do not know whether that matter has been considered: indeed, it would not be possible to have both visits on one day. Invitations for

the opening of the reservoir will be issued soon in accordance with a press announcement I made about two weeks ago.

PARK LANDS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: In view of the controversy that has taken place recently concerning the possibility of establishing car parks on the fringe of the Adelaide park lands, can the Premier say whether it will be competent for the Adelaide City Council to set aside any portion of the park lands for permanent car parking without having first received Parliament's approval?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I speak without having refreshed my memory of the provisions of the Local Government Act, but I believe that the City Council exercises control of the park lands under the provisions of that Act. That is borne out by the recent negotiations concerning the leasing of the Adelaide Oval, for a long lease regarding which the council had to obtain permission of the Minister of Local Government or Parliament and table in the House the provisions of the lease. I think that the City Council has the authority to occupy the park lands temporarily for car parking, but I hesitate to give a legal opinion without checking on the matter. I will ask the Crown Solicitor to set out for the benefit of members generally what power the City Council has in this matter.

SHEEP DRENCHES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe the Minister of Agriculture has a reply to my recent question about the effectiveness of proprietary brand drenches for the control of gastro-intestinal worms in sheep.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Senior Veterinary Officer states:

There are at least 10 different chemicals on the market which have been approved for use in treatment of worms in sheep in South Australia. Phenothiazine is still the standard compound against which all new components are tested for efficiency. With many of the newer products, their efficiency is high against one species of worm, and probably not as good against some others. In other regards, phenothiazine has reasonable efficiency against most of the internal parasites of sheep. Of the newer compounds, the benzimidazoles and methyridine show most promise, being more efficient than phenothiazine in most species. The organic phosphate group show high efficiency against some species of worm, but have a narrower spectrum. For treatment of sheep generally, all products available are useful for the purpose stated, provided the directions for use are followed completely. Where a parasite problem is occurring in a sheep flock, it is necessary to have an accurate diagnosis of the

species involved before any recommendation for a specific drenching compound can be made. As stated above, benzimidazole compounds have a very broad spectrum against worm species, but as yet they are too expensive for random usage when parasite infestation is suspected. The honourable member used two trade names, but I point out that as a rule the department discusses not the trade names but the compounds. I know the honourable member did not mean to be unfair in any way in this respect, but I do suggest that whilst privilege is to be guarded, in a case like this it might be wise to let me have the trade names privately in case an injustice is done. The honourable member referred to Kempak, which is an organo-phosphate. The department's opinion is that these organo-phosphates are good for certain types of worm. For instance, they are good for the barber's pole worm and the small stomach worms, of which there are two varieties. The Latin names of these are *haemonchus* and *ostertagia cooperia*. They are less effective for the black scour worm and the large mouthed bowel worm. In other words, the effect is that the organo-phosphate has a narrower spectrum. It is effective in certain respects, but not over such a wide range. On the other hand, the other trade name mentioned—Thiabendazole—is a compound which has a broad spectrum. It is very expensive for general use, but it is also very effective. The honourable member can see that both types of drench have their uses, and it is strongly suggested that a proper diagnosis of the type of worm to be treated be made before any expense is incurred in buying drenching compounds.

RED SCALE.

Mr. CURREN: Yesterday I was in communication with the Secretary of the Murray Citrus Growers' Co-operative Association and was informed that the pest board legislation concerning red scale on citrus is regarded as urgent. To allow the association sufficient time to implement the provisions of the proposed Act and to organize a control programme, will the Minister of Agriculture introduce the proposed Bill at the earliest opportunity?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked the other day for priority for the oriental fruit moth legislation, and he got results. I am not sure that I can promise the same results on this occasion, but I can assure the honourable member that legislation is in the course of preparation and that it will be considered by Cabinet very soon. Whilst I realize that the matter is urgent, an

extra day or two here or there would not have quite the same adverse effect in this case as on the previous Bill. The matter will be considered within the next few days.

CHEST X-RAYS.

Mr. HUGHES: Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say what action is taken against persons who neglect or deliberately ignore the compulsory requirement to present themselves for chest X-rays?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. RICHES: A *News* report of a statement attributed to Hugh Armfield, Canberra, states:

Ministers say the Federal Government intends to go ahead with the rail standardization project in South Australia. Work is expected to start within the next two or three years.

Can the Premier say whether there have been any further developments or negotiations between his Government and the Commonwealth Government on this matter, and if there have, whether they will affect the proposals the Premier has enunciated for South Australia to go ahead with that work this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have nothing definite to report at present. Members may have noticed a press report that certain works on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie railway line have been referred to the Public Works Committee. I think the reference is at present before the committee and that it proposes to start taking evidence on it tomorrow.

RAILWAY HOUSES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: A constituent has written to me regarding seven or eight houses in Burton Avenue, Duncan Avenue and Davidson Avenue, Parkholme, owned by the Railways Commissioner. These houses, which are of good design, were purchased from the Housing Trust and I believe they have been let with no guarantee of permanent tenancy and that one has been vacant for eight months. The yards of these houses are large for tenancy occupation. The letter indicates that people in the locality are disappointed at the condition of the houses. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Railways, request the Railways Commissioner to arrange for a reasonably continuous tenancy of these houses, and ask him whether it would be advisable in the circumstances to permit

railway personnel to purchase them if they desired to do so and whether he could arrange to have them brought up to a reasonable standard of painting and general outside appearance?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The answer to the latter part of the question is that I shall be happy to take up with the Commissioner the question of bringing these houses up to a reasonable standard. That is obviously in the interests of the Commissioner and the tenants. Regarding the first part of the question, I am not able from the description given to identify the houses, but I believe they may be houses that the Commissioner has to enable him to exchange staff in a temporary occupation. I am not sure of that, but I will inquire and report to the Leader.

LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. CASEY: I have been told that the contract given to a company in another State to supply diesel-electric locomotives for the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway line is behind schedule. Does the Premier know of this, and can he say when the first locomotive will be available and when the contract is likely to be fulfilled for the remainder?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no report that the tenderers are behind schedule. If my memory is correct, no locomotives were to be delivered until fairly late this financial year. I will get a report of the precise date of delivery provided in the tenders. As the honourable member would know, locomotives do not come off the production line all at once; one or two locomotives would be delivered in a certain time and thereafter so many would be delivered in each period. I will get information about the contract and the expected dates of delivery of the locomotives.

UNION BAN.

Mr. HALL: Will the Leader of the Opposition use his good offices and influence within the trade union movement to help prevent a black ban being placed on the tanker *P. J. Adams* so that a vital South Australian industry will not be prejudiced?

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The Australian Council of Trade Unions' representatives are dealing with this matter and I have the utmost confidence in their decisions, which I expect will be in the interests of the people of Australia generally.

CEREAL CROPS.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on September 27 on the effect of the dry year on wheat, barley and oat crops?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports:

Weather conditions during the next two or three weeks will have a big effect on the size of the harvest this year. The majority of crops, while incapable of producing heavy yields, would still respond to good rains within the next fortnight and even the cool showery weather recently experienced in some areas will help these crops to mature their grain. On the other hand, many crops have been affected by dry conditions so severely that they could make no worthwhile response to rains. Over all, it can be said that even if conditions from now till harvest are favourable the State-wide average yields to the acre of the three main cereals would be lower than the means of the last 10 years. In the case of wheat, the increased acreage sown this year could result in a total harvest slightly greater than the 10-year mean—just under 30,000,000 bushels. With barley, both the acreage and yield to the acre will be down and the total crop is unlikely to exceed 16,000,000 bushels. A smaller area of oats is likely to be harvested this year and the total crop will probably be about 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 bushels. All of the above figures could be reduced considerably, perhaps by 25 per cent, if there is much hot drying weather during the remainder of the month. The official estimates prepared by the department will be available within the next two or three weeks.

ABORIGINES' HOUSES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works, in his capacity as Minister in charge of the Aborigines Protection Board, a reply to a question I asked on July 31 about the purchase of houses from the Mines Department at Port Pirie to settle Aborigines?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Acting Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Board has been in the country for much of his time recently and, I am sorry to say, has not been well enough to attend his office on several days. I have not had any report from him on this matter for some time. I know that other departments were anxious to acquire some of these houses and, as I said earlier, it depended on what houses were available before any decision could be made. I have not had a decision from the Minister or the Director of Mines and I am not able to say precisely what the outcome will be, but I will discuss this matter with the Acting Secretary of the department at the first opportunity.

CADELL DRAINAGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Acting Minister of Irrigation obtained a reply to a question I asked on September 25 about the serious seepage problem in the Cadell irrigation area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The accumulation of surface water in the area occupied by the Cadell training centre in the hundred of Cadell has been investigated by an officer of the Lands Department and a comprehensive report has been received. Further examination of the matter is necessary and the correspondence has been referred to the Engineer-in-Chief with a request that the effect of the water on the nearby horticultural properties in the Cadell irrigation area be explored and a report furnished.

LIBRARIES.

Mr. BYWATERS: Will the Minister of Education indicate the Government's policy regarding free lending libraries and the response of local government bodies to the policy enunciated?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Libraries (Subsidies) Act was introduced in 1955 and amended in 1958. Under this Act the Government through the Libraries Board subsidizes the cost of setting up and maintaining public libraries managed by local government authorities and other approved bodies. Under the Act the Government subsidizes on a pound-for-pound basis all approved expenditure which a local authority is called upon to find out of its own resources and which is properly charged against the library, including buildings (but not land), maintenance, salaries, books and general management.

