

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 19 February 1981

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 108 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to strengthen existing laws against the prostitution trade, reject any proposal to legalise the trade, and request the Commonwealth Government to sign the United Nations Convention on Prostitution was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITION: I.M.V.S.

A petition signed by 638 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to re-establish the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit, to reinstate Dr. J. Coulter to his previous position, and instigate an inquiry into the administration of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science was presented by the Hon. Peter Duncan.

Petition received.

PETITION: TEACHERS

A petition signed by 96 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to appoint a committee to develop a long-term teacher supply and deployment policy and retain education as a high priority was presented by the Hon. Peter Duncan.

Petition received.

PETITION: SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

A petition signed by 131 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that entitlement hours for school assistants in Government schools are not reduced was presented by Dr. Billard.

Petition received.

PETITION: SECONDED TEACHERS

A petition signed by 29 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to take all possible steps to prevent the erosion in numbers of seconded teachers and support services in the Education Department was presented by the Hon. Peter Duncan.

Petition received.

REPORT ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: By leave, I lay on the table the report on domestic violence, phone-in report, from the Women's Information Switchboard.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY

The SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to Question on Notice No. 1081, addressed by the member

for Albert Park to the Premier. I direct that the question be removed from the Notice Paper, as it is a matter for the responsibility of the Presiding Officers. However, I am pleased to provide the following information for the member for Albert Park, and for all other members.

A working party, comprising representatives of the Public Buildings Department, including the security officer and the Clerk Assistant of the House, have been meeting over a period of almost 12 months. This arrangement was authorised by the Presiding Officers following receipt and discussion of a police report initiated by Speaker Langley, following the loss of 24 microphones from the House of Assembly Chamber. As a courtesy, regular reports have been made to the Joint House Committee on the matter, notwithstanding that the committee has no direct responsibility. A number of options for improving the security of Parliament House, seeking to guarantee the safety of members, staff, and the general public, and improving the working conditions of staff charged with the responsibility of maintaining security, have been discussed and further investigated.

Many refinements of existing procedures have been implemented and others are under consideration. To release the reports or detail their contents would only serve to expose deficiencies to public view—an action deemed to be against the best interest of the House community.

Security measures at Parliament House are not the responsibility of the Government but that of the Presiding Officers. The President and I, after full consideration of the issues involved and on the receipt of advice from the working party and organisations in both the public and private sector, have requested members, their spouses, staff and those persons with a regular work commitment at Parliament House to present themselves for photographing as part of the process required for the issue of identity cards. The process is current and has been widely accepted by those invited to co-operate.

The identity card is only one aspect of improved security for the safety and well-being of members, staff and all persons with a legitimate reason to be in Parliament House. The right of public access to members (a cornerstone of our Parliamentary democracy) will continue to be preserved at all times.

QUESTION TIME**WHARF FEES**

Mr. BANNON: Can the Premier say what effect he believes the higher wharf, pilotage, tonnage and conservancy charges announced by the Minister of Marine today will have on the campaign by South Australian business leaders to encourage greater usage of Port Adelaide's container terminal? In this year's Budget the Premier announced an increase of 5 per cent in port duties and other cargo related charges and an increase of 30 per cent in pilotage fees operative from 1 July 1980. The Minister of Marine has today announced that these charges will be further increased, for the second time this financial year. Wharfage and other charges are to go up by 12 per cent and pilotage fees by a further 25 per cent. The combined effect will be 17.6 per cent and 62.5 per cent respectively in a nine-month period.

A recent edition of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry journal carries an editorial urging its members to make more use of the container facility at Port Adelaide.

The editorial points out that the former Labor Government, realising that Adelaide was losing out to Melbourne and realising that even a small loss in trade through the port would have major effects on a wide range of local service industries, took what the Chamber describes as a "bold commercial risk" and built new container shipping facilities. Three years ago, the State Labor Government and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry set up a working party headed by the Chamber's General Manager to formulate ways in which the container facility might be better utilised. This work has continued. Recently, it has been announced that significant breakthroughs have been made in the use of the port. It has been agreed that from next March, when the new increases take place, a fortnightly container shipping service will be operated direct from Adelaide to Europe and only today an article in the financial pages of the *Australian* suggested that the long campaign by South Australia for a direct link with Europe is about to show some rewards when the *ACT I* berths in Port Adelaide next month, almost on the same day as these further increases. However, as the editorial in the *Journal of Industry* says, this breakthrough will be worthless if the service is not used to the full and it will be useless if higher charges discourage that use. The journal states:

If we do not seize this opportunity, if we do not make it commercially worthwhile for container ships to call at our doorstep, we soon will be once again the backyard poor relation—and can kiss goodbye, perhaps for all time, to direct access to suppliers and markets in the East. So let's use our brains to save our markets.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am very pleased indeed that the Leader has raised this subject, because it is a matter which requires the widest possible ventilation. At this early stage I would like to place on record my appreciation of the work done by Mr. Schrape of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and also by the Minister of Marine and the various members of the committee who have been assisting him.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you paying a tribute to Allan personally?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham, having now registered his presence in this Chamber, I think for the first time this week, can go home if he wishes, or back to court.

Mr. Millhouse: I've got a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier will resume his seat. I indicate to the honourable member for Mitcham that the question he seeks to ask will only be available to him if he is in the Chamber.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether even the member for Mitcham can ask a question in any other way. I repeat what I said earlier, namely, that I pay a tribute to Mr. Schrape and the members of his committee and to the Minister of Marine because of the recent breakthrough to which the Leader referred. I think he is supporting that breakthrough, if I interpret his remarks correctly, which is in no small measure due to the efforts made in recent months to persuade the United Kingdom shipping conference to agree to this service being provided. Yes, I certainly am paying a tribute to the Minister of Marine and to the other people who have been so active in arranging this service. The Leader's question is: to what extent will the increase in charges detract—

Mr. Bannon: How is it compatible?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The increases which have been made, in fact, have been made in the interests of good business management. That is a principle which has been recognised by industry and by the people who are running the shipping lines. They accept that charges will

increase in line with normal cost of living increases or increases in costs. However, I must point out to the Leader something that he obviously does not know, namely, that pilotage charges in South Australia are still well below those levied in other States.

Mr. Bannon: A very good thing, too.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I agree entirely. It is a good thing and it gives us a cost advantage which I think will be very important. The wharfage charges are going up in line with normal increases in other States. I certainly add my weight to what I interpret as a call by the Leader of the Opposition (and I must say that I am very pleased indeed to get this positive support from him) to all importers, exporters and industrialists in South Australia to get behind this service and to support it. The detailed analyses which have been made show quite conclusively that there is more than sufficient cargo, both in and out, to warrant the regular service which is again to be provided on a trial basis.

I repeat that I support what has been said in the journal of the Chamber of Commerce: unless people are prepared to get behind the service and to demonstrate that to those members of the shipping conference who are supplying it, then the experiment will be a failure. Fortunately, we have made our analyses and we have been given an assurance that members of the Chamber of Commerce and others will support the service, and I have every confidence that the experimental service which is to run for 12 months will prove to be a success, and indeed, that it will become a regular part of South Australia's developing future.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BOARD

Mr. GUNN: What can the Premier do to resolve the apparent disturbing conflict between the Sex Discrimination Board and the police regarding summonses from the board to gain access to personal files of police officers? Members would be aware that there has been a great deal of attention drawn to this particular apparent conflict in the press in recent times. I have been personally—

Mr. McRAE: On a point of order, as I understand this matter, it is *sub judice*. There is a proceeding being conducted at the moment by Her Honour Judge Layton, and, as I understand Standing Orders, it would be improper to continue with this question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The Sex Discrimination Board is not a tribunal or a court in the meaning of the *sub judice* rule which applies to Parliamentary proceedings. However, I would ask the honourable member for Eyre to be very careful in the use of information in his explanation.

Mr. GUNN: I was just saying that I have been approached by members of the Police Association expressing grave concern at the apparent breach of their privacy in the activities that have taken place. I look forward to the Premier's reply.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The present situation which is developing between the Sex Discrimination Board and the members of the Police Association and other members of the Police Force is, I believe, a regrettable one. It should be made clear at the outset that there is no question at all about the board's rights, under the provisions of the Act, to hold an inquiry and to require the production of books, papers and documents relevant to an inquiry. That power is quite plainly in the Act, and there is no question of that being quite proper. The thing that causes me concern, both as an individual and as a supporter and proponent of the principles of sex discrimination and the Equal Opportunities Act, is that one of the major reasons why

the Sex Discrimination Act was introduced in this place originally by me, and later taken up by the Labor Government, was that everyone recognised the need for a change in community attitude to be brought about by persuasion, by education, by conciliation—in other words, by a free acceptance of the wrongs that were being done in the past and which needed to be put right.

What concerns me about the present situation is that it is developing into a confrontation, whether from a misunderstanding of what the board's powers are or what the intention of the inquiry is, I do not know, and I do not pretend to know. I know that a confrontation situation is developing, and, in my view, that is totally contrary to the spirit of the Act. My concern is that, if this confrontation situation is allowed to develop, it may seriously undo or impair all of the progress in understanding which has been achieved over the past few years.

I do not presume in any way to interfere with the affairs of the Sex Discrimination Board, nor will I, but I have felt strongly enough about the matter to write to Judge Layton to point out my concern that a confrontation situation could do very little to help the underlying principles of the Act. I have asked her and the members of her board to examine the present situation with that in mind, and to make sure that no harm is done to the long-term future of the community's attitude and acceptance of the need for a fair and even-handed attitude, an equal-opportunity attitude, to all members of the community.

WATER TESTING

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Water Resources say what is the extent and detail of the water sampling programme conducted on the quality of the water supply in the north of the State; does the programme include Whyalla; in what way has the programme been stepped up recently; and when did this occur? I refer to the Minister's statement to the House on behalf of himself and his colleague, the Minister of Health, on 11 February, only a few days ago. He said that the water sampling programme was on-going and had been continuing as a matter of course before the discovery of amoeba in the Whyalla and Yorke Peninsula supplies. He said, too, that this programme had been stepped up.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Formerly, the water quality testing was done, and had been done for many years, on a weekly basis. After the detection of amoeba in the water supply, when it was not known whether or not it was the pathogenic species, water testing was increased to a daily basis, and has been continuing on that basis since then.

Over the years, testing in the northern towns, including Whyalla, has been carried out on a weekly basis. The amoeba was detected some two weeks before it was identified as *nagalaria fowleri*. It was determined that there were pathogenic amoebae in the system. At the time the first amoebae were detected in the water, the decision was made to increase the dosage of chlorine in the system and to install the additional plant at Whyalla. Since the detection of the amoebae, the water has been tested on a daily basis.

TEA TREE GULLY PLANNING

Mr. ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Planning advise the stage that has been reached in the planned rezoning of centres within the City of Tea Tree Gully, and when it can be expected that the regulations pertaining to those centres will be promulgated? I have been approached by a

number of constituents who are somewhat confused about the information that is being provided by the Tea Tree Gully council. These constituents live predominantly in the area known as the Modbury triangle, but one of the constituents lives on Lower North East Road, Dernancourt. In both of these areas my constituents are surrounded by areas that have been rezoned as commercial, but their area is zoned residential 1. For some time, they have been approaching the council to have this matter rectified, but the latest I have heard is that they have been continually advised that, due to the delay of the State Planning Authority, there has been no progress.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I appreciate the concern of the member for Todd in this matter. To answer the question properly I will have to go back to 1979, when the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs and the Tea Tree Gully council commenced and jointly funded a study which examined the desirable future provision and designation of commercial and industrial centres in the Tea Tree Gully area. In December 1979, following the completion of the study, the council adopted its major recommendations as the basis for the preparation of a centres supplementary development plan for the Tea Tree Gully area and for appropriate amendments to the council's zoning regulations.

Council officers commenced preparation of the supplementary development plan early in 1980, and a draft was circulated to relevant Government departments in April 1980. As members would appreciate, this is a requirement under the Planning and Development Act. At the time, a number of detailed comments on the plan were provided for the council by the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. I understand that changes in council personnel and a number of legal issues that were raised by the council's solicitors delayed the finalisation of the public exhibition draft of that plan.

Additionally, in November 1980 the department asked the council to incorporate in the plan the provisions of the metropolitan centres supplementary development plan, then on public exhibition, to ensure consistency between the two. The council agreed to do this. I understand that the council has now completed the draft of the centres plan, which will shortly be placed on public exhibition. During the plan's preparation, the department provided advice and support to the council and its officers, and I believe that at no stage was action on the Tea Tree Gully centres plan delayed by the council's having to await action by the department or the State Planning Authority.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is this a case of your patting yourself on the back?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Perhaps it is a case of patting the department on the back, because it is very much this Government's policy to have a close working relationship between councils and the department. The member for Todd has asked about his own council's situation. I am pleased to be able to provide that information for him.

NORTHERN WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Does the Minister of Water Resources still hold the view that the Government's highest water priority is the Murray River salinity control programme? In an *Advertiser* report, dated 3 October 1979, shortly after the Minister assumed office, he was quoted as saying that the \$25 000 000 water filtration project for the northern supply system, promised by the previous Labor Government, had been referred to Treasury for consideration, in light of the many financial

commitments facing the State. He said that the Government's highest water priority was the River Murray salinity control programme. In view of the tragic death from amoebic meningitis of the boy at Whyalla, and the Government's subsequent announcement of the go-ahead for the northern filtration programme, has the Government changed its priorities, and, if so, why?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The question that the honourable member has asked is virtually identical to the one asked by the member for Mitchell, either last week or earlier this week. All I can do is give the member for Elizabeth virtually the same answer. The Government still places the highest priority on pollution control of the Murray River, as the base source of water supply in South Australia. If I remember correctly, the member for Mitchell asked whether the Government regretted not having proceeded immediately after the election with the filtration of the northern towns water supply. To that I answered to the effect that, at that time, no funds were provided within the five-year Loan programme that we inherited from the Labor Government. I also said something to the effect that the Government would further investigate the project and make a decision within 12 months. That study period has been undertaken, the Government has made a decision, and the water filtration programme will proceed.