The Libraries Board provides trained staff for the first six months. It makes a substantial contribution to the initial book stock over and above what is provided by the local authority. It also makes available the majority of the books in the public library and any of its special services and collections, provides the central services in cataloguing, classifying and otherwise processing books and gives advice and assistance in every possible way. Conditions for establishing libraries under this Act are that they shall be freely available to all, that the books are substantially of an educational nature, although they may include novels of an acceptable literary standard, and that trained professional staff is employed.

I am pleased to say that after a slow start the free library movement has gained

momentum. There are at present 11 subsidized libraries serving the public and four more have been approved and will open during the next 12 months. Of these, the new library at Brighton will be officially opened on Saturday week, October 20. Over 500,000 (584,377) books were lent through these libraries during 1961. This was an increase of 67 per cent over the previous year. In the five years since the introduction of subsidized libraries over 1,000,000 (1,347,112) books have been issued. The average number borrowed by each registered reader was 15 and the average number of times each book was borrowed was 10. At the end of the year there were 58,988 books in local libraries.

For some time the Institutes Association and many of its constituent members have been anxious to come within the provisions of this Act, and some members of this House have been most outspoken in this regard, but those institutes do not come within the provisions of the Act as it is at present drawn. However, when I officially opened the annual conference of the Institutes Association during show week, I referred to this matter at some length and finally stated that I would initiate discussions with the Libraries Board and with the council of the Institutes Association separately and that, if they were agreeable, I would bring both the board and the council together to see how far we could go in extending the operations of the Act so that at least some selected institutes could come within its ambit. The pressure of other events has prevented my bringing those bodies together but I hope to have initial informal discussions with the Chairman of the Libraries Board (Mr. McFarling) and the Principal Librarian (Mr. Brideson) on these and other matters next Friday.

NANGWARRY HOUSING.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to a question I asked on October 2 about the many houses at Nangwarry at present unoccupied and the consequent drop in rate revenue for the Penola District Council during the current year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Conservator of Forests reports that it is the practice for the department each year to send a list of occupied houses to the Penola council in connection with rating. The list supplied to the council for the year 1962-63 showed that 10 houses were vacant out of a total of 237 houses for the whole settlement.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL.

Mr. RICHES: On July 31 last, I asked the Minister of Works a question about the preparation of plans and the Government's proposals for a new hospital at Port Augusta. Amongst other things, I asked whether the plans would be submitted to the Port Augusta Hospital Board when they were completed. The Minister replied that he saw no reason why that should not be done. He said:

Preliminary designs together with a detailed schedule of accommodation have been prepared. Apparently, they are ready now. Could those preliminary designs and the details of accommodation be referred to the Port Augusta Hospital Board so that it might have some knowledge of what is proposed? If the board could be shown those, it would help create a little more satisfaction than obtains at present. I admit that I put a question on notice about the plans and specifications, and we have been assured that money has been voted this year for this work. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the board could be taken into the confidence of his department to the extent of submitting to it the preliminary designs and the detailed schedule of accommodation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This, naturally, is a matter on which I should confer with my colleague the Minister of Health, but I will, first of all, ascertain what progress has been made in the plans and specifications for the project generally. As I informed the honourable member previously, it has been the custom for plans to be submitted to the hospital board concerned for it to consider them and suggest alterations to them, if it so desires. I assume, therefore, that this practice can be continued. I see no reason why it should not. I will ascertain from the department what information it has already collated and what progress it has made, and then take up the matter with my colleague in reference to the honourable member's request that the matter be considered by the hospital board at this stage.

FISH PRICES.

Mr. LAWN: Today's *News* carries a statement that West Coast fishermen claim they are selling whiting at 2s. 3d. a pound and mullet at 5d. a pound, the whiting being retailed to the public at 6s. a pound and the mullet at 3s. a pound. They claim that either they are not receiving enough or that the public is being charged too much. Will the Premier have this matter investigated by the Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Many years ago the Government helped to organize co-operatives in the fishing industry, and today that industry is operated substantially by the co-operative movement which conducts the market in Adelaide and which also does a remarkably good job in exporting certain types of fish produced in South Australia. The discrepancy mentioned by the honourable member is probably due, first, to the fact that the price he has quoted as the normal price for whiting is extremely low and is not the normal price and, secondly, to the fact that there are many ways of serving fish—some is served on a plate after being suitably cooked. I shall be pleased for the Prices Commissioner to supply a general report on the matter.

RESERVES.

Mr. BYWATERS: Many people were pleased to read the statement by the Minister of Agriculture which appeared in last Saturday's *Advertiser* under the heading "Minister Puts Plea to Save Wild Life". When the Minister was opening the first meeting of the reconstituted Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee the suggestion of a conference on this important responsibility of protecting bird life was considered very timely, and his statement that if areas are protected natural growth will appear has already been proved: at one small area at Loxton where this was done the native pine has prospered immensely. Can the Minister say what results his remarks about setting aside one per cent of their property for this purpose have had amongst the farming community, and whether consideration has been given to asking farmers adjoining fauna and flora reserves to act as honorary wardens as a means of protecting these valuable reserves?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have made numerous statements to members of the farming community and generally they have approved of what I have said. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that no-one has suggested that the proposals were not good. They have not been criticized. On the other hand, I do not expect them to be widely adopted until further activity takes place. I intend to discuss this at the forthcoming conference. If farmers are interested, I shall be only too pleased to enlist their assistance in maintaining reserves in country areas. Too often reserves, whilst widely appreciated, do not receive adequate attention. In addition to the expenditure involved in purchasing land for reserves, much more must be spent in ridding a reserve of vermin and in taking

adequate fire precautions. For this reason it is understandable that farmers are often critical of reserves. If neighbouring landholders are prepared to help maintain and control the reserves I shall be pleased to consider instituting a system whereby they can become honorary wardens.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1239.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The changes in the law that the Leader proposes to make fall into five general categories. I have obtained information from the Department of Industry on these amendments and the categories into which they fall, and I shall give a brief description of these amendments as I see them. The first amendment is to require that in the first three years of apprenticeship, all technical instruction of apprentices shall be given during normal working hours for a period of not less than 12 hours a week, or, in the case of apprentices in the country receiving technical instruction by correspondence, of not less than six hours a week.

At present the Act provides for the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, to prescribe both the time during which and the occasion when apprentices shall attend a technical school or class of instruction. In fact, apprentices are now required to attend classes for four hours a week during normal working hours and two hours a week in their own time in the evenings. The only reason that the Leader of the Opposition gave for the change he proposes was that, "There is no valid reason why they should be required to attend classes during their leisure time." The principle of all day-time training for apprentices has been accepted in two of the Australian States, but not in all of them. Thousands of students attend evening classes at the university and the Institute of Technology, and also when studying for accountancy diplomas. I cannot see why apprentices should not attend some classes during their leisure time. After all, they are attending for their own future benefit.

I am unaware of the reason why the Bill seeks that not less than 12 hours a week, instead of the present six hours, shall be devoted to technical instruction. This appears to overlook the fact that the instruction in the trades schools is designed to supplement and not to dominate the practical training

given to apprentices by their employers. Apprentices in country districts who receive technical instruction by correspondence will be entitled, under the Bill, to be granted six hours during normal working hours to undertake work incidental to the correspondence course. There is no similar provision at present.

The second change to which I wish to refer is that no employer is to be permitted to employ an apprentice unless the Apprentices Board approves of the standard of the employer's place of employment and his qualifications to take apprentices and until the apprentice has reached an educational standard determined by the board. Up to the present an indenture of apprenticeship has in this State been regarded as a matter between the employer, the apprentice, and his parents. It is true, however, that there have been cases where an employer has entered into a contract to teach an apprentice a trade when the employer himself has not been a tradesman and is not in a position to instruct the boy in the trade, nor does he have the facilities to do so.

There does seem to be ground for requiring some approval of an employer before he can employ apprentices, but in my opinion that approval should only be required of employers who employ an apprentice for the first time. Also, if the Apprentices Board requires any investigation before giving such approval, it would be more appropriate that the investigation and recommendation be made by the Chief Inspector of Factories instead of by a trade committee. There does not appear to be much merit in requiring all boys to have a minimum educational standard before they learn a trade, even though the standards may well vary between the various trades. Many who are good tradesmen today would have been disqualified from learning their trade had this been the case. I am of the opinion that it would be far more realistic to shorten the period of indenture for boys who commence their indentures with pre-apprenticeship training or with a high educational standard, for instance, with the Leaving standard.

The third alteration proposed by the Leader refers to the period of probation and date of signing the indenture. The Bill seeks to require the probationary period to be reduced from the present six months to three months, and also provides that the indenture should be signed within 28 days of the commencement of the apprenticeship, the same period to apply to assignments. It would, of course, be possible

for the indenture to be terminated by either party within the probationary period. I entirely agree with those proposals.

The fourth alteration it is proposed to make is to extend the age of apprenticeship. At present the Act provides that no person shall become apprenticed to any trade after he becomes 20 years of age, and, further, that the indentures of apprenticeship no longer bind the parties thereto after the apprentice becomes 21 years of age. The Bill seeks to relax the latter restriction to permit the indenture to continue to operate until the age of 22 years, and, by agreement between the parties, until 23 years. Personally, I do not understand the reason for the age restrictions in the Act. I agree with the proposal in the Bill. In fact, I consider that the age limit could possibly be relaxed a little more. However, as the Leader said in explaining the Bill, the provision is in line with most Commonwealth awards.

The fifth proposal that the Leader has mentioned is the creation of boards of reference to investigate matters arising out of indentures of apprenticeship, with power to transfer, assign or cancel indentures of apprenticeship. The Bill provides that the Industrial Registrar or his nominee shall be chairman of each board of reference which, besides the chairman, shall consist of two employers' representatives and two employees' representatives. Section 30 of the Act now provides that the Apprentices Board has power to investigate any matter arising out of an indenture, on the application of any party to the indenture. The Bill provides that the appropriate trade union shall also have the right to apply to a board of reference to investigate. No reason has been advanced by the Leader as to why new boards should be created to take over part of the powers of the Apprentices Board. I do, however, agree that provision should be made to enable approval to be given to transfers, assignments and cancellations of indentures, but it would be more appropriate for this to be done by the Apprentices Board rather than by a board of reference. Section 35 provides for the Chief Inspector or any other person authorized by him to have the power to enter and inspect any premises on which any apprentice in any trade is employed.

I should like to make two other general observations on this matter. Last year the Apprentices Board submitted a report to the Minister of Education concerning an amending Bill which was introduced by the late Leader of the Opposition, Mr. O'Halloran, in

1958. I also understand that the board is considering certain other proposals for amendments to the Act. Also, the question of the training of an adequate number of skilled tradesmen, sufficient for the requirements of industry, is currently being considered on a national basis. The Secretary for Labour and Industry (Mr. Bowes) was a member of a tripartite study group (which consisted of representatives of employer principals, senior trade union officials, and both Commonwealth and State Government officers) which met in February of this year to discuss many aspects of the training for skill. Further conferences on the means of overcoming shortages of tradesmen were not held because of an application made to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. On September 26 last Sir Richard Kirby, President of the commission, in addressing the parties to that application, said, *inter alia*:

The real remedy to the national problem requires a getting together of representatives of employers and employees generally and of appropriate representatives of the Commonwealth and the States.

With the agreement of the parties, he requested the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service to arrange for the calling together into conference of the types of representative person mentioned. The views of the parties and of the Commonwealth Minister will be given to the commission next Friday.

We see that apart from the amendments the Leader has submitted there has been an investigation under discussion. Certain investigations have been undertaken by the State and the Commonwealth authorities arising out of a Bill the late Leader introduced—and other amendments, incidentally, proposed by the department. Over-riding all this, there has been a move by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission to initiate a review of this important matter on a national scale.

The subject matter of the Bill that the Leader has introduced is probably one of the most important problems confronting us in Australia today. Honourable members have only to look at the newspapers, particularly towards the end of the week, to see the number of positions that are open for people with qualifications: there are pages and pages of advertisements for positions that cannot be filled. On the other hand, 90,000 to 100,000 people in Australia are classified as unemployed. I think I have only to mention that fact to emphasize that the question of the training of personnel today is probably one of the

most important questions that this or any other Parliament or authority in Australia could consider. We have tremendous requirements for trained persons but on the other hand many people are unemployed principally because they do not possess the technical qualifications to accept positions that may be open to them. Why is it that our present apprenticeship system has broken down or has not been adequate? I suppose the reason is that many employers will not be bothered undertaking apprentice training. It is a far cry from the time when to become apprenticed a boy had to pay something to his employer. Now, not only does the employer not get any bonus for accepting an apprentice (I am not suggesting that he should) but he has a considerable obligation in connection with his training. Generally speaking, the Leader's Bill imposes even more obligations on the employer. At a time when we are experiencing difficulty in getting employers to accept apprentices, this Bill imposes on them more obligations than those existing now.

Although many of the amendments contained in this Bill would, I believe, be desirable, the purpose for which it was introduced is not served by its clauses. I think that the extra obligations it places on employers will mean not that they will undertake further obligations in taking on additional apprentices but that it will be more difficult for a young man to find an employer who has the qualifications and the desire to take on an apprentice. Recently we have had to instruct Government departments to increase the taking on of apprentices because in present day conditions many employers will simply not be bothered with the job of training apprentices. I am not saying they are justified in that attitude; I am merely stating that this is a fact. The Leader's Bill will not have the effect of creating more willingness to take on apprentices but it will have the definite effect of making it much harder for a lad to get a suitable opportunity to become apprenticed.

As I have pointed out, a real move is now being made on a national basis to get apprenticeship and training on the widest possible scale. I have often wondered why adequate training is limited to young people and why we are not prepared, for instance, to enable intelligent people over 23 (or whatever the age is) who want to learn a trade from doing so. Why is it that the doors are so rigidly closed to them that they face so many real

difficulties in following a trade? If the conference being suggested by the President of the Arbitration Commission can do something that will enable more training to be successfully undertaken, I would support to the utmost any proposition put by the commission to provide that some of the people who, not having qualifications, are without jobs, be assisted to get the qualifications and the jobs. As I have said, there are vacant positions in many categories.

For the reasons I have given, I ask the House not to pass the Bill at this stage. In the first place, this measure makes piecemeal amendments, some of which are good and some of which, in my opinion, are bad, at a time when the whole subject of training must be brought up on a national scale and in a national plan. Even if the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission were not dealing with the matter and conferences were not being held actively at the moment, on balance I believe that the Bill would not aid us to get more apprentices successfully trained. I believe it will have the effect of increasing the disregard that some employers have of their obligations regarding taking on new apprentices. I believe that this topic is one of great importance. That I am not supporting the Leader's Bill is not an indication that I do not approve of what he is seeking to do—to improve the apprenticeship system. What I am saying is that one or two provisions of the Bill would militate against its success and, more than that, would aggravate the problem of getting employers to take on apprentices.

Mr. Jennings: Couldn't that be ironed out in Committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Leader has not indicated that he is prepared to accept amendments in Committee about that matter.

Mr. Shannon: We do not know that those amendments will be those referred to by the commission when it has heard evidence.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Apart from that, I am speaking only of the Bill as it stands. The clauses that add to the problem of getting employers to accept apprentices are undesirable at present. I believe I have given a fair résumé of the clauses as I see them, and I do not object to some. The provisions dealing with probation and the date of signing an indenture seem to be highly desirable.

Mr. Lawn: With a little bit of persuasion we could induce you to support the lot in Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Once before this session I seem to have been caught in that way when I supported a Bill in the House, and later was unsuccessful in deleting a clause in Committee.

Mr. LAWN: Have a second try with this one!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When one has had that experience once, one is foolish if one does not learn by previous mistakes.

Mr. LAWN: You can always try again!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Returning to the Bill itself, at a time when the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission is seriously taking up the problem, with the active assistance of both employers and employees, on a national basis, I feel that in those circumstances it is rather inopportune for us to start making what is, after all, only a limited number of amendments to what may be a Bill requiring a wide range; in fact, probably this legislation will come out with an entirely new conception of a training scheme. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): It is good to hear the Premier admit that this is an important Bill and also to hear his approval of certain clauses, but it is an unhappy experience to hear him say almost precisely what he said in 1958 when opposing a Bill then introduced by members on this side of the House, when he said that the matter should be referred to further inquiry. Now, apparently, the results of this inquiry have just come to hand after four years and we do not seem to be any farther advanced in regard to the Premier's attitude on this important matter.

Mr. JENNINGS: And the Government has done nothing about it.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Precisely. I will deal with some of the Premier's objections, for a start, and then more particularly with the various clauses of the Bill. The Premier has said that this matter is either about to become or already is the subject of a Commonwealth inquiry on a nation-wide basis, which of itself illustrates the importance of the matter. He went on to say that the question of training persons for industry was very important indeed because, from one point of view, of the many unemployed people most were unemployed because they lacked technical training. I think no-one would deny that. He went on to say that the apprenticeship provisions in the Commonwealth legislation had proved inadequate; in fact, he went so far as to say that they had broken down, and he could not understand why it was that the people interested in apprenticeship, mostly from a trade union point of view,

were opposed to the training of people over a certain age.

There are good reasons why there have been and still are strong objections to some of the schemes put up for training along apprenticeship lines people who have got beyond the age of normal apprenticeship. Anyone who has worked in industry will know that many of the attempts made along these lines have been made simply with the idea of breaking down industrial conditions. Many employers have endeavoured to get industrial work into a far greater series of classifications than have been laid down in awards, with a view to paying lower wages for certain classifications. This has resulted to some extent from the division of work in industry, the growth of repetitive work on certain types of machines, and the desire of the employers to get people working certain types of machines into specific classifications at lower rates of pay. If employers can give people technical training over the age of ordinary apprenticeship, then they may be able to work them into these special classifications and use them at a lower rate of pay than that at which they could use the fully apprenticed tradesman. This is a serious objection from a trade union point of view.

It may be that in the discussions that will take place on a Commonwealth basis this problem will be looked at frankly and a proper understanding of it arrived at because of the fear that the apprenticeship system will be broken down and that, because of its breaking down, apprenticeship will become less attractive to young people—which everybody here would agree would be detrimental to industry in general. It is because of this fear that there has been so much opposition to the training of people over normal apprenticeship ages—the fear of breaking down conditions in industry. That is the answer to this problem. When everybody can be assured that it is not the aim at present to break down the industrial conditions that now pertain to the tradesmen and their incentive to go into apprenticeship training, we may be getting somewhere; but, so far, no concrete evidence has been produced along those lines. What the Premier seems to overlook is that on every hand all the authorities are saying that in this age of technical advance apprentices must have a better training than they have had hitherto. I have listened to addresses from many of the best authorities on this question, and they all urge apprentices to continue their studies further because of the technical advances of this age, because the apprentice with only the training

of the past will not be adequate to meet the demands of either the present or the future.