However, the need for South Australia to come to grips with the water quality of the Murray River is by far the most essential factor. The amoebic meningitis problem of the northern towns cannot be solved by water filtration. It has been stated by people, other than the Government, that there is only one way of controlling amoebic meningitis or *naglaria fowleri* in the water supply system, and that is by an adequate chlorination level. Even with an adequate chlorination level in the water supply, if swimming pools are not maintained to the correct level of chlorine, then *naglaria fowleri* can develop and live in swimming pools which are not effectively treated, even if those swimming pools have been filled with water from the Engineering and Water Supply Department mains. Chlorine dissipates very quickly from any water source, particularly an open pool. The amoeba is in the area continuously; it is in the soil; it is airborne and can contaminate any open source of water at any time. The only effective way of controlling *naglaria fowleri* is by the correct chlorination level. That is why the additional plant was put in at Whyalla immediately the amoebae were detected in the water supply there, before it was even determined that those amoebae were *naglaria fowleri*.

The Government proceeded immediately to put in the additional chlorination plant, which was not necessary when the last outbreak occurred in 1972, but because of this particularly hot summer the conditions prevailed that enabled the amoeba to develop in the water supply system. That has been corrected, and there have been no amoebae in the water supply system from the time of the additional chlorination plants being installed and becoming operative. The Government will proceed with the water filtration of the northern towns as outlined in its statement last week.

PETROL PRICES

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Premier explain why the retail price of petrol in Darwin is 37.3 cents a litre, while the price is 39.1 cents a litre in metropolitan Adelaide and the country price is as high as 42.8 cents a litre? Furthermore, when a decision was made two weeks ago to lift restrictions on the wholesale margin to fuel companies,

was that decision made in the knowledge of pending announcements of massive oil finds in three States?

Many of my constituents have expressed concern at this discrepancy of 1.7 cents a litre (or 8 cents a gallon) in Darwin and Adelaide prices, and a further 3.7 cents a litre (or 16.5 cents a gallon) in the prices of the Adelaide metropolitan area and country areas. My constituents are aware of the Government's action late last year to restrict the wholesale margin to fuel companies to stop metropolitan discounting. However, they are most critical of the Government's timing of the announcement to lift these restrictions just a few days before a public announcement of massive oil discoveries.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: With great respect, it is rather difficult for anyone, even a Government performing as well as this one, to know of new oil discoveries in advance. I feel that any blame which the honourable member may be levelling at this Government for announcing petrol increases a day or two before announced oil discoveries really is not justified. I believe the honourable member has raised a number of questions that ought to be clarified, obviously because his constituents are concerned, and I can appreciate their concern.

Before the Government took the action it did to stop the chaotic discounting situation, which was occurring in the Adelaide metropolitan area and which was seriously threatening the very existence, literally, of dozens of small business men and resellers, the differential between country and city prices was far greater, two or three times greater in some instances, than the differential now. For those people who are still concerned about the differential between country and city of 2 cents or 3 cents, I might just remind them that before our action it was 10 cents, 11 cents, or even 12 cents, I understand, in one reported instance. I think we have had quite a significant effect on reducing the differential between country and the city prices.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: What we have saved is the livelihood of a considerable number of individual business men, small business men certainly, but individual business men and the one, two or three people each one of them employs. That is the basis for our action, and it is an action for which I will in no way apologise. If I can save those business men from going out of business and if, in the future, they prosper, as I hope they will, and tend to go on, they will be the basis on which increased employment opportunities will be founded in this State.

I return to the early part of the question, which referred to the comparison of present prices in Darwin with South Australian prices. My information is that Darwin petrol supplies are almost entirely received from Singapore and that the transport costs are therefore lower. It is not really adequate or fair to compare the prices at Darwin with the prices in the remainder of Australia. I would point out that, in Sydney, the price which has been agreed upon by the Government, which has controls over these matters, is, I understand, 39c a litre.

The fact that petrol is being sold at 37c is a decision which has been taken by the oil companies and the resellers. There is nothing at all to stop the oil companies deciding, if they wish, to discount by 1c, 2c, or even 3c in Adelaide. The point is that there is no way that we would allow a return to the massive cut-throat discounts which were being applied deliberately, in my view, to disrupt the market and to force people out.

We have made quite clear to the oil companies that we will be monitoring the system very carefully. I repeat what I have said many times: this Government will not stand for

any monopoly, whether it is a monopoly of big business, whether it is a monopoly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —of Government, or whether it is a monopoly of the trade union movement. The Liberal Party has always stood to represent individuals, and that is something of which we are very proud. We do not stand only for big business; we stand for small business, and for every individual who wishes to work and get on in the world. I believe that the action which was taken on petrol prices has already brought back a stability in the market that is most valuable to those people who are working in it. Not only that, it has restored a sensible differential between country and city, not the extreme one that existed before. In the long term I am quite certain it will be seen to be a move that was well worth making.

NORTHERN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Water Resources say whether an on-going water sampling programme was conducted on the Whyalla water supply (and I stress to the Minister that I am talking about the Whyalla supply) prior to 25 January 1981, and, if it was, was it as comprehensive a sampling programme as programmes carried out at other sampling points in the northern water supply system? Was all necessary action to ensure the safety of the water supply at Whyalla taken prior to the diagnosis of amoebic meningitis on 25 January 1981? In his statement of 11 February, the Minister listed action that the Government has now taken to ensure the safety of the water supply at Whyalla, but he failed to mention whether, and to what extent, action had been taken prior to 25 January 1981.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The procedure that has been occurring in the northern towns area as far as water sampling is concerned has been going on since the additional chlorination plants were put in, in 1972. Those additional chlorination plants were put in during the time of the previous Government, when exactly the same situation occurred; there were the unfortunate deaths at that time as a result of amoebic meningitis. The advice of the Government's engineers and chemists at the time was that two additional chlorination plants installed at Port Pirie and Port Augusta would be sufficient to protect the total water supply of the three major northern towns. The tests have been continuing on that basis, on a weekly basis, ever since that time, and the decision to increase the testing to a daily basis was made at the time of the week of the testing that detected amoeba in the water supply at Whyalla.

When amoeba was detected in the water supply at Whyalla, a decision was made immediately to take a portable chlorination plant to Whyalla, because no amoeba appeared at Port Pirie or Port Augusta, where the additional chlorination plants were installed. I am not pointing a finger at the previous Government or its decision in 1972 to install only two additional chlorination plants in the North. I am quite certain members of the previous Government regret in hindsight that it did not install three plants at that time, but obviously the engineering assessment and the decision at that time concluded that two additional plants would be sufficient, and for a number of years they have kept the system completely clear of amoebae.

Because of the climatic conditions this summer, the prolonged heat, and the fact that the water in the mains

rose to a temperature of about 38 degrees Celsius, a situation was created where, with the dissipation of the level of chlorine, by the time the water arrived at Whyalla the amoeba was active and was able to multiply. It was an unfortunate situation, but it reflects in no way on the decision taken in 1972 that two additional plants would be sufficient to protect the people and the system from any further amoebic outbreaks. This proved not to be the case in January, but I reiterate that the decision to go from weekly testing to daily testing was made immediately following the tests which indicated the presence of amoebae in the water. On that test, the department took immediate action and installed the additional chlorination plant.

AMDEL

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy report to the House on the removal of low level radio-active waste this morning from the Thebarton plant of Amdel?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The word "waste" is given fairly wide currency at present. Perhaps it is not the appropriate word to use in quite such a wide context; in fact, the material involved was tailings resulting from analysis of material produced by mining activities. At 6 a.m. today, two semi-trailers belonging to the Department of Mines and Energy left the Amdel site for Radium Hill. They are due to reach Radium Hill this afternoon. The semi-trailers carried 140 drums of low level radio-active tailings accumulated as a result of work undertaken in the first instance in 1978, under the previous Government. In fact, I understand that all of the material moved today was accumulated as a result of the 1978 work under the previous Government.

Mr. Becker: So the Labor Party—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was under the auspices and the aegis of the Labor Party that the work was undertaken and the material accumulated.

Mr. Langley: What about Sir Thomas Playford?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are going back in history to the 1950's which gives added point to the fact that the Labor Party has suddenly got interested in closing Amdel down when it lived quite happily during the entire life of the Labor Government. The present Government has equipped the Health Commission with additional material to set up programmes and monitor the waste the Labor Party accumulated. This work will be done under the scrutiny of the Health Commission, and the material will be buried immediately at the Radium Hill site. Also, there will be rehabilitation of the tailings dam, as announced in this House about a fortnight ago. I was also told that eight members of the media attended this morning, 12 members of the public, Mr. Scott, M.H.R.—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order. The Deputy Premier has the call to answer a question.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There were two or three placards with my name on them, but I could not read what they said (it was a kindly reference, no doubt), two dogs, and one cat. I have not necessarily listed in order of importance those who attended. The claim has been made by at least one media outlet that Mr. Scott, in some way or another, takes the credit for this movement of material. Let us put that suggestion to bed immediately.

I gave the House certain facts in October last year, in answer to a question from the member for Mitchell, who was giving currency to the falsehoods that were noised

abroad to the effect that Radium Hill was to be used as a negotiating point in trying to sell uranium from Roxby Downs and that Radium Hill would in some way become a repository for high level waste from overseas nuclear reactors. I was surprised that the honourable member gave currency to that sort of rumour. We are used to it from the member for Elizabeth. Mr. Scott has recently reverted to type, but the activities of the member for Mitchell rather confirmed these left wing preponderances that are coming to the fore. This low level material—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: One week I'm right wing, and the next week I'm left.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are becoming increasingly worried about the way the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy is leaning. He is lining up with the member for Elizabeth, who gave currency to this sort of scurrilous rumour, and we are not surprised at Mr. Scott's behaviour. There is no such proposal, but I pointed out at that time that there was a proposal to use the Radium Hill site to dispose of the low level waste that had accumulated during the life of the previous Labor Government. This is today's activity, and the announcement I, with the Minister of Health, made a couple of weeks ago was the logical conclusion to those investigations.

There is no proposal, as has been suggested, to use this site as a dumping ground for waste from nuclear reactors. The material has been described to me as being about as radioactive as drums of sand that one could pick up in some parts of the Moana beach area, where there are some traces of thorium. I do not believe it would generate much interest if a couple of semi-trailers backed on to the beach and loaded 140 drums of beach sand: it might attract the odd seagull or two, but I doubt that even the dogs and cats would worry about it. That is the level of background radioactivity that is in this material, as described by at least one scientist who, I believe, would have some knowledge of the matter. I have given an account of this morning's activities, and no doubt it will generate some media interest. In conclusion, I deplore the activities of people like Mr. Scott, who has suddenly emerged from a long period of silence.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: He'll be there for a long time, too.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He almost was not there. He would have suffered the same fate as comrade Apap if he had gone on as was his wont. I deplore the activities of people like Mr. Scott and, more recently, the member for Mitchell (I gave the honourable member credit for more sense), the member for Elizabeth and others in this State who want to close down Amdel. I deplore this kind of activity.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr. KENEALLY: Were the Minister of Health and her department fully informed and satisfied with the water sampling programme carried out in the northern part of the State prior to 25 January 1981, and is she satisfied that the Government's then programme was adequate?

The tragic death of the young child at Whyalla, mentioned earlier during Question Time, has caused great concern in my electorate, particularly in Port Augusta and Port Pirie, where deaths from amoebic meningitis have previously occurred. In fact (and I am sure that the Minister knows this), more deaths from this disease have been diagnosed as coming from Port Augusta than from any other town in the world. That is a sad record that my city of Port Augusta would prefer not to have.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The answer to both questions put by the honourable member is "Yes".

SCHOOL ANCILLARY STAFF

Dr. BILLARD: Could the Minister of Industrial Affairs indicate the outcome of his negotiations today with the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers concerning reductions in ancillary staff in schools? Following an answer the Minister gave to a question on this subject yesterday, he indicated that he would be meeting with the unions involved, in an effort to resolve the dispute. This especially concerns my electorate, where some schools have been unable to take up their entitlement for school assistance hours. In one case, a school has been short 29½ hours for nearly 12 months, because of the failure of other schools to give up voluntarily school assistance hours to which they were not entitled.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, we did hold a meeting earlier today between the Government, represented by the Public Service Board and the Education Department, and also the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. Those discussions were very productive. It has now been agreed (and this is a proposal that I put to the meeting) that further discussions on a range of subjects, sorted out at the meeting this morning, should take place immediately. It is proposed that those further discussions take place as from Monday, if certain undertakings are agreed to by the parties involved.

The Government, as an act of good faith, announced at the meeting that it would not proceed with a compulsory reduction of hours, or compulsory transfer of any ancillary staff, during these discussions. That was accepted very well by the parties involved. In return, I have asked that all industrial action be suspended during these discussions. The unions involved have agreed to go back and put that to their members. As honourable members would know, a strike is proposed for next Tuesday by some ancillary staff. I have indicated that, if any industrial action continues, the Government has no alternative but to withdraw the undertaking that compulsory transfers and compulsory reductions, under clause 13 (3) of the industrial award, would not proceed.

The sort of subjects being considered by the working party include sick leave and superannuation provisions. Discussions will take place on whether or not there should be pro rata provisions where a person works less than full time. Also, compulsory transfers from one school to another will be discussed, and the basis on which any forced reduction should take place, particularly the manner in which clause 13 (3) of the industrial award should apply and be implemented.