Our Bill is designed to give the apprentice that better training. The Premier says that it will probably have the effect of making it more difficult for an apprentice to secure employment, to get employers willing to take on apprentices; but, whether the Commonwealth in its discussions solves the problem or not, it will undoubtedly agree that a higher standard of education for apprentices is necessary. The Bill aims in every respect to raise the technical training of apprentices and no-one will deny that this is desirable and necessary in the interests of the country as a whole. I shall enlarge on that later to show how the clauses to which the Premier objects are in fact aimed at this objective and that, therefore, they are desirable, irrespective of how the employers may react.

Let us suppose that employers react as the Premier suggests they will. By not passing this Bill, we do not improve the situation at all. At present the employers have not been taking all the apprentices they can take under the various legislations in the States. I believe they have been taking only about 75 per cent of the apprentices they could take. Whether they will do the same if this Bill is passed or whether they will take fewer apprentices, it still does not detract from the fact that the apprentice of tomorrow has to have a better training than hitherto. By giving him a better training we are not spoiling the whole position for apprentices. If employers refuse to take on apprentices, obviously the Commonwealth Government must take some action. In introducing this Bill we have certainly not sought to suggest what should happen to those employers who do not engage the number of apprentices needed for industry. That is a Commonwealth matter with which we are unable to deal. We are dealing with what comes within the State's purview—improved training for apprentices.

Ample evidence can be supplied to prove that what we propose is desirable. It has been commented upon favourably by the authorities that have examined this matter. We are not putting this proposal forward unsupported by evidence. The Premier objected to the day-time training of 12 hours a week in the employer's time. He said that we had given no reason for the introduction of 12 hours' technical instruction instead of the present six hours. The reason is that it is necessary. I recently heard the Principal of the Institute of Technology say how necessary it is for the apprentices of tomorrow to have a better technical training than

apprentices had in the past. Better training is obtained by increasing the number of hours during which an apprentice has technical study. I draw members' attention to a fact which the Premier did not mention in this regard. The Premier referred to the first portion of the provision relating to the attendance at a technical school but did not refer to the second part which states:

Provided further that any apprentice who has failed to reach the required standard after the third year of his apprenticeship may be required to attend such technical school or class for instruction outside the normal hours of his employment.

That is an incentive to the apprentice to make sure that he does attain the necessary standard while he receives tuition during his hours of employment. If he does not, he must attain that standard in his own time. This is a desirable provision. We are trying to make apprentices better and more qualified to meet the needs of this day.

In referring to clause 6 the Premier said that there was no provision in the Act at present to require an apprentice to perform theoretical or practical work incidental to a correspondence course. That is so, but we have appreciated the need for a better technical training of an apprentice who is doing a correspondence course. We are making it obligatory for an apprentice to have the necessary hours available to him during his hours of employment so that we can ensure a better standard of training for him. That is perfectly logical and it fits in with the previous clause. Again, we provide the same incentive—the incentive that if he does not reach the required standard during that time then he must continue the course of instruction outside his normal hours of employment. These provisions are provided for two specific purposes—to raise the standard and qualifications of apprentices and to provide the incentive to apprentices to attain these higher standards. I do not think any authority would deny that these objectives are desirable and essential.

Clause 7 requires the board to approve of places of employment and the educational standard of apprentices. This is an attempt to raise the standard of apprentices. People who have knowledge of various places where apprentices are employed realize that some are excellent and provide everything an apprentice could need—a wide range of work, adequate facilities, proper instructors and proper supervision in every respect. On the other hand, in some places apprentices have no variety of work, facilities are inadequate and

there is no proper training. In fact, such places are ill equipped to accommodate apprentices. What is the ultimate result of that? A lad goes there with the best of hopes for a good training as an apprentice, but after a while he discovers that he will not get that training. His parents, who possibly had no experience of what was required, agreed that he should work in that establishment. He could waste two or three years before he or his parents realized just what the situation was, and by then it would be too late for him to start again. In other words, that lad's future is ruined so far as his apprenticeship to a trade is concerned. This is an important matter in the life of a young man who has before him a vision of doing something good as a skilled tradesman. Surely it is worth while having in this Bill a provision to prevent an employer from taking on apprentices unless his place is properly equipped for their training. If we are to raise the standard of apprentices, it is essential to provide protection for the young man who aspires to be a skilled tradesman.

The Premier said that the second part of this clause did not appear to have any merit. It deals with the educational standard of the intended apprentice and it provides that the apprentice must reach a standard determined by the board on the recommendation of the appropriate trade committee. The Premier said that there were many good tradesmen who had only a comparatively low educational standard. They were good tradesmen and they had not been obliged to comply with a requirement of this type. I am surprised that this sort of argument should be advanced. It is as good as saying, "What was good enough for my father is good enough for me." That statement is not applicable in this age. It is essential that the apprentices of today should have a proper educational standard. I can remember only too well in years gone by, when apprentices were difficult to get, lads with an inadequate education being admitted to industry. A year or so after they had been apprenticed, they found themselves incapable, in mathematics particularly, of going any further, because they had not had the grounding: they had not reached the initial standard that would enable them to fully complete their apprenticeship. There again, there was disappointment, and possibly it meant a lad giving up his job when he was half-way through his apprenticeship, simply because no inquiry had been made into whether he had the initial training necessary in order to complete his apprenticeship course. With the higher

requirements in engineering today, it is essential that a student attain a certain standard in mathematics if he is to accomplish an engineering apprenticeship.

Mr. Frank Walsh: What about the automotive apprentices?

Mr. LOVEDAY: They are on a similar basis. Here again, greater technical knowledge is required, and unless the base of education is there the superstructure cannot be built. The Premier agreed with our proposals in clause 8 whereby we suggest that the indentures of apprenticeship should be signed by all parties thereto within a period of 28 days. I will say no more on that subject except that I have known many instances where there was a failure on the part of the employer to sign indentures that should have been signed months or sometimes a year or more prior to the time when they were actually signed. This is a very necessary provision.

In the same way, clause 8 (b) deals with the question of the signing of transfers within 28 days, and this again is a necessary provision because of inordinate delays that have taken place when apprentices have been transferred from one employer to another. We are pleased that the Premier agrees with that provision. Clause 9 deals with the age of apprentices, and here we consider that where the apprentice cannot complete his full term of apprenticeship before reaching his 22nd birthday, he can by agreement with his employer serve his apprenticeship until he reaches the age of 23. At present the limit is 21 years of age. There are quite good reasons why the age should be extended. We are pleased that the Premier agrees with this, because obviously it is to the advantage of everyone concerned.

The next two clauses strike out sections 30 and 32 of the principal Act with a view to the introduction of clause 13 of this Bill, which provides for the appointment of boards of reference for each apprenticeship trade. It provides that the boards of reference will consist of two employers' representatives and two employees' representatives, with the Registrar of the South Australian Industrial Court or his nominee acting as the chairman of each such board of reference. The Premier went on to say that no reason was given for the creation of new boards of reference. He explained that there was an advisory board dealing with apprentices and that he could see no reason why that was not sufficient. However, I point out that that board has limited powers. In dealing with various industries it has been found that there are many different

problems involved owing to the division of work and the specialization of work, and therefore it is desirable that there be separate boards of reference in order that those boards may be conversant with the problems of each industry. This is followed in the Department of Labour and Industry in dealing with all the applications that come from migrants to this country who claim to have the qualifications of tradesmen. Each trade has a special committee set up to examine the claims of these people. The reason for this is that there are separate and associated problems with each of these industries, and it is necessary to be conversant with the problems of the particular industry in order that proper decisions may be reached.

In this respect we are following the lines that have been found necessary in other similar matters. We say that these boards of reference are necessary in order that people who are dealing with the problems of the apprentice in a particular industry shall be conversant with those problems. Surely that is the right approach, particularly—as the Premier has said—because of the importance of apprenticeship training in the future of Australia. If we admit that, we must admit that the people who are dealing with the various problems should be conversant with the matters that they are discussing. Let us see what other authorities have to say on these matters. I refer now to the Commonwealth-State Apprentices Inquiry which arose out of a resolution carried by the Premiers' conference in September 1950. This resolution approved a joint examination of apprenticeship matters. It is interesting to note that that body reported on March 15, 1958, in regard to South Australian administration:

In South Australia, administrative supervision is not as close as in other States, and there is no single Statute or portion of a Statute which provides a complete code. Provisions for the technical education of apprentices are separated from the regulation of their working conditions.

These are the things which we hope to amend, and obviously from the trend of that remark I suggest that we are proceeding along the lines suggested in the report. Regarding administration, the report recommends that the local body charged with the task of administration must carry out a day-to-day administration of the apprenticeship system. Again, this points to the importance of the provisions that we are enunciating in this Bill; in other words, they fit in with the report of this committee. The committee also reports that no employer should be allowed to employ a youth as a

probationer or indenture him as an apprentice without the approval of the apprenticeship authority. Turning to day-time training, the report had this to say:

As regards day-time attendance for compulsory technical education, five members of the committee, including the chairman, recommend that wholly day-time attendance be accepted in principle as Government policy and adopted as an objective to be implemented over a period of years. Four members, including the chairman, suggest a period of, say, five years. The other four members would recommend that something like one-third of school attendance for compulsory technical education be evening attendances.

We are not glossing over the fact that the recommendation in this regard was not unanimous, but we point out that most members of the committee recommended that full day-time attendance be accepted in principle as Government policy and adopted as an objective to be implemented over a period of years.

Mr. Shannon: Did it give the hours?

Mr. LOVEDAY: No, but in dealing with the question of hours I previously said we were suggesting the increase because of the great need for improved technical standards in this age. Regarding the overseas position, the committee said:

It has similarly been a movement of steady growth in other countries. We have noted, for example, amongst other information that Great Britain has affirmed, by the provisions of the Education Act, 1944, the principle of the continued education for one full day a week of all young people from 15 to 18 years not in full-time attendance at school. In Great Britain also advisory councils in a number of industries have within recent times adopted provisions for the day-time attendance of apprentices at technical school classes for eight hours a week for three years. In England, whereas in 1937-38 some 40,000 students were released by their employers for one day a week to attend technical schools, in 1952-53 the number had increased to 300,000. In the United States of America the majority of the States have legislated for the part-time day attendance at special classes of young workers in industry and in a number of European countries the compulsory attendance of apprentices at technical schools for day-time instruction up to a day a week was in operation for years before the Second World War.

It can be seen from this that what we are suggesting is in line with trends elsewhere, where the need for a higher standard of technical education has obviously been recognized. What happens in regard to some apprentices who have to leave home at an early hour in the morning, work all day, and then attend classes at night has been mentioned in this House before. On occasions they are absent from home for between 15 and 16 hours, and that is not desirable. This Bill has as its object the

much closer supervision of apprenticeship work in general, and on this particular matter the committee to which I referred had this to say:

We are strongly of opinion that supervisors should be considered an essential part of the administrative machinery in any apprenticeship scheme. They should be tradesmen and ideally should have some training in one or more of the social sciences as well as the interest and personality required for this important work. Their duties should include personal contact with apprentices at their places of work in the interests of their welfare, amicable relations between them and their employers, and satisfactory working conditions.

Where this class of supervision is carried out and apprentices have a wide variety of work, it is remarkable how easy it is for them later to obtain anywhere in the Commonwealth situations of a more responsible character than the ordinary run-of-the-mill apprentice. From my own experience I know that apprentices trained at the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited receive a thorough training. They have a most excellent workshop and a sound scheme of technical training in and out of the workshop, and when they finish their apprenticeship they have no difficulty in securing good jobs elsewhere. In fact, those who have gone on from that particular form of apprenticeship have often achieved high positions in the technical sphere of engineering. That in itself indicates the value of this type of advice. As the Premier said, the newspapers contain many advertisements calling for men possessing these qualifications. It is only by putting the apprentice system on a much more sound and better supervised basis that we can get men who have these qualifications. If we raise the standard of the apprentice, I feel sure we will make apprenticeship more attractive. We must guard against breaking down conditions in the trade if we are to keep it attractive to the young man who wants to become a skilled tradesman. In the 1958 report of the Apprenticeship Commission of Victoria, supervision was dealt with as follows:

Much is involved in the training of apprentices if they are to become skilled craftsmen and close supervision is essential. The training in the employer's workshop is, of course, of fundamental importance and the commission considers that the supervision of this practical training is one of its most important obligations. In addition, there are the many day-to-day problems arising concerning the responsibilities of employers, apprentices and parents, complaints of absence from technical schools and many other matters all requiring investigation. The work of supervision and investigation is carried out by a staff of 21 trained supervisors, most of whom are skilled tradesmen.

This again emphasizes the necessity for having the supervision proposed in this Bill over the

class of workshop in which people are apprenticed. Without that supervision the high standard of skill will not be maintained and the high standard of training that is required now will not be possible.

I think it is most unfortunate that the Premier dealt with this Bill in the way he did, even if what he said were true—that it might cause some employers to be more reluctant to take on apprentices. Whatever is done, if we are to meet the needs of this technical age the provisions suggested by this Bill are necessary. If they are not passed in this House within the next few days they will have to be passed in the near future because, whatever employers may do, a higher standard of training and supervision is essential. We as a State cannot say what the employers must do in this regard but surely we should pass this Bill knowing that what it contains is absolutely necessary to achieve the better standards of skill in industry that are necessary to meet the needs of this age. We could then meet the problem of what the employers would or would not do. We should not be crossing our bridges regarding what the employer will do. If an employer needs some incentive and encouragement to employ more apprentices, the Commonwealth Government can take the necessary action, but it is necessary to have the provisions of this Bill in operation to achieve what we are after. I hope that, notwithstanding what the Premier has said, the Bill will have the support of the House.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): This is a serious and important subject, and I respect the views put forward by the member for Whyalla. Obviously he is aware of the conditions that exist in many factories, as he should be because he comes from a district that has one of the best equipped workshops for apprentice training in Australia. I think all members agree that Australia is suffering from a shortage of skilled tradesmen. There is no question about that. This shortage is more serious than most members realize, and certainly far more serious than most members of the public realize, because the shortage of tradesmen will retard and affect the future development of this State and of Australia as a whole.

It is not generally realized how acute this shortage is. Earlier today, mention was made of the many advertisements appearing in the daily press, but that is only one aspect of the matter. Many jobs I know of are being held up in workshops through the shortage of competent and well trained tradesmen. Where they are not available, other types of employee have to be used—rather along the lines of the

ditutees who were employed during and after the Second World War. Today, there is more employment in secondary industry in South Australia than in all the primary industries. We must appreciate the importance of this shortage of tradesmen in the years to come. Linked with that, we must appreciate also that apprenticeship is the main source of supply of tradesmen. In fact, apart from immigration, it is probably the sole means of supplying tradesmen for the future of this State. It is advisable to train our apprentices in our own ways of manufacturing and our own customs. Occasionally, migrants come to this country with young children who, in turn, are apprenticed here. I personally have taken over at least two indentures of lads coming from Germany who have trained for part of their apprenticeship in Germany, and I have enabled them to complete their indentures here. They have become first-rate tradesmen in Australia. So apprentice recruitment must be stepped up to preserve the development of this country.

We, as members of Parliament and of the public, should do all in our power to facilitate the recruitment of apprentices and encourage employers to accept more apprentices within their own concerns. So I desire, as we all do, to increase the number of apprentices available to industry. When I heard the Leader announce that he intended to introduce a Bill on apprentices, I thought, "This could be the answer to a maiden's prayer. Perhaps it will contain provisions to overcome this problem of the shortage of apprentices."

That was my reaction, but I was disappointed because, on reading the Bill and the Leader's speech, I soon realized that the Bill would tend to defeat the very object I was hoping it would provide for. There is not even one positive suggestion in this Bill (I make this as a general comment) about how more apprentices can be obtained for industry, how even only one more apprentice can be obtained. I do not want to be severe but it seems to me that this Bill is almost specifically designed to make it harder for apprentices to be absorbed into industry—it certainly makes it more difficult for a company to obtain and engage apprentices. No incentive is given here. As I said earlier, I believe it is essential for the good of South Australia and of Australia as a whole that we obtain and absorb more apprentices into industry.

Most of my comments are related to the metal trades industry, which is of course the largest of the various craft industries and is

used often as a yardstick by the industrial commissions in establishing awards. I use this as a basis because last year there was a total of 1,379 apprentices for all trades here in South Australia, of whom 783 were absorbed into the metal trades industry; so about 63 per cent of all apprentices are absorbed into the metal trades industry, compared with a mere 200 absorbed into the building trade.

But my comments on the building trade apply to other trades also, except that certain trades do, I admit, require more schooling than others, and it is equally true to say that some trades require much less training. My comments are based on personal experience of being able to see this work from both sides, both as an apprentice and as a person who has employed apprentices. The apprenticeship system today has advanced enormously and improved greatly over the years. We all know the historical background, so I shall not go over it, from the days when it was regarded as a privilege by parents to have their lads trained, when they paid a commission, bonus or retaining fee to a master to train their boy. Now, thank goodness, we live under more enlightened conditions and the apprentice has more advantages and facilities available to him than hitherto, which is right. I support that.

Mr. Jenkins: Also, he is paid.

Mr. COURCE: Yes. I was paid when I was an apprentice or I would have kicked up a fuss.

Mr. Jenkins: Did you earn it?