I must point out (and I think that all parties agreed with this) that there will be fundamental problems with a reduction in student numbers, and therefore a reduction in teachers, as to how we work out each year what ancillary staff should be available to each school, and how the adjustment should take place as quickly as possible. This year there has been a reduction of 7 000 students, and in the past three years student numbers have been reduced by over 20 000. The basic problem last year was that there was a reduction in student numbers of about 5 000, and, although there was a reduction in teacher numbers, there was no immediate reduction in ancillary staff. Therefore, for all of last year the numbers of ancillary staff across the board were well above the actual quota laid down in the formula. These types of matters have been discussed, particularly how we can quickly bring about an adjustment

of ancillary staff numbers at the beginning of each calendar year when the school academic year commences, rather than trying to tie it in any way to budgetary financial years, which occur half way through the school year. I think that is extremely important.

I must stress that one matter which is not under discussion or negotiation is the 4 per cent reduction. That is a Cabinet policy and, as I pointed out to the meeting this morning, that is not part of the discussion. I should point out that I have been very pleased with the reductions that have taken place so far. I understand that through voluntary transfers and voluntary reductions in the last month it has been possible to achieve about a 2 per cent real reduction in the number of ancillary staff in schools. I stress that the 2 per cent real reduction has been achieved with no compulsion by the Government at all.

The parties at the meeting this morning said that claims were being made that there had been compulsory transfers and that they were scared or concerned that the undertaking given by the Government about no dismissals was about to be breached. I stress that there have been no compulsory transfers of ancillary staff from one school to another by the Education Department. Any transfers that have taken place have been on a voluntary basis; there have been no dismissals or retrenchments of ancillary staff.

I believe that, with the co-operation of all the parties involved, we will largely remove some of the areas of concern that have been expressed so far by the ancillary staff so that the Government can achieve its intention of reducing ancillary staff as the number of students in schools reduces and the number of teachers is also reduced in line with the 4 per cent reduction proposed by the Government under the formula, and so that we can achieve rationalisation of employment of ancillary staff but taking into account at the same time the personal and human problems confronted by each individual person who is a member of a staff.

NUMBER PLATES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Transport say what changes, if any, the Government is making to arrangements for the supply of motor vehicle number plates in this State? I am emboldened to ask this question because of the Premier's answer a few minutes ago to the member for Flinders when he was trumpeting anti-monopoly and private enterprise.

I have just received a letter written yesterday from Mr. David Flehr, Secretary of the Master Painters, Decorators and Signwriters Association of South Australia. I desire to quote briefly extracts from the letter to explain the question. It says:

We wish to bring to your attention the anxiety of the members of our association, some of whom have regularly been suppliers of number plates to the State Government . . . It has come to our notice that a tender is to be let for the supply (complete) of the State requirements on a one-off basis.

You may not be aware that some 10 makers of these plates are at present in business in South Australia, and these suppliers have been in this industry for some 50 years. Of this 10, at least five have been regular suppliers (on a competitive basis) to the State Government.

I can remember difficulties in this area when I was a Minister, and also some discussions about it. The letter continues:

I refer to "Government Tenders" in Saturday's *Advertiser* (14/2/81) that the whole of the supply of this State's demand in this field is to be let to one tenderer, and we have good

reason to suspect that this tender could be awarded to an interstate firm.

He ends his letter, having discussed the question of unemployment if this were to happen, as follows:

We hope our State Government stands for private enterprise and wishes to protect employment in this State. It is for those reasons that I ask what the Government intends to do.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The information that the member for Mitcham gave in his explanation is substantially true, and I will comment on one or two aspects of it. The member for Mitcham mentioned that there are 10 suppliers in this State. I understand that there are certain groupings within those suppliers who have all been in the habit of tendering together in one group. I make that point clear to the House.

The reason why the tender is called is that the new number plates to be supplied to South Australians will be reflectorised in the interests of road safety. It was essential that we obtained a tender price, otherwise the cost to the citizen, the motorist (indeed, to the taxpayer, as the Minister has just reminded me), could have been higher than the cost of the present number plates. The member for Mitcham asks whether the Government believes in private enterprise. One of the strong facets of the private enterprise system is the public tender process, and, if we are to get the correct price and the lowest possible price for the motorist of South Australia, of course this should go to open tender.

As to the question of jobs, those firms in South Australia are very much to the fore in my department's thinking and will be considered when the tenders are received. It is far too early; as the member for Mitcham said, tenders were called only last week. I think the explanation is plain; we are going to open tender because we want to get the best possible price for the citizens of this State, but as always when tenders are assessed the effects on job opportunities for people in this State will be considered.

AC/DC CONCERT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment say what action his department can take to control noise levels of rock concerts at Memorial Drive? I understand that the local group, AC/DC, presented a concert at Memorial Drive last Tuesday evening and complaints about noise levels came from as far away as West Beach, Henley Beach South, Fulham and Lockleys, which are suburbs in my electorate. People could hear the noise from that far away, and my constituents contacted me in the following terms:

As we must suffer excruciating noise from certain jet aircraft at West Beach airport, surely we do not have to suffer the bleatings of some inconsiderate rock music group.

I have been requested by my constituents to ascertain whether the noise control unit of the Department of the Environment will monitor noise at future concerts and recommend more satisfactory noise levels for rock music. I want to make it clear that I am not opposed to rock concerts, but I believe that young people ought to be aware that the deafening noise of some of these types of groups can cause hearing loss.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: As members would appreciate, this is a very complex issue—a noisy complex issue. On previous occasions I have mentioned to the House the concern of the Department for the Environment in protecting the community, but as a Government we recognise that we do not want to be too restrictive. The situation that was experienced in Adelaide the night

before last is an experience that occurs in most big cities in Australia and, indeed, throughout the world, particularly with the type of equipment that is available these days. It is quite obvious that there is a demand for this type of entertainment, and the crowd that attended the concert at Memorial Drive indicated the popularity of this type of entertainment. I must say that it is not my cup of tea, but the large number of people there appeared to enjoy it.

It is necessary for my department to consider what is necessary for the protection of the community. The noise unit of the Department for the Environment received only five complaints; I understand that on the night of the concert the police received about 22 complaints altogether, and the member for Hanson is quite right in saying that complaints came from as far away as West Beach and Henley Beach. Concern was expressed from that side of the city—I am not quite sure whether a strong wind was blowing in that direction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The point has been made that people in the member for Hanson's electorate might have been aware that the concert was on and may have gone outside to listen. However, complaints did come from a very wide area. The member for Hanson has asked what can be done to ease the situation in the future. We do not want to be too restrictive in this regard, but it may be necessary to look at limiting the number of these concerts and at specifying the time of concerts or rehearsals. It may be that we need to look at the selection of the groups that will appear. These matters are being looked at. We have written to the entrepreneurs responsible for many of these groups coming to Adelaide requesting that we be informed when groups will be coming here so that we can monitor the concerts. Also, we have had discussions with the South Australian Tennis Association seeking advice about when these concerts will be held on its grounds. It is interesting to note that yesterday morning a senior officer from my department was on a radio talk-back programme and, when the programme was open to the public, only 20 calls were recorded between 10 a.m. and 1.30 p.m., so only 20 people were concerned enough to contact that radio station. I think that indicates that the majority of people are prepared to put up with noise that results from such concerts. I believe that, if we look at the possibility of having the controls that I have mentioned, that may help to solve the problem in the future.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: VISIT BY PRINCE OF WALES

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased to report to the House that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales will visit South Australia on 23 and 24 April.

Prince Charles will open two major complexes while in South Australia and will attend a Royal Charity Performance at the Festival Theatre. His first official duty will be to open the Mount Gambier Regional Cultural Centre. This complex, situated in the heart of Mount Gambier, incorporates a 500-seat theatre, library and council offices and council chambers. His Royal Highness will leave Mount Gambier late in the afternoon of 23 April to attend a Parliamentary reception, followed by the Royal Charity Performance. The concert is being arranged

by the Festival Centre Trust and the Channel 7 network, which will televise the event nationally.

During the next day Prince Charles will be given a mounted police escort along King William Street to the Town Hall, where he will be greeted by the Lord Mayor and introduced to councillors and aldermen.

The Royal party will then proceed across Victoria Square to the new S.G.I.C. building. Prince Charles will perform the opening ceremony, following which he will tour the Southern Vales district and attend a luncheon at Seaview winery. Following lunch, His Royal Highness will open the new Aldinga Primary School. That evening, he will attend a reception at the Art Gallery as part of its centenary celebrations. The Royal party will depart early on the morning of the twenty-fifth.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members will join with me in extending a warm welcome to His Royal Highness. Although he will be here for only a brief time, I trust that all South Australians will ensure that his visit is a memorable one.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the National Parks and Wildlife Act on two separate subjects. First, it deals with the seizure and forfeiture of firearms or other objects used in the commission of offences against the principal Act. At present, the power to order forfeiture is vested in the Minister. The Government believes that this power would lie more appropriately in the court before which the owner of the forfeited object is convicted of an offence. Accordingly, a new provision is proposed by the Bill under which objects that have been seized under the principal Act may be forfeited to the Crown by order of a court before which the owner is convicted of an offence against the principal Act.

If no such order is made, or if proceedings are not commenced within three months of the date of the seizure, the object is to be returned to the owner. If the Minister, after making reasonable inquiries, is unsuccessful in ascertaining the whereabouts of the owner, he may sell or otherwise dispose of the object. The Bill also amends monetary penalties prescribed by the principal Act in order to take account of the effect of inflation on the value of money. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 deals with the forfeiture of confiscated objects in the manner outlined above. Clause 4 increases monetary penalties prescribed by the principal Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport), on behalf of the Minister of Health, obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide that the Governor has power under the Act to proclaim certain articles to be poisons and to vary or revoke any such proclamation from time to time. As the Act now stands, there is no substantive provision that expressly confers these powers, although the expression "poisons" is defined as meaning "such articles as the Government by proclamation . . . from time to time declares to be poisons within the meaning of this Act". This Bill puts the matter beyond doubt and makes clear that all previous proclamations were validly made. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts in section 5b the power to proclaim certain articles to be poisons or poisons of a particular class. The power to vary or revoke proclamations made under this section already appears in paragraph (c). New subsection (2) validates all previous proclamations relating to poisons.

Mr. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 12 February. Page 2802.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I have always maintained that a responsible Opposition should not oppose Government measures merely for the sake of opposing them. Unfortunately, that was the practice of the present Government when it occupied the Opposition benches. It was a practice that, in my view, certainly damaged its credibility. I believe that an Opposition should support measures that it believes to be correct and just. I therefore intend today to welcome some of the measures proposed in this Bill and to make constructive criticisms about areas that I believe could be and should be improved. First, I would like to register my complaint about the way in which this Bill was introduced into this House a week ago by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. You will no doubt recall, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister said in introducing the Bill. I wish he were in the House at the moment, but unfortunately he is not. I thought he would pay me the courtesy of listening to my second reading speech, as I listened to him.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: He will be back in a moment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: He knew the Bill was coming on at this stage. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in introducing the Bill, the Minister (and again I say that he is not in the House) said:

Whether the unions wish to support this Bill or not is up to them. However, as the Minister responsible I am determined to ensure that vested interests are not allowed to prevent essential changes occurring in our training system.

They are brave words, but not very bright, in my opinion. Obviously, the Minister, in supposedly laying down this challenge to the unions, was trying to impress on his back-

benchers and the public that he was a powerful Minister who was prepared to get tough with the unions. As a challenge, I think it was a paper tiger and one which should have been avoided.

The Minister had had extensive talks with representatives of the Trades and Labor Council and, according to the trade unions, had in fact backed down on 10 of the 12 principal points of contention. So much for the strong man of the Liberal front bench. The Minister's provocative statement, which implied that he did not give a damn whether or not the unions were prepared to accept the Bill, was nothing more than a smokescreen. In fact, it was the Minister who had backed down, but he did not want his Caucus mates to know about it.

The Minister has not been long in the job, and I hope he will accept my advice in the spirit in which it is intended: if you do secure agreement with interested, but usually divergent, parties, for goodness sake welcome the fact. Only an inexperienced or insecure Minister would try to show off by this big noting in such an inflammatory fashion and in a way that could damage consensus and prevent acceptance. In my view, that is not tough talk. It is political stupidity, and I ask the Minister today to withdraw his statement so that consensus and good will can be restored.

I must make a point in the Minister's favour. Before inserting that paragraph in the speech, I believe the Minister had taken a great deal of trouble to arrange a consensus opinion right throughout the community, and on that I congratulate him. I believe that he was able to get over many problems that this Bill contained when first introduced. Strong criticism was sent to me from Trades Hall and other interested parties.

There is not much wrong with the Bill; in my view, it is an excellent Bill. That is where the Minister should have left it. He was in command of the situation; he had conciliated and had reached a consensus, which was a difficult job considering the new matters involved—I make no bones about that. To have reached conciliation and consensus and then to depart from it and throw down the gauntlet to the unions was inviting trouble, and I am surprised that the Minister did not get it from the unions. I believe that it was a challenge to the unions, an unnecessary challenge which the Minister should have left out of his second reading explanation.

I have believed for some time that our industrial training situation has needed overhaul. In particular, I emphasise that I have always supported the need to establish training facilities and programmes that will cover more than the traditional apprenticeship trades. That is essential, the Bill does that, and I support it.

I refer now to the removal of age barriers for people entering either apprenticeships or other forms of contract training. I have never made any secret of the fact that I oppose educational and employment discrimination based on age barriers in the same way that I oppose those based on sex and race barriers. Therefore, I am pleased that the discrimination against older people that was inherent under the old apprenticeship system will finally come to an end. However, I would be remiss if I did not refer particularly to the relevant clause of the Bill. Historically, adult apprenticeships have not been acceptable to the craft unions of Australia, and age limitations have been inserted in legislation and industrial awards.