Mr. COURCE: I do not say I earned it. I deplore any move to break down this apprenticeship system and I support any move to improve it. I hasten to agree with the Leader in some of his suggestions, which I sincerely believe would improve this legislation; but, at the same time, I strongly oppose others, which, in my opinion, would be a retrograde step. I shall oppose as strongly as I can any move tending to break down the apprenticeship system and to make it more difficult for apprentices to be absorbed into our trades today. As I have said, this Bill defeats this desire to absorb more apprentices and makes it harder for employers to have the opportunity to train more apprentices. Why do I say that? I will give the House, briefly, two reasons. If we look at the cost structure (I am not saying that this is the only thing to be considered but it must be taken into consideration) to an employer, whether he be a large company or a small company, of training an apprentice, first of all the wages paid to an apprentice (which are set by award) are not the main cost to an

employer. If we take the metal trades as an example, we must realize that during the first year an employer gets little or no return from an apprentice. The time taken in training him must be considered when assessing the cost of the scheme. An apprentice often ties up a machine, which would otherwise be operated by a tradesman and provide a return on the capital invested in it. The employer, in engaging an apprentice, is willing to accept that responsibility and to train the apprentice. He undertakes that obligation, but an apprentice can tie up an extremely costly machine. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, in Mr. Loveday's district, has one of the finest workshops in the State. It has an expensive plant which would be beyond the financial means of many smaller employers. A manufacturer must get some return on his machines, so obviously a first-year apprentice is not trained on the most expensive machine. Often an apprentice is training on a test piece, and sometimes on something for a production job. If an apprentice is half-way through a job and he has to leave it to attend school the machine is tied up for a day. These are factors that must be considered in the cost of training an apprentice. If the Leader's suggestion that the four hours at school be increased to 12 hours, these problems will be magnified. At present, instead of an apprentice spending four hours a week at school the practice is for him to attend school for eight hours every other week. This suits the Education Department and the employers, and is a good procedure.

The question of spoilage must be considered. It is difficult to estimate how much spoilage accounts for during the early training of apprentices. I have seen in my workshop and elsewhere jobs well advanced towards completion on which spoilage has been caused by an apprentice. An employer often gives an apprentice an opportunity of working on jobs to get the training he must receive, but unfortunately spoilage occurs. It is a risk that must be taken, but it adds to the cost structure. What will be the natural reaction of employers faced with this cost problem to the suggestion that the period of training at school be increased? At present employers are willing and prepared to accept and train apprentices, although there is no legal obligation on any employer to take one apprentice. Employers accept this as a moral obligation in the interests of their own trade and they hope that when an apprentice completes his indenture he will remain with the company in which he has been trained. Today most tradesmen are paid

over-award rates. Unfortunately, what happens frequently is that the company that trains an apprentice does not receive the benefit of that training because the apprentice either strikes out on his own—which is an admirable action—or he transfers to an opposition company. I have seen that happen frequently, and it is rather frustrating to an employer when it happens.

Mr. Loveday: If all training were raised to a high standard the movement of apprentices would not adversely affect employers.

Mr. COURCEL: Surely the honourable member does not expect me to believe that! I am not that idealistic. The cost structure is assuming greater proportions today not merely because of over-award wages but because of the other costs that arise. We are faced with a shortage of tradesmen and apprentices, not only because we have more factories but because of the growing reluctance of employers to accept and train apprentices. This is a fact of life that cannot be denied. Costs are spiralling, yet the Opposition suggests that these costs should be increased. The natural corollary is that there will be less incentive for employers to train apprentices. Incidentally, if we do provide that an apprentice shall receive 12 hours' training at school each week, what will be the position in the hair-dressing trade? How could an apprentice in that trade advantageously put in 12 hours a week at school learning various facets of the trade? I do not know how much a man's haircut or a woman's permanent wave would cost.

I remind the House that the signing of indentures is a tripartite agreement between the employer, the apprentice, and the parent or guardian of the apprentice. The employer undertakes to train the apprentice; the apprentice undertakes, when he signs the indenture, to learn and study the trade of fitter and turner, boilermaker, hairdresser or whatever it may be, to the best of his ability; and the parent agrees to submit the apprentice to the care of the employer. Now it is suggested that the apprentice is expected to undertake all his technical education in the paid time of the employer. What about the apprentice playing his part by, in his own time, spending half the number of hours at technical school that he spends in the employer's time? What about his playing his part and receiving some voluntary education? That is the position at present: an apprentice undertakes two hours in his own time; in fact, it is compulsory for him to attend. He also has to attend for four hours in the employer's

time. After all, who will get the greatest amount of benefit from this scheme? Certainly the employer will get some benefit, but it is the apprentice who will get the greatest advantage. What he learns in his five years of apprenticeship, for only three years of which he has to go to school, will last him for the rest of his life. Surely, it is not too much to ask that he undertake two hours at night in his own time.

In was mentioned in this House that thousands of students attend the University of Adelaide, the Institute of Technology and other places at night. Why is it that of recent years all our high schools are packed every night of the week with workers' education and adult education classes? Who are those places packed by? By adults—most of them parents—who voluntarily go along to these classes to learn something more or to improve themselves and better their positions. All I am suggesting is that the present scheme should continue. The Opposition is suggesting that we do away with that entirely and that the whole of the schooling should be done in the day-time—in the employee's paid time. The people who go the farthest in this world are those who are prepared to work and to help themselves. We know of organizations in our own districts that achieve much because they are prepared to help themselves and not rely entirely on hand-outs from the Government.

I remind the House that the whole basis of apprenticeship training is that school work should be supplementary to the workshop training, not the other way around. School work should supplement the practical work, because, after all, it is a trade that is involved and not a theoretical undertaking. I think that too often that aspect is lost sight of. It is suggested that the trade committees should be set up to inspect employers' workshops in order to see whether those workshops are suitable for the training of apprentices. In effect, they are to see whether the employers themselves are suitable persons to train apprentices. We should take a look at where we are going in this. It seems that a board of reference is to set the standard, and I ask: what is the yardstick to be used in the case of an existing workshop? Quite frankly, I would not know, and certainly a board of reference would not know. Is an old-fashioned workshop that has trained apprentices for years to be denied the right to train apprentices? What about the modern and highly mechanized factory? Is the work there to be considered too narrow and defined, not giving the apprentice a broad enough training? I do not know, and I suggest

the board of reference would not know. Is the old-fashioned establishment to be told that before it can train an apprentice it has to scrap its old plant and put in modern and very expensive equipment? I know what the reaction would be: no more apprentices. On the other hand, is the highly modern factory, with expensive equipment that may be designed for a particular project, to be told by the board of reference, "You cannot train apprentices on this production; before you can have apprentices you have to go in for a new type of production to broaden the output of your product"? In other words, in this board of reference to be able to dictate to employers how they must run their businesses? That is the question I pose.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Wouldn't that board of reference consider all the circumstances?

Mr. CUMBE: That is what I have just been posing. I have quoted the case of the old workshop that possibly has been training apprentices for 60 or 70 years.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Those old-fashioned workshops turned out some pretty good tradesmen.

Mr. CUMBE: I agree entirely. The best apprentices do not necessarily come from factories that have the best equipment: often they come from factories that have equipment which, although serviceable, is a little on the old side. The apprentices who do not have the very best equipment on hand and have to learn their trade on an older type of machine have to make do and improvise in some instances. I do not want it to be thought that I am condoning the use of old-fashioned equipment. However, the motor mechanic would probably get a better training if he learned his trade on an old model vehicle, such as the T model Ford, rather than on a modern V8.

Mr. Loveday: There is another side to that argument, too.

Mr. CUMBE: I realize that. I am posing several questions as I see them.

Mr. Frank Walsh: If you keep on you will get the answer.

Mr. CUMBE: I am posing the questions as I see the practical difficulties.

Mr. Loveday: If you had an apprentice trained on a 1900 lathe, would you put him on the latest tool and cutter grinder?

Mr. CUMBE: No, not straight away, but perhaps I would in his fourth or fifth year. When I was being trained we had some modern machines but we also had some machines between 60 and 80 years old. In fact, we have a machine today that is about 90 years old, and although it is infrequently used it is still in operation.

Mr. Bywaters: Would you have an apprentice sweeping out the factory for the first two years?

Mr. COUMBE: I am approaching this subject in a practical and serious manner, and if the honourable member likes to make snide remarks like that—

Mr. Bywaters: Many people do what I have suggested.

Mr. COUMBE: The question we should ask ourselves is whether these provisions will encourage the recruitment of more apprentices, and my answer to that question is "No". I submit that these provisions regarding boards of reference would make it more difficult for employers to conform with the many requirements that the boards would demand. Quite frankly I would think that, seeing there is no legal obligation on them, the employers simply would not put up with it. In effect, the board would be telling them how to run their businesses, and it would certainly be interfering with their businesses. It would be an interference with a system that has worked for many years. That system, although it has some faults, mainly has worked very well. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) mentioned a certain case, and I know that this sort of thing has occurred. After all, a perfect system has never been evolved; there is always a rotten apple in every case. I think the honourable member would agree that, except for an isolated instance, the system has worked fairly well. In fact, a better system has not been evolved to take its place.

If a new company is being set up or a firm is employing apprentices for the first time, I admit there would be a valid case for inspections to be made, and I think that would be the way to start this. However, I think it would be extremely difficult to introduce it into existing workshops because, as they are of different standards, it would be difficult to establish a yardstick. I do not agree with the boards of reference proposed by the Bill. The advisory board is doing a good job and I think it is the proper authority to do this work. The advisory board consists of the Superintendent of Technical Schools as chairman, the Chief Inspector of Factories as deputy chairman, two persons nominated by the Minister (I do not know whether it is the Minister of Industry or the Minister of Education), two persons nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council, one person nominated by the South Australian Employers' Federation, and one nominated by the Chamber of Manufactures—a broad representation. I suggest this is the most competent body to deal with this matter.

Mr. Loveday: It is a little one-sided, isn't it?

Mr. COUMBE: In what way? There are two representatives of the United Trades and Labor Council and a representative from each of the Employers' Federation and the Chamber of Manufactures—two and two. There are also two representatives appointed by the Minister and two members of the Public Service.

Mr. Loveday: That is four to two without the other two.

Mr. COUMBE: Not necessarily, but perhaps I have not a suspicious mind like the honourable member's. The advisory board can delegate its powers, and all members know that factory inspectors visit factories. If the member for Unley wished to employ apprentices he would know as well as I that an inspector would come around to his factory to see if he was training them correctly, if his machinery was adequately guarded, if he had the correct number of toilets, and so on. The advisory board is the most competent body; a series of boards of reference would only make the thing creak. So many people would be involved that the right hand would not know what the left hand was doing, and someone would have to be chairman. The whole thing would be bogged down because of the number of people employed and the paper that would have to be used.

The educational standard has been mentioned in this debate. Of course, it is most difficult to get a standard to apply to all trades because many of the first-rate tradesmen we now have would not have been able to become apprentices if they had had to reach a certain academic standard. I do not think a suitable standard could be arrived at that would apply to all trades. Some trades might even be penalized if a standard were fixed. A move has been made in the last three or four years to introduce an educational standard at the conclusion of, not on entry to, an apprenticeship. At its trade schools, particularly at Kintore Avenue, the Education Department has introduced fourth-year and fifth-year training for the brighter students so that they can take advantage of recent technological advances, and that is a good move forward. This training can be done in the apprentice's own time so that he can improve himself, and I think by applying he can do some of the work in the employer's time. The Secretary of the Australian Society of Engineers, whom we all know is Mr. A. B. Thompson (a popular man), was reported in the *Advertiser* of September 28 to have said about the conference suggested by Sir Richard Kirby:

A conference of all parties concerned with apprenticeship could only produce "some good". Unions admitted a dearth of skilled tradesmen in engineering but certainly did not blame the apprenticeship system for producing this shortage.

I was pleased to note that Mr. McMahon, the Commonwealth Minister for Labour, recently said that he supported the movement for a conference.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Mr. Thompson is not opposed to the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. COURCELLE: I did not say he was; the honourable member is saying that.

Mr. Fred Walsh: I thought you were.

Mr. COURCELLE: I read the relevant part of the quotation. I agree with some of the amendments contained in this Bill but oppose others. I do not believe that I should speak on a Bill unless I can suggest remedies to improve the position. It has been suggested that this Bill could appropriately be introduced following on the conference that will be held, and that all suitable amendments could be put in together. I believe the apprenticeship system must be fostered and encouraged, and I think all members agree with me. As the best possible means of removing the shortage of tradesmen, I suggest there could be more encouragement of the present technical training in the fourth and fifth years of apprenticeship. My remarks are based on the metal trades, where this is being applied to the brighter students. The Education Department makes facilities available for them to take advantage of recent technological advances, and I think that type of thing should be encouraged. The extension of the age of an apprentice at entry and completion could, with adequate safeguards, be agreed to in special cases. The moment when a lad becomes 21 is the end of his apprenticeship, except in certain special circumstances. If an extension of the age of both entry and completion could, in some cases, be investigated, it would be most helpful, but certain safeguards would have to be written in to protect the apprentice and the trade union concerned. Also, the reduction of the mandatory limit of one apprentice to three tradesmen could be considered. I know that at this stage the relevant trade unions have opposed this. We are limited to one apprentice to three journeymen, which means there is a definite limit to the number of apprentices that can be employed in direct ratio to the number of journeymen available. Consideration should be given to reducing this ratio to one to two—of course, always under the oversight and within the jurisdiction of

the Apprentices Advisory Board. I make that clear because the reason why this was written into the Apprentices Act years ago was a genuine fear by the trade union representatives that employers would put younger men on and older men off. This should now be reviewed, with safeguards so that the advisory board can police it. This might have a big effect on increasing the number of apprentices that can be introduced into industry.

Then I suggest that parents be advised of these things. In fact, parents in many cases should wake up to their obligations and advise their children when they get to school-leaving age to go into a trade and learn it rather than go into what we call a "white collar" job purely for social reasons, because I sincerely believe that, depending on the type of lad we can get to take on apprenticeship, there will be a better future and certainly greater security for him if he learns a trade instead of going into a job where he is counter-jumping or pushing a pen all day. He will get greater security for the future because this training will at all times fit him for a job and train him to become a future executive in industry. Not only can he become a technician, as he will when he has completed his course, but he will become a technologist of the future—and it is a lack of technological skill that we are suffering today.

In conclusion, I put forward four or five practical solutions that I consider would be one way to overcome this problem of a shortage of apprentices, which has led to a shortage of tradesmen. My reason for opposing the Bill is not because I am opposed to better conditions for apprentices, not because I am opposed to further education for apprentices—because I fully support that; it is because I sincerely believe that, if this Bill is passed in its present form, it will act as a deterrent to employers' engaging more apprentices. That is my main reason for opposing it.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): With steady improvement in the various trades, it has become apparent that the Apprentices Act must be amended to suit present-day conditions. The call for more skilled tradesmen increases each day. They are needed for the future development of this State. Skilled workmen are hard to find these days, and helping apprentices for the future must help our State in general. Our amendments will lead to better apprentices who will learn a trade successfully. The setting up of a register of places of employment will better the chances of a young man interested in his trade to do a complete course; and to do a complete course makes for

better living for him in particular and people in general. These amendments afford an opportunity to a trade committee to approve an establishment that has not employed apprentices before. This trade committee would help both the apprentice and the employer; it would make the employer appreciate what is required of the apprentice at an early age. Firms with a good name have nothing to hide; they have been carrying on apprenticeships for a number of years and have turned out some fine apprentices. But there are other firms that have not done so well with their apprentices, and a review of their conditions would be a great help to the trade in general and to the apprentice in particular. Also, more scope would be given the apprentices by this trade committee. The more an apprentice can learn at an early age, the more it will benefit him in the future. We are short of tradesmen and I am sure that more scope in their five years of apprenticeship and their three years of schooling would be a great help.

The board of reference is highly commendable. It has proved a most successful procedure in Commonwealth industrial legislation. It comprises two employers, two employees, and a registrar with an industrial background as chairman. I have been to one of those meetings and found that the employer and the apprentice were given every opportunity to state their respective cases. It is encouraging to the parents and to the employer to know that this board of reference is sympathetic to the apprentice if he is good enough to carry on. This could help in more ways than one because sometimes apprentices do not wish to continue, and sometimes an employer does not require an apprentice. I favour the reduction of six months to three months. During that period an apprentice could lose some apprenticeship time by not attending school; also, by the end of three months an employer would know whether the young man had the aptitude to continue in his trade; it would give him an opportunity to employ another apprentice and keep his business in running order. This would greatly help the employer in the running of his business.

I listened to the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) speaking about the high cost to an employer of training an apprentice, suggesting that our Bill would increase that cost. Surely higher technical training will not be denied because of that? If what he says is correct, it is time the Commonwealth Government considered whether some inducement was necessary to ensure the employment of the maximum number of recruits. It is admitted that better technical training for our apprentices is neces-

sary. Surely our Bill provides for that. I commend the amendments, which provide for better apprentices in the future and, naturally, better tradesmen, and that is what we require in this State. Many projects are coming forward and opportunities for apprentices to learn trades thoroughly would help the State greatly.

I believe that the Government could include in its contracts to outside organizations a clause stating that apprentices should be employed. It may add to the cost of a project, but it would be a means of providing for this State's future requirements of skilled tradesmen. The Government spends much on projects in which apprentices could be employed. The provisions in this Bill call for give and take by employers and apprentices. An employer must provide for apprentices, and if he treats his apprentices well they will stick with him.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I do not suppose there has ever been a time when it has been more necessary for secondary industry to export than at present. If secondary industries are to compete on overseas markets it is essential that they establish overseas credits. Up to the present they have been living on the overseas credits created by the primary producers. The time is arriving when, because of increased cost of production, it will be impossible for primary production to provide the overseas credits to enable Australia's secondary industries to continue to expand as they are expanding. Secondary industries must work to export and create overseas credits for themselves. I cannot support the Bill because almost all of its provisions will make it more difficult for secondary industries to export in competition with other countries.

The Premier asked why the apprenticeship system had broken down. This was partly answered, but I believe there are two reasons for the breakdown in the system. The employer is partly responsible and, secondly, for many years we have had over-full employment when boys have been able to earn more money from other sources than they would have had they signed up for an apprenticeship. Consequently, we missed out on getting new apprentices. Certainly we got semi-skilled employees, but not the highly skilled tradesman. I know this for a fact. For every skilled man we employ, we get six who claim to be skilled but who prove to be semi-skilled. None served an apprenticeship.

Mr. Loveday: Do you think we should have a pool of unemployed in order to get apprentices?

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not say that, but it is one reason why the apprenticeship system

has broken down. The second reason is that employers have not used and are not using apprentices as they could. Certainly under the award they are limited. As the member for Torrens said, an employer is entitled to only one apprentice for every three skilled tradesmen he employs.

Mr. Loveday: But employers are not taking apprentices.

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly. I said that.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You did not know what he was talking about when he said that.

Mr. HEASLIP: I happen to know what I am talking about.

Mr. Fred Walsh: I don't think you do!

Mr. HEASLIP: I do, because I have several apprentices working for me. I signed them on. They are indentured, not only in the metal trades but in graphic arts and in air-conditioning. I know a little of what I am talking about.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Have you ever employed an apprentice?