There was a simple reason, which in my view was not a good reason, for this departure. Trade unions were concerned about protecting the employment opportunities of people leaving school: they were concerned that adults who had gained work experience might have been given priority for jobs over school leavers by prospective

employers. This argument could have some validity, and there is no doubt in my mind that those trade union officials who held that view—and there are plenty of people who still hold that view—were and are quite genuine and sincere in adopting the stance that they adopted on this issue. However, as I have indicated, I disagree with that philosophy, because I believe it is wrong to discriminate on any level whatsoever. Indeed, to discriminate on the basis of age is a clear and proper case for a discrimination commissioner to adjudicate.

Why should any person be deprived of changing his or her career course in life, as many people do because of desire or necessity? I can cite many instances of tradesmen who have changed their occupation for occupations such as truck driver, machine operator, and for various other like duties. It makes sense to me that, if it is accepted that a tradesman can change his career, it should be perfectly acceptable for non-tradesmen to change their careers and be trained in a job of their choice. There are essential economic reasons why adult training is necessary. Tens of thousands of bread-winners have been forced from their normal employment with absolutely no prospect of returning to that employment while Liberal Governments are in charge of the economy of this nation. Therefore, it is practical and humane to provide new job opportunities to these people by offering them the chance to be retrained so that they can once again return to the work force. Only in this way can we claim to be providing equality of opportunity for all people.

The progress in this area has not advanced as speedily in South Australia as it has in some other States; it has not progressed as speedily as I would have desired. However, in 1978 I was able to move one step forward when I successfully negotiated an agreement that allowed the established trade committee, by a majority of votes, to approve adult apprenticeships. I am delighted to say that several applicants were successful under these provisions which, I believe, can quite properly be described as the break-through in this area and the forerunner of the current provisions.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Why didn't you accept my amendment?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not saying that I am satisfied with the number of successful applicants under those provisions, but it was an instance in which Liberal or Labor Governments before that period had not been able to succeed; agreement could not be reached in any circumstances, irrespective of which political Party was in power, until that time. I think it is quite proper to place on record that that was the beginning of what I have always believed in, and whether I accepted the amendment mentioned by the Minister does not matter one iota: quite clearly, what matters is that there was a commencement of change. Change never comes easily. People who have had some responsibility in Government (and I believe that the Minister is beginning to learn this) know that to obtain change is difficult. It is a long, hard road to make people accept change—it takes hard work. Because of hard work, the break-through came, and now we have reached what I have always supported. As a consequence, we have this Bill. However, I do not believe that, because of the complete taking away of the barriers and because there will no longer be a hurdle to jump, there will be a great influx of adult apprentices into trades. I do not believe that: I believe that people will take some time to get used to the fact that they have this right. People will have to make conscious decisions about training, and that is not easy once a person reaches a certain age.

Another aspect that will debar the flow to a large extent is the wages concept. It is quite obvious that an employer

can obtain a young apprentice for lower wages than an adult apprentice will be paid, so the industrial awards will have an effect on who the employer chooses. Let us not over-estimate the situation by thinking that many thousands of people will make applications for adult training or apprenticeships. However, the opportunity is there, and that is what I support. If a person wants to do it, he should have the right. When I was a Minister, I was in direct conflict with the trade committees in regard to some of the decisions that they made. I do not believe that some of the decisions were proper, and I brought the committees to task and questioned them on the incidents about which I was not happy. Whether the Minister applauds this or not (that does not worry me greatly; my conscience is clear), I commenced this operation, which I believe has been introduced to the full extent.

I also welcome the establishment of pre-apprenticeship programmes, which allow successful students to obtain reduced terms of apprenticeships. I understand that this Bill enables pre-apprenticeship training to be undertaken under the broader umbrella of pre-vocational training, which is not so trade specific. It allows young people to be eligible to enter a range of related trades rather than one specific trade. I welcome this broader brush approach, as it allows young people more flexibility in choosing their career path. The necessity of a commission to examine the whole range of policy issues concerning industrial training and my own experience as a Minister led me to believe that the Apprenticeship Commission became too bogged down in mundane disciplinary and procedural matters. The establishment of industrial advisory committees is also to be welcomed. Too often in the past, employers and trade unions focused too much on the specific needs of a particular craft. The establishment of trade advisory committees as subcommittees of industry advisory committees shows that the specific needs of trades will not be neglected. However, I am pleased with the change, because it is right and proper that specific trade needs should be examined in the context of the interests of the industry as a whole.

One clause of the Bill refers to the commission's liaising with other training bodies throughout Australia. This is very important, and too often only lip service is paid to the proper co-ordination between the States. I appreciate that this matter is not completely under the Minister's control; however, I suggest that the streamlining of training procedures should be suggested as a matter of priority at the next Ministers of Labour conference, which will probably be held next month.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We have already had talks. I met with the National Training Council last year, and we are already moving in that direction.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am delighted to hear that. I support it completely. After all, each State has different apprenticeship classifications and curriculum content in Department of Further Education courses. There are variations in the extent to which credits are provided and in the extent to which State commissioners adhere to the strict letter of the award or allow for variation. Each State cannot regard itself as an island, and it is obvious that, with increased mobility, there has to be greater co-operation and co-ordination among the States.

Australia badly needs a properly thought-out, national manpower policy. I would like to quote from a Chinese friend, who once told me:

As one famous Chinese philosopher said in the seventh century: If you wish to plan for a year, sow seeds. If you wish to plan for 10 years, plant trees. If you wish to plan for a lifetime, develop people.

I suppose if the Minister of Agriculture did his own

research, and cared for himself a little more than he does, he would not be in the trouble that he is now. In terms of manpower policy, present Australian practice has not progressed beyond the first proverb. By international standards of manpower policy, Australia is an under-developed country. The Federal Government, like the State Government, boasts of its commitment to private enterprise, but this is never extended to our people. In Malcolm Fraser's view, workers either sink or swim at the whim of private capital.

Such a philosophy is not only socially devastating, but is also economically irresponsible. Nothing more clearly illustrates the wastefulness of not having a national manpower policy than the over-supply of teachers, the unavailability of apprenticeships for thousands of well-equipped young people, and the over-supply of untrained people, and it is always the working class families who suffer in this context.

Certainly, it was refreshing to see the Federal Labor Party offer such a positive commitment in the area of trade training at the last elections. That policy, spelt out clearly by Bill Hayden, showed that a Federal Labor Government would no longer tolerate the criminal neglect of the present Federal Government in the area of trade training.

The task of a national manpower policy is not just to ensure an adequate match in the demand and supply of labour, but it has a fundamental aim of achieving an equality of opportunity for all Australians. Labor's policy, upon achieving government federally, would be to establish an Australian manpower office. Its task would be to reverse the years of manpower neglect under the Fraser Government, and to begin the enormous backlog of research and development in manpower policy.

When Labor is elected at the next Federal election, Bob Hawke's Australian manpower office will begin the most ambitious and far-reaching investigation of labour market behaviour in Australian history. The best and brightest minds in the country will be recruited, and no effort will be spared to ensure that the Australian manpower office brings manpower policy to the forefront of the economic debate. Let us compare that pledge with the current situation. To actively set about massive recruiting drives overseas in search of skilled tradesmen of which this Government is guilty, while unemployed young Australians are left to rot on the dole, is inexcusable. Perhaps the Minister of Industrial Affairs will remind his Federal counterpart at the next meeting of Ministers of Labour that between 1976 and 1978 the number of apprentices in training fell by some 6 per cent. So much for the employment spin-off from our so-called resources boom.

It is a great tragedy that we are presently, in Australia, training only 80 per cent of our requirements for skilled labour, and this will fall to below 70 per cent by 1985. There needs to be a thorough reappraisal of the whole training system throughout Australia, and this would have been one of the priority tasks of the Australian manpower office, which would have been established if Labor had won the Federal election last October. I notice that my friend from Henley Beach is applauding that situation. Labor's pledge was to scale down progressively the skilled migrant intake and boost current apprenticeships by 50 per cent, or 20 000, during the first term of a Hayden Labor Government. Some achievement, if the Australian people had voted a little differently from the way that they did.

Whilst welcoming most of the provisions of this Bill, I would like to stress that its impact on South Australian employment will be marginal. I am told on reasonably good authority that the implementation of this Bill, and all of the good things about it (and I am not condemning the Bill in essence), will probably not increase the labour force

very much at all. However, it will give the employer a reasonably trained first-year apprentice or first-year trainee. But, irrespective of that, the information that I have been given is that that particular employer would have been employing an apprentice, or a trainee of some sort, in any case. In those circumstances, it would not be his intention to employ more people than his business requires, anyway. I am not saying that is a bad thing. The employee gets a free vocation training certificate, so he is much more qualified than someone who is untrained and who walks in off the streets. But I do not think we should let our imagination run away and think for one moment that in those circumstances we can judge any great rising spiral so far as employment opportunities are concerned. I hope that I am wrong about that, and I hope that pre-vocational training, abilities and opportunities that should come from this Bill, if the commission does its job properly, will enhance the situation for young people to be able to find employment. I suppose that only time will tell. The point I have raised was put to me strongly yesterday and again today that it will have a very ordinary effect.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Who put this to you?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Several people put it to me. I am not prepared to give their names and have them recorded in *Hansard*. If the Minister wants to talk to me privately, I will inform him of the circumstances. Landy has written an article, which raises certain doubts about this matter.

The latest record unemployment figures show the need for the reintroduction of direct job creation schemes that will not only give young people work but also give them valuable work skills and experience to enable them to get other, more permanent jobs. Just as the Minister was prepared to see sense and back down on 10 of the 12 points of contention in this Bill, I hope he will admit his mistakes and now push in Cabinet for the reintroduction of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme.

I also felt that the Minister overstated, in his introduction to this Bill, the employment impact of the so-called resources boom. In fact, resource development will not provide a significant boost to employment growth. We in the A.L.P. welcome major development projects, but they must be examined and reported on realistically. Mining is extremely capital intensive, and the technology used is an investment for improving productivity rather than employment expansion. In the absence of a significant amount of domestic processing, proportionately few jobs are created for residents of the region.

Whilst there will be a multiplier effect upon the total number of jobs, it will be only of the order of two, and at the most four. Most certainly it will not be 10 or 15, as claimed last year by Mr. Viner. Those figures are entirely false. When new developments do open up, skilled workers are frequently recruited elsewhere in Australia, and they are increasingly being recruited overseas. In this fact alone there is sufficient weight to prove that the so-called development boom will not make any real impact on current unemployment levels.

I think I should again place on record the belief that I have held for some four or five years, and it is one of the matters that the *News* took up during the last Federal election. As Minister of Labour at that time, I gave qualified support, certainly not unqualified support, to the metal trades industry case. I have always believed that tradesmen in this country are under-paid. I have no doubt about that. We could solve most of our tradesmen problem if we could just encourage those people who have left the industry to come back into fields in which they are trained.

I believe it is the wages and conditions concept of the

Federal Metal Trades Award that drives them out and keeps them out. I had some figures taken out three or four years ago, and at that stage 165 000 tradesmen had left the industries and occupations in which they had been trained. If we could get only half of those people back into the so-called boom areas, we would not need to import skilled migrants from overseas. We could meet our demand for skilled tradesmen. The Australian Labor Party believes that something must be done to lift the wages of tradesmen. The present wage for a tradesman is about \$200.20, but many operators, truck drivers and clerks receive \$220 or \$250 a week. One would not have to be very sensible to realise that more money can be earned outside of the occupation for which one is trained. After all, the only thing the working man has to sell is his labour. Australia needs to take notice of this fact if it wants to train tradesmen and keep them in the industries in which they are trained.

Again, I am getting assent from the member for Henley Beach, and I am happy about that. At least he does not believe in low wages. Even if we bring skilled tradesmen into this country I do not believe we will solve the problem of the shortage of skilled tradesmen. Once they learn that they can get better wages outside their trade, they will also leave the industry. Once they have been in this country for a while they will soon learn that better wages can be earned, provided the economy is booming in other areas. I would like to know whether the Minister agrees with what I have been saying.

The Opposition will support the Bill, but I shall be moving two amendments in the Committee stage. I think in the main this is a major step forward in the training and retraining of people for various vocations, and the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the Bill and endorse the remarks of the Deputy Leader in commending the Government for introducing it. The Government recognises, as the Minister indicated in his second reading speech, the importance of the apprenticeship system of training. However, it has been quite clearly demonstrated that insufficient skilled tradesmen have been trained within the apprenticeship system in this State and in this country to meet the requirements. As a result, there have been many occupations in which training has not been provided or is offered in perhaps an unco-ordinated manner. Certainly the need for flexibility and more mobile skills has developed progressively during the last decade, and that is amply demonstrated by the clearly changing direction of job opportunities in relation to the resource development in this country that offers a tangible future, as a result of investment, for job opportunities. That means there will be a need for redirection and change, and flexibility will come to the fore.

One of the purposes of the Bill is to co-ordinate the administration of areas of commercial and industrial training. Indeed the Deputy Leader referred to that aspect of the Bill and commended the Minister on that particular measure, in that in an integrated way it will ensure that training opportunities will be available to all age groups within the community. Once again, it has been quite clearly shown throughout Australia that there is a need for the opportunity for people to undertake retraining to take on skills in another vocation. By doing that, we will be opening up job opportunities and flexibility for people in all age groups to take on a particular skill and thus obtain job opportunities and security.

The Bill contains many provisions which will enable occupations to be described by regulation as so-called "declared vocations". That will enable contracts of

training to be entered into in respect of people being trained for those occupations. Among other things, the commission is also empowered to determine and approve other schemes of training appropriate to non-trade and non-declared vocation areas, but for which a training contract is not considered necessary.

I wish to speak specifically in relation to the certificate in farm practice, a unique approach to skills training in the rural industry. The course gives due recognition to practising farmers as a source of training, and recognises that industry facilities should be used for training, thus avoiding costly duplication such as we see today in educational institutions. The certificate in farm practice is an integrated skills training programme for farmers and as such, as an on-property activity, it has set this course above all other approaches for skills training for farmers in Australia. Certainly the United Farmers and Graziers and those who pioneered this scheme in this State deserve commendation for their initiative in this field of endeavour.

Unfortunately, because of the lack of Government support to people who have undertaken this training in the past, the scheme, through no wish of those who have promoted it, has tended to develop as a scheme for the elite, emerging within the rural industry. I think that is a disappointing aspect that has crept into what could be a very valuable tool for the purposes of training people in our rural industry, an industry in the driest State in the driest continent in the world, which through efficiency in farming methods and techniques has developed a viable agricultural community that has contributed significantly over the years to the wellbeing of this State, and certainly financially and economically to this State. However, without the direct subsidy for those taking part in training schemes, such as CRAFT or NEAT, or one of the other Federal Government sponsored schemes, we find that costs are emerging for those taking part in the certificate in farm practice, first on the level of trainer cost and certainly on trainee costs. This is reflected in the fact that these costs have caused about 30 per cent of the firm enrolments to withdraw from that course.

That does not take into account the number who did not enrol in the first place, on the basis that they received no remuneration for undertaking training in that field. To the credit of the Minister, he took up the issue on behalf of the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia and those in that course, for he considered that it was vital that the Government should encourage employers to ensure that their employees are properly trained over a much wider range of occupations than those which traditionally have provided training in the past. The Minister's efforts in supporting the United Farmers and Stockowners in South Australia has been recognised, and his encouragement for the development of its farm training schemes has been very much appreciated by that sector of the South Australian community.

The Minister took issue with the Federal Government in relation to the inflexibility, and thus inability of the Federal Government to support by wage subsidies those taking part in the scheme. The Federal Government suggested that farm training become part of the apprenticeship system in South Australia. If that were the case, it would be prepared to provide funding under the craft scheme. However, it was impossible to do that because of the disadvantages in apprenticeship training which revolved chiefly around the inflexibility of that system. As the Minister has pointed out, those inflexibilities existed basically because the apprenticeship system in South Australia was many years ago inherited from the United Kingdom as the appropriate method for

the training of skilled craftsmen. The Minister has indicated his and the Government's objective in this legislation: whilst retaining the apprenticeship system for training in those trades for which the system was originally intended, alternative methods of training should be available for those in skilled trades. Further, opportunity should be available in other occupations where there is a definite need for a skilled component.

The Federal Government recognised that there was a need for assistance in this area, and provided some funding through the United Farmers and Stockowners to establish the scheme within South Australia. However, because it was not classified under the apprenticeship system it was therefore ineligible under the CRAFT scheme for those taking part to receive some reimbursement for their time commitment to that scheme. Unfortunately, budgetary constraints, constraints of the criteria under the apprenticeship system, and lack of recognition, placed at disadvantage those taking part in the scheme, and we can see emerging that pattern to which I have referred of an elitism within the scheme. That is disappointing because the more certificates in farm practice schemes we are able to establish through Department of Further Education colleges in country areas the more people can participate in those courses and the greater capacity those people will have in later life to contribute to the wellbeing of the rural industry and their own enterprises.

The scheme to which I have referred was placed in jeopardy because of lack of funds, despite the efforts of the U.F. and S. to attract them, and I suppose that that was partly due to the uniqueness of the scheme. It seems that, unfortunately, in those areas in which there is no historical parallel and therefore no historical source of funds, difficulties will be encountered in meeting criteria for funding. The aim to which I have referred is training in farm practice—to train young farmers in the practical skills of farming and farm management. The legislation the Minister has introduced will enable flexibility to be introduced into the whole field of apprenticeship training, skills training in all vocations, that I hope will lead to the capacity for the Government to continue to argue, as the Minister has most forcefully argued on behalf of the U.F. and S. and those in the rural industries for support and subsidy through CRAFT funding for those trainees taking part in a scheme.

Whilst the legislation will not automatically correct that anomaly, it lays the groundwork whereby the Minister can follow up the matter with his Federal counterpart in order to attain that support, that funding, for that particular skills training area. I hope those endeavours are successful and that, as a result, we will have an increase in the number of opportunities for those in rural areas to take part in the future in what has been a very successful scheme.

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): As has the Deputy Leader, I want to indicate that the Opposition intends to support the Bill with a couple of amendments. I should indicate at the outset that I commend the Minister for the amount of discussion that he has put into the process of arriving at this stage of the Bill. He is showing considerable acumen in realising that discussions with the trade union movement can pay dividends, even if one cannot arrive at 100 per cent agreement. I cannot help feeling though, that the Minister, like many Ministers before him (in fact, many people before him) is in rather a quixotic position, because he is charging at a windmill that he will not defeat. He is addressing himself to a problem that is insoluble, if approached in the way it has been approached over the

years. Of course, this problem of a shortage of skilled labour and semi-skilled labour is not new.

On the Australian scene, ever since the first European settlers arrived on these shores, there has been a shortage of skilled labour and, despite the best efforts of many people since the beginnings of this country under white domination, the problem is still with us. Last year I referred to a poem written by Henry Lawson in the last century which was called "Australasian Engineers" and which spelt out precisely the problem that confronts us at the moment. This poem was written at the end of the last century when thousands of unemployed youths were unable to get jobs in the engineering trades, whilst the owners of the means of production resolved their immediate problems by importing people in ships. In fact, we have had a problem, especially since the early 1950's, in relation to the supply of tradesmen. I now wish to quote from an article for which I will give the reference later. It is as follows:

One fundamental problem—

this is in relation to the shortage of tradesmen—

is that, while the community must have a supply of tradesmen sufficient to supply its needs, the provision of that supply under the apprenticeship method is dependent on separate decisions of individual potential employers faced with their own individual problems. What is even more important is that the supply of tradesmen in any given year is dependent upon the circumstances that were, five years earlier, influencing potential employers in their decisions whether or not to engage apprentices.

Thus, if business prospects and other general economic factors influence employers not to take apprentices or great numbers of apprentices, in 1961, the results will only be noticeable in 1966, when it must be assumed that the conditions could be radically different.

That is a quotation from a document put out by the Commonwealth Government under the title "Training for skilled occupations" and commissioned by the then Minister of Labour and National Service, the Hon. William McMahon, as he then was. Despite his best efforts and those of a few Federal and State Ministers since then, we are still stuck with that position. They have not addressed themselves to the real situation—and it applies equally to another very important problem, demarcation. The main problem is the lack of guarantee of the right to work or the right to a decent living at a level which will allow a person some dignity in his life. Until that guarantee is there from Governments, we will continue to have this problem.

There are a number of anomalies in the arguments put forward outside this House, as well as inside it, and there is also a great deal of confusing material advanced. It is interesting to note that, in October last year, the firm of T. O'Connor & Sons was telling the media that it was drastically short of skilled people, in particular boilermakers and welders, and had had to send overseas for them. The matter was drawn to my attention by a person who, at that time, had worked there until quite recently, that in the first half of November the firm retrenched six boilermakers and welders, and I think we can find the answer to the problem in an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 3 January 1981, under the heading "Sharpening the skills". The Minister is referred to, as follows:

And Mr. Brown points out that already resource development is making unfulfilled demands: engineering contractor T. O'Connor and Sons has been seeking about 60 boilermakers unsuccessfully (though it wants only top-of-the-line tradesmen who are always in short supply).

Employers will not take on tradesmen from the supply that

exists in the area. I do not know what constitutes a "top-of-the-line" tradesman. Over the years, employers have gradually reduced supervision, or put into supervision people who cannot really supervise. Then they put in people who, they say, are not top-of-the-line tradesmen, and give them all the responsibilities that used to devolve on a works foreman or a works manager. If the fellow cannot handle the job of works manager at the rate of pay of a boilermaker or fitter, they say he is not a top-of-the-line tradesman.

As a result of the report I received in relation to the situation at O'Connors, I contacted the Commonwealth Employment Service on 28 November 1980, and I was told that that office could not give me any information as to the number of jobs available and the number of vacancies. I was told that there were eight on the board at that establishment, but it was suggested that I should contact the manpower research and information section of the department, and this I did. The latest figures at that time for the South Australian region showed that there were 47 registered vacancies for fitters, and 170 registered job seekers who were fitters. At the time, there was a slight shortage of boilermakers, with 75 registered job vacancies and 36 job seekers—but that is another tale. There were 19 job vacancies for welders and 140 job seekers; two vacancies for electrical fitters, and 42 job seekers; and 17 vacancies for electrical mechanics, and 178 job seekers.

I will not quote more figures, but obviously there are people in the community who consider themselves tradesmen but who are not acceptable to employers. One of the reasons for this, unfortunately, is that many of them are over the age of 45 years, and in many instances that seems to exclude them from the category of top-of-the-line tradesmen, the term the Minister used. I know some of these men, and they are good tradesmen. They are possibly not in quite such a good physical condition as they were in 20 years ago, but that raises another problem to which Governments and society must address themselves, namely, the conditions under which people are required to work once they have the skills.

The Deputy Leader referred to the number of apprentices who leave the trade immediately on or shortly after completing their apprenticeship. Some of them get a helping hand. Although I applaud the Minister for taking on apprentices recently in the Government service, I draw attention to the condition: when these people complete their apprenticeship, they complete their employment with the Government, so they are on the labour market as skilled tradesmen.

There is another remarkable anomaly. When those lads, fresh out of training schools and workshops, front up at a private enterprise or Government workshop with their brand new tradesman's certificate, they present it to the employment officer and he will ask what experience they have had. They say they have just finished their time and that they are looking for a job, and they are told that they are not top-of-the-line tradesmen, and have no experience. They have had four years experience in workshops, working with tradesmen, but the employers will not give them jobs and allow them to develop their skills.

It is similar to the situation of a doctor, for instance, who goes to university. Even the A.M.A. does not regard him as a doctor until he has completed an internship. Unfortunately, for doctors in South Australia, or aspiring doctors, things are not too bright. I have here two newspaper clippings, one of which refers to seven doctors being on the dole, while the other points out that in New South Wales doctors are trying to make \$800 an hour.

Employers expect tradesmen just out of their apprenticeship to front up as experienced tradesmen, and

it is an impossibility. If employers stick to that line, they cannot resolve their problems. They are insoluble.

I have agreed to curtail my remarks, but I want to refer to a point reported in an article by Dennis Atkins in the *Sunday Mail* on 15 February, commenting on a remark made by a national research officer of the A.M.W.S.U., and referring to the fact that this argument is heresy, as far as the employers are concerned.

It refers to the very important fact that skilled tradesmen are underpaid. That can be clearly sheeted home to the Menzies Government, which set out in 1953 to destroy the wage system that had served this country from the beginning of the century until that time. It is rather amazing that the Federal Minister is now trying to re-introduce that provision in a similar form. During the 1939-45 period, the Tradesmen's Rights Regulations Act came into being, and that guaranteed certain rights for tradesmen. The trade-off was that the tradesmen would accept a training scheme that would overcome shortages of skilled tradesmen. This worked very well until the early 1950's, when the Menzies Government doublecrossed the tradesmen of Australia, emasculated the Act, and used it as a rort to bring in boat-loads of people from overseas, some of whom were skilled but many of whom were not. In the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's, the Act was a means of providing a bureaucratic organisation for giving jobs to public servants and of helping the manufacturers in this country to obtain labour.

The Deputy Leader referred to the proposition that we import people to do jobs. He is dead right when he says that they learn the ropes and may then leave the jobs and get into better occupations, because they can get better money, cleaner circumstances and less risk to life and limb. In fact, some people find it more acceptable, when they are confronted with some of the filthy low-paid jobs in skilled and semi-skilled areas in industry, to go on the dole, reduce their intake and their lifestyle and exist in a reasonably safe and sound atmosphere rather than, for a lousy few bucks more, risk having their legs cut off, arms crushed, or eyes knocked out. Such accidents are all the fault of the employers, because they will not provide a safe working environment unless driven to it. When people are brought here to do jobs, once they arrive here and learn the lurks, they realise what the situation is, they see that they can do better out of this place, and so they move on.

If one wants proof, one need only look at the history of B.H.P. in the late 1940's, the 1950's, and the 1960's, especially prior to the initiation of air passage for migrants, when the big ships came in. B.H.P. would not increase wages and improve conditions. People were dragged from Europe, and told about the Mediterranean climate of Whyalla and the beautiful lifestyle on the shores of sunny Spencer Gulf, but when they arrived they found what it was really like. They worked their guts out to get out of it and B.H.P., knowing that they were on the way, ordered another shipload. If anyone wants verification of that, hundreds of thousands of people will substantiate it. They may like living in Australia, and in the end they may have been better off, but there is no doubt about their feelings about B.H.P. They can be substantiated.

I congratulate the Minister on realising something that some other States and the Federal Government have not realised. Attention was drawn to this fact in the *Advertiser* on 9 February 1981 in an article headed "Shortage of labour may effect boom". The article refers to Mr. Gordon Mathams speaking somewhere in the Eastern States at a symposium of the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors. The article stated:

Mr. Mathams said the disturbing lack of understanding by

Federal and State authorities was shown by their preoccupation with the need to supply qualified tradesmen who had undergone a full apprenticeship.