Mr. HEASLIP: I already have a number of apprentices.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Down on the farm!

Mr. HEASLIP: I signed their indentures myself, and I know what I am talking about in this regard. I know that under the award an employer is permitted only one apprentice for every three skilled tradesmen he employs.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That is not so! Different awards vary.

Mr. HEASLIP: Under the Metal Trades Award—

Mr. Fred Walsh: Even under the Metal Trades Award the sections vary.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEASLIP: In welding, the three to one ratio applies. The same situation applies with fitters and turners. Both classifications come under the Metal Trades Award.

Mr. Fred Walsh: But that award has many sections.

Mr. HEASLIP: They are the biggest classifications.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Don't talk about the Metal Trades Award because you would not know much about it.

Mr. HEASLIP: With graphic arts, the ratio is one apprentice to every three skilled tradesmen.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What was the one you quoted in the Address in Reply? You would know more about that.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not speaking now on the Address in Reply.

The SPEAKER: No, we have had that.

Mr. HEASLIP: At present I have an apprentice bookbinder. He signed his indenture. In that trade it is a five-year apprenticeship. To be able to apprentice this lad I had to name the manager and sub-manager of the firm to be able to fulfil the requirements relating to three tradesmen. I could employ another apprentice, but under the award I am not permitted to do so. This apprentice has been working for 12 months and I believe he will be a successful tradesman.

Mr. McKee: Would it be cheaper labour to employ another apprentice?

Mr. HEASLIP: One reason why employers will not use apprentices is that they are not cheap labour but expensive labour. I advertised all over Australia for a pen ruler, but I could not get one. Ultimately I had to bring two pen rulers out from England. I provided homes for them, but after about five years one decided to return to England and I was one pen ruler short. I again advertised throughout the Commonwealth, but could not get a replacement. I then engaged an apprentice. That lad spent six months in the job before he signed his indenture. Today he is completing his indentureship, but unfortunately he cannot make up his time. In other words, he is too expensive to keep on. After five years' training he was not worth anything to us, and unfortunately no-one else would employ him. During those five years he held up a pen-ruling machine. He has never made up his time and never will, and I am still short of a pen-ruler. It means that I have to apprentice another pen ruler. I have lost five years and so has the lad. Although he had that six months' trial period, he decided that he was not a pen ruler and did not want to be a pen ruler and that he was going out to do another job. It is not cheap labour: that five-year apprenticeship has cost me a considerable amount, and it has increased the cost of production. That is partly why employers are not taking on apprentices. I believe those are the main reasons why the apprenticeship system has broken down.

I have looked through the Bill to try to find something that would encourage more apprentices. I find that the Apprentices Board would have to keep a register of approved places of employment. I will not debate that matter, except to say that I agree entirely with the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) that it would be almost impracticable. In my opinion, it is not workable, and it would give us not more apprentices but fewer apprentices, because some employers would not be allowed to take on apprentices. The next clause suggests

increasing the time at school in the employer's time from four to 12 hours. That will certainly reduce the number of apprentices that employers will take on, so how can that help us get more apprentices? The Leader suggested that the aim of the Bill was to increase the number of apprentices, but I cannot see how that can come about. Another clause states that the employer may take on apprentices only when his premises are approved. Then comes the question of the standard of education of apprentices. In my opinion, all these clauses must result in the number of apprentices being reduced rather than increased.

I agree that the extension of the age limit is desirable. I have an apprentice who started at the proper time, but unfortunately he met with an accident while away from his work. That put him in hospital for about 12 months, and consequently it put him 12 months behind in his apprenticeship. He will reach the age of 21 before he has finished. Unless this present provision is altered, the law will preclude him from remaining an apprentice. The proposed extension of the age will allow the completion of apprenticeships. Frankly, I cannot see any objection to older men being apprenticed, for I cannot see how that could break down the apprenticeship system. The proposed provision could result in more skilled workmen. Surely, if they are prepared to sign indentures—

Mr. Frank Walsh: Then what are you opposing it for?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not: I am giving credit to this clause, which I consider a good one. I should like to see that clause adopted, but unfortunately there are many clauses that will not help and they easily outweigh the good clauses. In my opinion, the setting up of boards of reference is only duplicating the administrative part of the Act. I cannot see why section 30 of the original Act should be deleted and another one inserted to do the same job. The old section 30 is satisfactory, and there is no need for the alteration.

I have many doubts regarding the wisdom of the reduction in the probationary period from six months to three months. I think any employer will decide in three months whether a lad will be any good or not, but it is not always so with the lad himself. One lad that I had on probation went to the fourth month before he decided to give it away. Quite frankly, I consider that he did the right thing. He had the aptitude and the ability, but he decided he would rather do something else, and today he is doing a very good job in another trade, in which he has become apprenticed. It took

him four months to find out whether or not he was suited. Had the probationary period been three months he would have been signed on and committed to be apprenticed to a trade which actually he was not suited to. I do not think it is advisable to reduce the period to three months. It is far better for us to lose three months and make sure than do something in a hurry and be sorry for the rest of our lives. That is what would have happened to the lad had he gone on with the apprenticeship. If we are to expand our secondary industries it is essential that we get skilled men, and men who have been apprenticed are the most skilled. If we have the skilled men we can produce a better article at lower cost, and this will be to the advantage of our overseas trade.

Mr. BYWATERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1038.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the second reading of this Bill which, although a small measure, is nevertheless important. At present there is a close liaison between the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and the Department of Medicine at the University of Adelaide. The Act provides for two persons nominated by the council of the university to be on the council of the institute. I believe it is wise, when possible and when expensive equipment is used, that the greatest use be made of such equipment. In this instance the university and the institute will be able to use the isotope laboratory jointly in the best interests of medical research, and that is the only purpose of this Bill.

Those of us who were privileged to inspect the buildings of the institute in the Royal Adelaide Hospital grounds were impressed by the devoted service of the medical personnel engaged on research. The dreaded complaint of cancer, which has had a heavy death-rate in Australia, has in many instances been checked by treatment in the early stages and has proved the worth of these laboratories. In today's *News* appears an item stating that research scientists claim that people should have early treatment for this dreaded disease. It is possible in many instances to effect a cure for certain types of cancer provided that it is administered in the early stages. We were

advised of this when we visited the laboratory last year.

Always in the cause of furthering knowledge through research, men and women subject themselves to danger and in this instance, with radio-active isotopes, every care will need to be taken in the correct use of this equipment. I understand that a special laboratory will be created for this purpose. I believe much concern has already been expressed in another place about the urgency of taking special precautions with the radio-active materials that will be used. I consider it is most essential that we give careful attention to the future in this regard. I have no doubt that the university and the institute have a keen knowledge of the dangers associated with this equipment and that they will use it to the best advantage and with the utmost care. In a world that appears to be hell-bent on destruction, it is heart-warming to know that dedicated scientists are willing to work towards curing what have previously been incurable diseases. Only last week an article appeared in the *News* and a news item was given over television about a happening in the Northern Territory. This article, headed "Fever Carrier Hunt Narrows", stated:

Three positive reactions obtained so far from blood tests would help narrow the field in the search for typhoid fever carrier in the Northern Territory, Dr. J. A. Bonnin said today. Dr. Bonnin is the director of the South Australian Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. He said he was now hopeful that the outbreak would soon be checked. Tests had been completed on about 200 of the 800 blood samples taken last week by two Adelaide scientists in a wide area around Darwin, where there had been 14 cases of typhoid fever. Dr. Bonnin said he expected the remainder of the blood samples to have been tested by the end of the week. He said authorities in Darwin would be constantly advised of the results of the tests in Adelaide. However, the positive test result did not necessarily mean that the people were definite typhoid carriers: they could have had the fever or recently been immunized against it.

That is a case where the institute is providing a real service in the cause of prevention and detection of disease and making sure that it does not spread. I think every member fully appreciates the excellent work scientists are doing to fight the dreaded complaints that were incurable in the past. No doubt they will continue to learn by the experiments and by the knowledge they accrue from time to time.

These people do not want to be in the limelight; often they are not heard of, but behind the scenes they are doing a magnificent job in the cause of human health. They are not only fulfilling a function for the present generation

but doing something that will assist future generations. This applies not only to medicine but to research into veterinary science. I know that veterinary surgeons in country areas are indebted to the institute for the advice they get from time to time. By taking samples to the institute they have been able to find out the causes of many of the deaths that occur in animals and to overcome many diseases by knowing their cause. Sometimes new diseases occur in animals and veterinary surgeons are at a loss to know their cause. They can go to the institute to ascertain this for themselves and work on these problems to develop the science of animal husbandry as we know it.

I support the Bill, realizing that it is necessary to establish a research laboratory such as this. I commend the department and the institute for endeavouring to use wisely and economically the expensive equipment that has been acquired.

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

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to repeal the Aborigines Act, 1934-1939, and to promote the welfare and advancement of Aborigines and of persons of Aboriginal blood in South Australia and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Bill be printed and the second reading made an order of the day for tomorrow.

I seek your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the question whether the speeches already made on the previous Bill introduced may stand on the record.

The SPEAKER: As the proceedings on this Bill were recommenced solely to correct an irregularity in its initiation, I feel that it would be necessary only for the Minister to move the second reading formally and for the debate to be resumed at the point at which it was left on August 30, when the honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) obtained leave to continue her remarks.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 11, at 2 p.m.