He talked about tradesmen making up only 20 per cent of the on-site workforce. He referred to concrete workers, pipe layers, scaffolders, riggers, dogmen, crane operators, and plant operators. I agree that, if we can bring these areas under some sort of control, it will be very good. If we can ensure that people are given training, I am sure that safety on-site will be improved.

Mr. Lewis: Do you agree with it?

Mr. O'NEILL: I am not an unreasonable person. People should be trained. It is better that that is done. People should be trained and paid a decent wage, instead of our bringing poor, illiterate peasants from agricultural countries who are untrained, and paying them a very meagre wage and putting their life and limb in jeopardy, just to make larger and larger profits. We are beginning to realise the fallacy of the argument that one can succeed by robbing the workers. Certainly, a lot of money has been made in the last decades of this century, but I hope that this is an indication that the conservative Party of South Australia is beginning to realise that it must talk to the trade unions, and listen to them. I understand that the Minister agreed to 11 of the 14 points, and I congratulate him for that. I believe that he is rather like Don Quixote in that he is charging at windmills, but at least he is making an attempt, and I hope the situation will improve somewhat. To really overcome problems, we must guarantee the people the right to work and the right to a decent income that will allow them to live a dignified life and not, as the Prime Minister is trying to do, cut off the dole payment for those people for whom he cannot supply work.

Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd): I support the Bill. It is a little difficult to speak fourth in a debate and make new points, so I will emphasise those points in the Bill that I regard as of greatest importance. From my previous employment, I would agree totally with the Minister when he says that well structured training arrangements are vital to the overall economic growth and development of South Australia. Part and parcel of that is to give people the opportunity to gain skills and knowledge. Unlike the member for Florey, who I believe was a little simplistic in laying the blame entirely at the feet of the employer, I believe that there is no doubt that the fault for the present situation rests in many quarters. There is no doubt that at times the employer is and has been at fault, but certainly there have been times when the unions have been extremely difficult to get on with. A lack of co-operation has led in a high degree to some of the difficulties with which we are confronted.

Additionally, I cannot accept the point made by the member for Florey or the Deputy Leader that wages are the main reason for the lack of skilled tradesmen. Unfortunately, the employers can afford to pay only a certain part of their income in wages and, unless the worker can be more productive for the extra money that he requests, there will not be too many businesses left in operation in this country. Thus, co-operation between employer and employee is vital if agreement is to be reached. I do not want to see a return to the Whitlam days, during which wages were increased out of all sight. This had a disastrous effect on inflation and employment. If members opposite suggest that we should return to those days, I for one cannot accept that.

Nor can I accept the point made by the Deputy Leader, that the mineral and resources boom will not create a significant increase in demand for skilled tradesmen. I

believe that the reverse is true. Let us consider Roxby Downs as an example. I realise that members opposite do not want Roxby Downs to go ahead, but Roxby Downs promises for this State one of the greatest developments possible. The mine could be bigger than Mount Isa or Broken Hill and, if the scheme goes ahead, we will require skilled tradesmen not only in the mining industry but also to develop the town.

If we are going to have a town bigger than Mount Isa or Broken Hill, just think of the number of tradesmen that will be required in the building industry alone. What about the railways, roads, water supply, communication, and so on? Do members opposite not believe that that will bring about a need for skilled tradesmen? I cannot accept the point that they have been making. As far as I am concerned, I see the State's mineral development as one of the major factors leading to a greater demand on the numbers of skilled tradesmen.

Another problem the State is presently facing, as are a number of other States and countries, is the rapid introduction of new technology which is having an important effect on the employment of skilled tradesmen. One of the Bill's greatest benefits is that it breaks down old barriers, one of which is the age barrier, and I am delighted to see its removal. In the past, discrimination has existed against older persons. Once one was in one's 20's, that was too old to be given apprenticeship training. We see that opportunities will now be provided for people in their 20's, 30's and even older.

The company I was with before I came into this House had already started a programme, not with skilled tradesmen but with unskilled tradesmen, which could be expanded by using some of the opportunities this Bill will offer. Some two years ago, when I left, Chrysler was introducing multi-skilling to ensure that workers on the production line were trained to do not just one job, but two, three or more jobs, so that should a position on the line become redundant, or should new equipment be brought in that would mean that their skill was no longer needed there, they could immediately be moved to other parts of the manufacturing line.

This was done with the full co-operation of unions, and only those workers wanting to enter the scheme did so. It worked excellently, and meant that the company had a work force able to be moved throughout the plant without causing any disruption to production or to employment. I see the sorts of things that this Bill provides for as giving an opportunity for expansion into those areas for the skilled tradesman. A person may be fully trained in a certain skill, but now he will not be prevented from being trained in an additional skill, for which there may be a greater demand in the future. That is most important.

We have seen the number of industries that are expanding in South Australia, and the number being attracted here, increasing tremendously. The number of jobs in South Australia is increasing, for the first time in many years. We will need additional skilled tradesmen to cater for that expansion. This Bill will make it much easier for these needs to be met.

Apprenticeship will remain a fundamental part of training, but now persons will be able to obtain skills in other ways. Again, I saw only too well the inflexibility of the old system as having a deleterious effect on production and employment. I am delighted that now there will be opportunities for persons in the trades to gain additional skills without any threat of employment loss. Other forms of training will go side by side with apprenticeship, and that will provide the necessary flexibility.

I am particularly pleased to note, too, that training schemes will be specifically made available for those

people presently unemployed. This Government has already shown considerable concern for those people. On a number of occasions we have heard the Premier and the Minister speak about the 2 000 jobs made available for the young unemployed in this State, and the 550 firms that have taken part.

Mr. Whitten: Do you really believe that?

Mr. ASHENDEN: Of course, I believe it; the figures are on the board. If members opposite cannot accept figures that come out, I do not know what we have to do to prove to them that we are doing something for these people. There is a little bit of rhetoric from the opposite side, just as there was from the Deputy Leader in the *North-East Leader* a couple of weeks back. All sorts of unsubstantiated statements were made about unemployment. This Government has deliberately turned its attention to this very real problem. It has been successful and will be much more successful as time goes on.

I am sure that I am no orphan, as a member of Parliament, to have had in my office a number of young people, as well as a number of people in their 20's and 30's, who are unemployed and who are desperately looking for a position. I see the retraining arrangements catered for in this Bill as a major factor in assisting these people.

I see the Industry Advisory Committee as playing a key role. It can make recommendations on training needs for industry. I speak from the management side of a major company when I say without fear of contradiction that one of the major concerns we faced when I was in industry was in obtaining trained people to come in to the work force. I realise that it is hard to get a line of demarcation between what is the responsibility of a training area and what is the responsibility of an employer in determining how to prepare people for the job they are to do within a company. I am delighted that the Industry Advisory Committee will talk with management to determine what are training needs, so that when new employees come to the companies they will have a good background, a good basic training, on which companies can build skills and development. I hope that there will not only be close consultations between unions and employees about what is seen as a training requirement, but that there will be consultation with the employer, and that programmes developed through consultation will go much closer to meeting the needs of all concerned.

The Bill contains provisions to enable occupations to be "declared vocations", and to offer training contracts, which is an excellent move in the right direction. The member for Rocky River spoke about that, and I will not go into greater detail.

We are getting away from the rigid apprenticeship scheme that applied in the past, in that the commission will be empowered to determine and approve other schemes of training which are appropriate to non-trades and non-declared vocations but for which a training contract is not considered necessary. Thus, another group of persons will be able to be catered for when the Act is passed.

There is no doubt that, with an increased number of skilled tradesmen (and that is what this Bill will primarily bring about), there will be an increased need, not only for skilled tradesmen, but for other workers who can support the skilled tradesmen and who will be able to provide the service necessary in areas that will be opened up because of the additional skilled tradesmen that will be made available. The Minister's scheme will provide an opportunity for training that will enable employers and training organisations to provide people much better suited to the work they will be required to do when entering the work force of the expanding industry in this State.

I am delighted to see that the Minister has consulted with unions and employers, and has produced a Bill that is almost entirely acceptable to both sides of the House. He deserves commendation for this, as has been pointed out by members opposite. I certainly hope that the employers and employees will be as co-operative when the Act has been proclaimed.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I support this Bill. I am sure that when it comes out of the Committee stage it will be a much improved Bill after some of the amendments foreshadowed by the Deputy Leader have been adopted. I commend my Deputy Leader on his contribution, and I also commend the member for Florey. I also commend the Minister. I know it is surprising that I should ever commend the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I would say that he would be a much better Minister of Industrial Affairs than the Minister sitting on the front bench at the moment.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You'd better have some thought for the one sitting in the front seat, because he is the Minister's deputy for the time being.

Mr. WHITTEN: I feel that he would be a much better Minister because I do not think he would ever say, when the workers get into a bit of trouble, "Starve them into submission." If the Minister of Agriculture did not interject, he would not be subjected to the treatment I will give him if he keeps on going.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will provide the difficulties if interjections continue.

Mr. WHITTEN: Thank you for your guidance, Mr. Speaker. I commend the Minister for his consultation with the trade union movement. I never thought that a Liberal Minister would visit Trades Hall and seek the views of the unions in the way this Minister has done. I commend him for that, because consultation is the essence of industrial relations.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He has a lot of nous.

Mr. WHITTEN: Yes, and he has a lot of other things that I do not agree with. I wish to place on record my appreciation and that of the Labor Party for the services we have had for many years from our Apprenticeship Commissioner, Mr. Crawford Hayes. I have known him for about 40 years, during which time he has done much for apprenticeship training in this State.

This Bill is really a change from the attitudes of the Liberal Party in the past, when it refused absolutely to allow daytime training. The lads had to work from 7.30 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. and then go on to trade school until 9 p.m. At least we have progressed in the training of apprentices. I am also pleased that the apprenticeship system will be continued, even though it will not be continued in the same way as it has been operating, because the apprenticeship system years ago was a source of cheap labour for employers, and certainly those lads were exploited. They were not taught a trade in the way I believe they should have been. I know that some of them started off earning 15 shillings a week, and then they had a magnificent rise to 17/6d in the next year.

Mr. Lewis: A lot of money in those days.

Mr. WHITTEN: If you convert it to today's money, you can see it wasn't much in those days. Those lads were paying 12/6d a week board.

Mr. Lewis: I used to get 6d a rabbit.

Mr. WHITTEN: Some of them were cheaper than that. Some of them come for nothing, and some of them could even speak English. Like the member for Todd, I compliment the Minister on his second reading speech, in which he said:

Well-structured training arrangements are vital to the

overall economic growth and development of South Australia and to the people of this State to give them the opportunity to gain the skills and knowledge needed for vocations and careers.

Certainly that is something with which we would all agree. We hope that the well-structured arrangements are decent and fair, because they have not always been. The Minister also said:

It is a sad reflection on the policies of the past that at a time of high unemployment companies have been forced to bring in skilled labour from overseas.

At the moment we have the highest unemployment this State has ever had. The figures of the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs for November 1980 showed that in South Australia 1 576 skilled metal and electrical tradesmen were unemployed. As there were 271 unfilled vacancies for skilled metal and electrical tradesmen, there were six skilled tradesmen chasing every job available, and this is supposed to be a time of a shortage of skilled tradesmen.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Have you considered that the community may not be able to afford—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: I have given a lot of consideration to the number of unemployed in my district, which includes Port Adelaide. I can assure the Minister that the relationship between the number of unemployed skilled tradesmen and the number of jobs available is a lot greater than the average in South Australia. Port Adelaide is an industrial area where workers congregate, and that raises the ratio of unemployed to the number of jobs available.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: When are you going to recognise—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is in charge of the House but not of the debate. I ask him to desist from interjecting.

Mr. WHITTEN: The Minister also said:

For too long successive Governments in Australia representing both political Parties have relied on importing trade skills rather than training our own people.

The member for Florey covered that point well, but I think the point should be made that companies had never indentured the number of apprentices they were entitled to indenture under the ratio of apprentices to tradesmen. The reason for this given by the member for Todd is that the employers cannot afford to employ these people. However, I still say that apprentices are used as a source of cheap labour. The Minister also said:

This Government recognises the importance of the apprenticeship system of training. However, insufficient skilled tradesmen have been trained through the apprenticeship system to meet the country's requirements.

The Minister said that he had endeavoured to help apprentices who are unable to complete their apprenticeships. I have endeavoured to help them, but I have been unsuccessful. Last year in the plumbing industry more than 50 apprentices were on the books after having been put off, and they were unable to complete their indentures because the companies had folded up, mainly through the actions of this present State Government. With the assistance of the Apprenticeship Commission, some of these people have been able to continue their apprenticeships. The Minister also said:

We have assured the trade unions that apprenticeship will remain a fundamental part of training. The rights of tradesmen will be protected.

I commend the Minister for that. He went on to say:

Whether the unions wish to oppose this Bill or not is up to them. However, as Minister responsible I am determined to ensure that vested interests are not allowed to prevent essential changes occurring in our training system.

I wish he would have a go at the other vested interests which are interfering with the employment of apprentices, but he is looking at the trade unions as vested interests. Those organisations will endeavour always to try to assist apprentices. He did some good work by going down to Trades Hall, which at times he has called the hall of socialism, and consulting with the trade union movement. However, he is destroying that by saying to people, "I will take you on; I will not give in any more to you people."

Mr. O'Neill: That's the Liberal rhetoric.

Mr. WHITTEN: That might be. I also want to make some points about the wages of skilled tradesmen. The point has been made that there are many skilled tradesmen who are not working at the trade for which they were trained, particularly in the metal trades, especially boilermaking, which is a dirty, rough, heavy and hot trade. Having regard to the wages they receive, one can understand why so many do not work at the trade. I know many of them who work on the wharves, because an unskilled wharfie gets a fair deal more in wages than those who work at a trade, and they work less than a 35-hour week. I want to read into the record the award wages that are received by a tradesman. The Deputy Leader quoted a figure; I am not sure what it was, but I have the correct figures. I refer to the metal industries Federal award applicable on or after 9 January 1981. The grand sum of \$188.10 is paid to fitters, boilermakers, sheet metal workers and electrical tradesmen. It should be remembered that most of these people have undergone a five-year apprenticeship. It has now been reduced to four years, but originally it involved five years of low wages in order to obtain the magnificent sum of \$188.10, plus a supplementary payment of \$12.10, which makes a total weekly award rate of \$200.20. What a magnificent sum to receive after sweating your guts out during a 40-hour week.

Mr. O'Neill: It's about half what the Minister pays in tax each week.

Mr. WHITTEN: Well, that might be right. I am not aware of the other interests of the Minister, and I do not want to delve into that. I am pointing out that metal tradesmen are paid too little and, until they are paid a decent wage, there will always be problems of getting men to work and remain at the trade. Amendments will be moved which will improve the Bill greatly. I support the Bill.

Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach): It is one of those days when one thinks that, due to the advances in technology, perhaps it would be good to have debates televised from this House, because for a change, instead of antagonism (although there has been some) between the Parties, there seems to be a degree of conciliation whereby both sides agree to a Bill. I believe, if one looks back at the history of this whole matter, one would begin to understand why. As a Liberal Party member, as a working class person and as a unionist I, along with many other Liberal working class members, took note of the 1978 debate in this House, because we were promised in the 1977 elections by the Australian Labor Party policies which were very similar to Liberal Party policies developed by the Liberal Party in the early 1970's. One of the policies concerned an adult apprenticeship training scheme which was designed to make adult training easier. However, during the 1977 debate in this House we began to see that the Labor Party was beginning to change its tack. If I remember correctly, one trade union, which was a millstone around the then Minister's neck (he is now the Deputy Leader), made loud noises about rejecting its affiliation with the A.L.P. if the

Bill went through in a form which recognised adult apprentices, and other reasons were given. I suppose the Labor Party was caught up in a philosophical argument, and I guess it does have some problems to face. As the Deputy Leader quite rightly pointed out, however, usually giant things are achieved after first taking small steps. As he quite rightly pointed out, in 1978 the small steps had begun to be taken. I guess now it is a lot easier for him as an Opposition member to concede that he agrees with the approach that the Government is to take, because we have achieved something which he could not achieve in Government but which he dearly wanted to achieve. On that basis I believe the Opposition can support the measure before the House.

The member for Price made an interesting observation concerning wage rates, and he stated his concern about wharfies receiving more money than tradesmen. He even took the opportunity to place into *Hansard* the salary rates of tradesmen compared to those received by wharfies. With this problem there lies part of our problem in a community which has begun to recognise unskilled labour as against people who have spent five years training as apprentices. I spent five years as an apprentice, and one of the things that irked me during that time was that my mates who had left school at the same time as I, and who had gone into the clerical and Public Service areas, received far in excess of what I did as an apprentice. No wonder people did not want to get into the apprentice system. No wonder they wanted to become clerks or to work in other areas, because the remuneration was far more attractive. Such remuneration was granted and negotiated with the unions, the unions taking the key with the employers. Unions must recognise that apprenticeship training needs recognition, that it needs preservation and the protection which it quite rightly deserves. Most of my comments are based on my own personal experience as an apprentice and from my observations in growing up in that area in the 1970's.

I refer to the booklet entitled "Is apprenticeship outdated?" which was published in the early 1970's. At page 19, under the heading "The future of apprenticeship", comments which are relevant to this matter today are as follows:

If we are to create a system which enables people to use their inherent abilities to the full, we need to re-think our concepts of "training for skill". The type of training required to meet the changing needs of the new technological revolution must:

- be flexible to enable new skills to be developed as required at any stage in a man's working life
- be speedy, so that time spent in learning is kept to a minimum
- allow the most appropriate people to be recruited to undergo training regardless of their age
- take account of the need to develop career patterns so that the semi-skilled worker who is a late developer is not restricted to a dead end job. We cannot afford to ignore the claims of the semi-skilled to become skilled just because they did not enter the ranks of apprenticeship at an early age when their characters and aspirations were unformed. To maintain this attitude would be to ignore a potential pool of skill which the nation badly needs.

I read that quotation because it sums up the general concern in the community in the early 1970's regarding our approach to apprenticeship schemes. The Liberal Party took up the matter early and changed its policy. It was not elected to Government at that time, and the Labor Party took the matter up and promoted it quite strongly at the 1977 election. We saw an interesting aspect of the Labor

Party trying to implement this policy in 1977, and that is why I laughed today when I heard the Deputy Leader quote the Labor Party's present manpower policy, as outlined by the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament.

This Bill takes up the challenges outlined in the quotation. Pre-vocational training will be recognised. What an advance, what a step to be taken! At last, those unemployed people who are using their initiative and going to an institution of further education, and who are beginning to be trained in skills, will be recognised. The school-to-work transition which is taking place will be recognised as part of training, shortening the apprenticeship time and giving people the recognition they deserve.

The apprenticeship scheme has been under pressure because of technological changes, demanding on-going training. In the area in which I worked previously, I did not finish my training at the end of the fifth year, although I received the necessary certificates to indicate that I was a fully qualified tradesman. My training seemed to go on indefinitely, and that is part of the society in which we live today. Because of the continuing changes, rapid changes, we need to be trained continually. Tradesmen must continually upgrade their learning, and they are having an opportunity to use their initiative by attending courses after working hours, advancing their skills and achievements.

One concern I have is that there is no recognition of a person's skills for job advancement. The trend seems to be that, if a person has academic qualifications, he will get the advancement, without recognition of whether or not he can do the job. Unions and employers must look closely at that area. How do we recognise the person who needs to have that extra remuneration? Do we say that, because he has trained at a college and has a certificate, he should get the advancement? No. I believe that we must recognise that the person who can do the job must get the recognition he deserves.

A person might train as an apprentice for five years and, in his mid-20's, as I did, he might want to diversify his area of interest or occupation. I elected to move from the technical area into the social area, but the avenues were not open to me. Because of the existing system, I could not, as an adult, do a training course and get due recognition. The flexibility produced by the Bill will allow those who may be unsatisfied in their present occupation, or who want to advance their training or change direction, an opportunity to do so, provided that they get recognition as adult apprentices. Employment prospects might not be increased, but job satisfaction prospects will be.

At last, we will have adults who want to train, having worked in an unskilled area and now finding themselves redundant, who will have the opportunity to take on an area in which they are interested or to vary their approach. I have given an undertaking to keep my comments short, and I will do that by summing up. As an apprentice who has come through the system and who understands that there needs to be a change, I am glad to be a member of the Liberal Party and to see the Liberal Party implementing that change.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): Basically, I support the Bill, although with a few amendments, as indicated by my Deputy Leader. I would like to pick up one of the points raised by a number of my colleagues, including the member for Florey, in relation to the number of

tradesmen in the community. There are dormant tradesmen in the community. I worked with many of them in my previous occupation, and no doubt many of my colleagues have experienced similar situations. These apprentices, after becoming qualified, have found that the rate of pay has been insufficient, especially when compared to rates applicable to those in unskilled classifications with whom the qualified tradesman works every day.

It has been my experience that many of these tradesmen have left their occupations, joined other unskilled or semi-skilled occupations, and have received an increase in their rate of pay. If the skills of the tradesmen were recognised sufficiently, and if the decisions of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission were not so unjust, in my opinion, in failing to recognise the skills of these people, I believe that many of these dormant tradesmen would come flooding out of the woodwork. I have known them as bakers, and shunters and in many positions within the railways industry where I previously worked.

I do not intend to rehash the issues raised by my colleague, but I would like the Minister to investigate one matter. It arises from a comment made to me by a person who lives just outside my district and whom I have known for several years. He has told me that in many Irish newspapers, as well as other overseas newspapers, the Australian Government is advertising for 18 to 20-year-old people to come to Australia as apprentices on a two-year basis. The situation concerns me. If it is correct, how will the position affect the young people who are coming on, those who are leaving school or who have left school? The matter is worthy of investigation, and I hope the Minister will make inquiries. I will check it out through my Federal colleagues.

I have expressed concern about another matter, the number of school-leavers or those who would like to leave school, who have sufficient qualifications, and who have applied for apprenticeship positions here in South Australia.

I was speaking recently to the State Government Relations Manager of General Motors-Holden's, Woodville, Mr. G. F. Brimner, after I inspected the plant at Woodville. Mr. Brimner informed me that G.M.H. required 40 apprentices last year, and 1 020 applications were received. That is a very serious situation. He also informed me that, of those 1 020, at least 800 were suitable for the company's needs, but only the top 40 received apprenticeships.

Another issue raised by the member for Todd (and it is not very often that I agree with him) was the question of multi-skilling. On September 10, I was fortunate, with the Deputy Leader and the member for Peake, to visit the Woodlawn mine outside Canberra. This is an interesting innovation and my colleagues and I considered it more than worth while to look at the way in which the unions and management came together at this plant to agree on the multi-skilling procedures. The unions involved included the A.M.W.S.U., about which we hear a lot in regard to its militancy and its alleged attitude towards management. However, in this case, management and the unions came together and, in consultation, in conjunction with the E.T.U. and the A.W.U., agreed on the multi-skilling arrangements that operate at the mine. The mine had been operating for 18 months when we visited it, and we were informed by the public relations officer that only one industrial dispute had occurred in that time, which, he said, was a management fault relating to a safety issue. I believe that, given the proper attitude by employers, employees and the trade union movement multi-skilling exercises can operate very successfully. I came away full of

praise for the way in which the system operated, although it was not without flaws.

I would have liked to go on in more detail, but because of the time restraints I will curtail other issues that I wanted to raise. One matter raised by members on this side is the Minister's attitude. He made an unfortunate statement in the second reading explanation, by saying:

The rights of the tradesmen will be protected. Whether the unions wish to support this Bill or not is up to them.

That statement is unfortunate, because the unions and the Government came together and agreed on this Bill. For the Minister to have made that statement after leaving the Trades Hall was very remiss, and I hope that he will consider withdrawing it. Statements of that kind do not assist industrial relations in this State. We have enough problems without heaping more fuel on the fire. We all know what can come from rash statements. Basically, I support the Bill, subject to the amendments that will be moved by the Deputy Leader.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): Bearing in mind the Government's desire to pass this measure tonight, I point out that I am a little disappointed that the Bill should be pushed through in this way. I represent many people who have been involved as employers with apprenticeships over many years. I have not been able to show them the Bill and to get a response from them, and I would have liked to do that. I have had no local response to the Bill, although the Minister has spoken to parent bodies. From what I can gather from the second reading explanation and the debate on the Bill, it has some very good points, and I fully support the Minister's intention of trying to do something about the apprenticeship scheme and endeavouring to implement something new from which a lot of South Australians will benefit.

I feel somewhat disadvantaged in representing my constituents, because I have had no feedback from them, and this makes it difficult for me to speak with any real authority. The member for Rocky River mentioned the farmer training scheme, but there was no reference to that scheme in the Bill. However, the all-embracing aspect of the Bill would accommodate many of the needs of the farmer-training scheme. One problem is recognition of the scheme and of farming as a profession in order to attract Federal funding. The farmer-training scheme has existed in South Australia for over four years. I was a member of the initial committee that assisted in setting up the scheme. I was also a member of the Further Education Council and, in consultation with Leon Holme, presently at the Port Adelaide Community College, the council, with the then United Farmers and Graziers, piloted the scheme that is now becoming recognised throughout the State.

The scheme is rather unique: it is not an apprentice scheme as is run in Victoria, and it does not have the union complications that exist in some other States. I believe that it has the backing of worker groups in regard to the manner in which it is run and the type of operation that it is. The scheme commenced four years ago on Lower Eyre Peninsula and was centred around Cummins. There were 24 students. It was a pilot scheme and was initially funded through the Department of Further Education. The NEAT scheme assisted the farmers in providing part-payment to the lads who participated. The tuition was funded by the Department of Further Education. Collectively, it worked very well, but unfortunately the NEAT scheme was a once only operation, particularly in relation to the funding of this type of scheme. A three-year course was involved.

Annually, there were two block releases. The students either camped at locations on Eyre Peninsula or came to

Roseworthy or Adelaide, and in that way they were followed up. It proved to be a very successful scheme. Farmers became master farmers and in turn trained the students. It was not a father/son operation: the father of one son trained the son of another farmer, in order to get around the NEAT scheme and employment operations.

It was difficult to set up, but so successful was the scheme that requests came from all over South Australia and the rest of Australia for a similar operation. At present, even without funding for farmers, which is unfortunate, the only ones participating are those with parents who can afford to pay their sons and daughters whilst off the farm. This has limited the operation, to the extent that there is almost a 50 per cent dropout, purely because of lack of funding. A requirement will be that an industry committee for primary production will be set up, so that due recognition can be given to the course, and necessary funding provided.

The manpower forecasting unit is commendable. The producer organisations have been endeavouring, in their own small way, despite the hardships involved, to collect those sorts of figures, to present cases to State and Federal Governments. In this State, five courses operate without funding, and I have referred to the large number of people who have dropped out. Courses are also operating on Eyre Peninsula and in the South-East. There are Riverland horticultural courses, and courses at Murray Bridge and Clare. In the face of the adversity, the persistence by the producer organisations and farmers gives a strong indication that this aspect of apprenticeship training should be used as a model for other types of vocational training. Certainly, the rest of Australia is looking at our present scheme with envy, and seeking ways to adapt it to their own location. I fully support the Bill, and commend the Minister for what appears to be a very real attempt to solve apprenticeship training problems.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): As I understand that the kiss principle applies in this debate, I will keep it short and sweet. I support the Bill, with the reservations put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is a definite improvement and broadens training opportunities for all people. It has been said that many tradesmen leave the industry for which they have skills. That is an indictment of the PAYE system, and of the conditions under which some men and women have to work. This Bill does not touch on that area at all. Some people move out of the tools area and go into management. Their skills and knowledge are retained, but many leave altogether.

In relation to apprenticeship training and the attitudes of apprentices, in the *Ryldes* magazine of February 1981 there is a report of Richard Coombe, who describes himself as an observer, who has seen what must be classified as inadequate careers guidance, has worked with disgruntled apprentices on the factory floor, and lectured apprentices in the technical and further education system. He says that the problems of 20 years ago seem to remain very much in evidence. He has obviously had experience in the apprenticeship field. He states:

Basic skills and motivation are the foundation for a successful work career. The tailoring of these to specific work demands incorporating competence with technological advance will be much more readily mastered if the foundations have been well laid.

I think that is a valid point, which no-one would dispute. The basis of further acquisition of skills and knowledge makes a competent man or woman in a trade or vocation.

Apprentices from all over Australia recently participated in a forum, in conjunction with the award of the apprentice of the year, at the Herbert Vere Evatt

Memorial Foundation at the Ryde (Sydney) College of Catering. They stated that the most serious problem they were experiencing in acquiring skills and apprenticeship was the course content.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Do you know we won the Australian award for an apprentice from the Public Buildings Department?

Mr. PETERSON: We breed them well here, no doubt, but they have problems. These are the top apprentices, and obviously they represent what would be the cream of the tradesmen when they leave their time. Their main problem is that the course content is not valid. This commission will consider that problem of course content. Another point raised at this convention was that these top apprentices saw that their acquiring of trade skills was only a stepping stone to management. They were keen to do postgraduate studies. Provision for that is included in the Bill, but that will not solve the tradesmen problem, if they move out of the area. The apprentices raised a few other valid points. One of the questions asked of them was:

How can the working relationship between the apprentice and the craftsman from whom he or she learns be improved?

One of the points given in answer was:

Match the apprentices and tradesmen on a personality basis.

I do not know whether that is possible in all cases, but it is a good point. A valid point which might be looked at by the Minister in relation to universal training is as follows:

Train tradesmen in how to teach apprentices.

It is one thing for a man to learn and be adept in his trade, but it is another thing for him to be able to pass on that knowledge. The other point that the apprentices made in relation to improving the relationship between craftsmen and apprentices is as follows:

Develop forms of recognition for those tradesmen who train apprentices.

I am not sure how that would be done, but I am sure that some system of recognition for tradesmen-trainers could be worked out. We have other training schemes in the community on how to impart skills and knowledge. That aspect should be seriously considered in apprentice training. Another question asked of the apprentices was:

What specific changes should be made in the way subjects are taught? Why?

The students saw a need for improvements in teaching techniques:

They didn't like reading notes or writing from a board. They preferred demonstrations, discussions, visual aids, variety, and wanted reduced class sizes with continuous assessment rather than examinations.

In this day of improved visual and educational aids, I am sure that that is also an aspect that could be looked at. The apprentices were critical of poor on-the-job training and in many cases saw themselves being used as cheap labour. That point was raised earlier in relation to apprentices some years ago, and is obviously still considered to be so. The writer of the article said:

There needs to be change to make the attitude to the apprenticeship system more attractive. Too often the apprentice is regarded as the small cog in the big machine, but I point out that if he fails the machine is likely to fail, thus the quality of the tradespeople suffers.

Again, that is self-explanatory. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

Well-structured training arrangements are vital to the overall economic growth and development of South Australia and to the people of this State to give them the opportunity to gain the skills and knowledge needed for vocations and careers.

That statement is extremely valid and it gives a promise for

improvement. The breadth of knowledge and representation on the commission obviously augurs well for the future of apprentice training in this State. There is a good spread of skills, knowledge and experience which should make for a far better assessment of what is needed. In the second reading explanation, the Minister quoted figures from the Departments of Labour Advisory Committee (DOLAC) Working Party on Skills Shortages, which estimated that there will be a significant shortage of skilled men soon. The removal of discrimination against older people I am sure will help in the training of skilled tradesmen.

This system is an innovation in the method of commercial training, and this is obviously a step in the right direction. One problem I see is that at the moment there is no definition of what commercial training will cover. In the second reading explanation the Minister said that it had been under discussion for nine months and, whilst the trades are clearly defined as being trades, there is no definition of vocation or the commercial aspect of training.

I believe this Bill is a major step in the right direction, and I await the amendments. I applaud the fact that apprentices will be given a chance to acquire skills and become tradesmen, but there is a significant point involved because, once an apprentice takes a job, there is no longer a job. The apprentice has to serve four years as an apprentice, so theoretically that job disappears for four years. Perhaps the Minister can explain how that will work. There is no shortage of people who want jobs; in fact, there is a surplus of people who wish to be employed as apprentices and to acquire skills. It seems to me that there are only two ways to overcome this problem. We can have an intensive training scheme so that we can have people with basic skills in a short time, so that we can build on that through this training scheme.

The second way is to have more job opportunities. Until we get more opportunities for people to be employed and acquire skills, all the training schemes in the world will not solve the problem. I support the Bill, with the reservations I have put forward; I am sure that it would improve training. I applaud it for the innovative way in which it has attacked the problem, and I await the amendments.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): At the outset, I would like to thank members for their contributions to this afternoon's debate. I think it is one of the best standards of debate I have heard on a Bill during the seven or eight years I have been in this place. It is a major and significant step forward that we are making this afternoon, and I certainly appreciate the positive attitude expressed by all members in this House in taking that step forward.

A number of members criticised the statement I made in the second reading explanation, particularly relating to how certain amendments had been made and saying that I could no longer allow any vested interests to stop the passage of this Bill. Unfortunately, some people think I directed that comment specifically to the United Trades and Labor Council executive. That is not the case.

Mr. Whitten: It looked that way.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is specifically directed to vested interests, and I referred to trade unions in a general sense. I think I am fair in saying that. First, in my discussions with the United trades and Labor Council a number of areas of concern were discussed at some length, during the 4½ hours I spent in those discussions. It was a broader group than just the executive of the United Trades and Labor Council, and I stress that at no stage at the end of those agreements was it ever said, "If these

amendments are made, then do all of the unions present agree to support the Bill?" In fact, one or two unions had been extremely critical of the Bill, and they were still critical during those discussions. I had no idea whether or not some of those individual unions or persons were likely to support the Bill. I do not direct that comment at Mr. Gregory, because he had generally agreed with the Bill as I intended to amend it, but I do direct it at certain individual unions, some of which were not even present at the meeting with the U.T.L.C. but which publicly criticised the Bill. That is the reason for my comments. In no way do I retract from them. I think they were fair comment, because there had been no agreement with all the parties involved and all the unions who had passed comment on the Bill that, if these amendments were made, they would then support the Bill.

Mr. Whitten: It appears to me you were looking for a confrontation.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I was not.

Mr. Whitten: Perhaps I don't trust you.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I was not looking for confrontation. I was pointing out that certain vested interests had held back trade training in this State for a long time in certain areas. A classic example is that age restriction on apprenticeship has been an issue in this State for many years. We have taken that final inevitable step whereby there will no longer be any discrimination because of age against a person when it comes to industrial training. It is an important step, and I compliment the previous Minister for the move he made in this direction. It was an initial move but it did not go far enough at the time. He took a step and started to open it up. It needed to be buried once and for all. I am delighted to say that in this Bill we have done that. In making those remarks about vested interests I wanted to make sure that this Bill was not going to be tainted with certain aspects which had held back apprentice training, I believe, by a minority of trade unions and employers in this State.

I would also like to comment on one or two of the points raised by the Deputy Leader. I thought his speech today was good. He made the point that this Bill, by itself, would not attract industry and would not necessarily increase the size of the work force. That is not necessarily the case. More and more in my negotiations as the Minister responsible for the Department of Trade and Industry, when we get down to specifics in trying to attract a particular company to South Australia, and where that company may be a fairly large employer of a particular type of skilled trade or a semi-skilled trade, then as part of that negotiation we need to be able to promise to that future developer in this State a supply of skilled labour. For the first time under this Bill I believe it becomes quite feasible to tell a company that we are trying to attract to this State that we, in conjunction with the Federal Government, and with the contribution of finance also from the private employer, will now train specifically to meet the labour needs of that company, if it develops in this State. We have had discussions along those lines with a number of companies. This Bill sets up the broad principle by which we can carry out the training and so make such a commitment to those companies. That is an important new step. For so long we have simply tried to attract industry to a locality in the State. We have not considered the needs of that industry, particularly at present with a shortage of skilled tradesmen around. We have not considered the problems that those companies will face if they cannot get skilled labour. This Bill allows for that, and I think effectively and ultimately it will allow us to expand the work force of South Australia.

The member for Semaphore raised the point about

training tradesmen to train apprentices. I am delighted to be able to say to him that recently we have taken 32 skilled tradesmen from the Public Buildings Department and from the Engineering and Water Supply Department and put them through a specific training programme, so that they can train tradesmen through the Department of Further Education. We have pumped into the department an additional \$1 600 000. We are proposing to take on a substantial increase in the number of apprentices this year. In fact, the indication is that that will occur.

Further, we are looking to take on 400 people in pre-vocational training, for the first time using the facilities of the Department of Further Education. To do that, we need very quickly and rapidly to expand the supervisory staff in the Department of Further Education. To do that, we have gone to Government departments where there are skilled workers available and taken them from those departments. We have given them specialised training as tradesmen and have now put them into the Department of Further Education on a short-term basis. By short-term, I mean that they will remain whilst the need for training programmes exist.

The other point raised by the member for Semaphore was that the Bill did not specifically define what was pre-vocational training. The reason for that is that it needs to be left broad. For instance, in the metal trades there is very broad training in a number of areas as part of our pre-vocational training. It is not appropriate to try to define that, for to do so would mean we had to bring in new restrictions. The whole purpose and direction and emphasis of this Bill is to make sure that the system is flexible enough, while taking into account the needs of certain groups. We must have the flexibility to meet the needs of industry and the needs of our community in ensuring that people are being trained.

A point raised by the member for Albert Park concerned an advertisement in a British newspaper. I do not know of it, but I will carry out an investigation. It may be referring to some other State; there are certainly shortened apprenticeship courses in other States. For instance, I think in Western Australia one can complete an apprenticeship in three years as part of the rapid apprenticeship course.

In some ways today highlights and brings to an end 2½ years of hard work in trying to review the entire trade and commercial training system in this State. I remember sitting down 2½ years ago with a group of people who were concerned about training in this State and going through the apprenticeship system and determining the deficiencies of the system in great detail. After a series of meetings, we started to put down a policy. Today highlights the implementation of the Liberal Party's policy on industrial and commercial training, as we announced before the last election. It is a major step forward, but it is only the beginning. In my second reading explanation I highlighted a number of initiatives that had been taken by the Government to increase significantly apprenticeship training and other forms of industrial training in South Australia.

This morning I met the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, Mr. Ian Viner. We discussed a number of matters, the key one being that we need to train people for our natural resource development. The Minister has put out a statement as to what was agreed between the South Australian Government and the Federal Government in those discussions this morning. In particular, we have said that we will ask people who will be involved in large natural resource programmes or developments to, first, go through and assess their labour requirements, their skill requirements, and, secondly, to

take into account what role they should play, both during the construction phase and the operation phase, and how to train people to meet the skill requirements of our community.

I am also pleased to say that this morning I put to the Federal Minister a specific request that we set up specialised training facilities where there is a need in this State. I put to the Minister that there should be established on a joint funding basis between the Commonwealth and the State, and including private industry, a specialist welding training facility in South Australia and a training facility for injection moulding for the plastics industry in South Australia. Both of these are key industries, almost the key industries in relation to room for expansion in the manufacturing industry. I am delighted to say that the Minister has agreed to set up a joint working party between the State and Federal Governments, so that we can work through and determine whether assistance can be achieved. I am quite hopeful that assistance will be achieved in establishing those types of facilities.

However, I stress that this Bill is there to create the right framework; it does not solve our problems, but allows us to set up the mechanism to go out and take some major new initiatives, some of which we have already started, in particular, the need for pre-vocational training in South Australia. As I stressed in the second reading explanation, although it is a new initiative, this year we are taking on 400 young people under that section. The other important area, which still has been ignored by our community, is the need for re-training. I thank members for their constructive comments. I appreciate the thought that they have given to the Bill, and I would urge the Upper House to carefully consider the standard of debate and the comments that have been passed in this House when considering this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 15 passed.

Clauses 16—"Sub-committees."

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I move:

Page 7, line 43—leave out "employees" and insert "employers".

In subclause (4) the word "employees" is used in two places in connection with representation of interests, whereas one of those should refer to "employers", so that there are equal numbers of both employee representatives and employer representatives.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—"The Disciplinary Committee."

Mr. PETERSON: Is the committee directed only at the apprentice, or does the employer have some responsibility? Will he be involved as well, as a party to a contract of apprenticeship?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Basically, the Disciplinary Committee is there to deal with the employee, the apprentice, or the person with a contract of training, in terms of what discipline should be handed out for a breach of contract. There are penalties elsewhere on the employer. I would like the committee to be seen as a conciliatory sort of committee. There may be, for example, a problem involving a fault on both sides, and I see the committee as being the body that can negotiate and understand some of the problems that might develop.

It is being set up to act hastily. At present, all disciplinary matters go back to the Apprenticeship Commission, so the Full Commission deals with routine matters that should not be dealt with by a commission of that size and importance. We have set up a specialist committee to deal with these matters, and I think it will

expedite some of the problems that have developed in the past, and it will have the benefit of being a committee that specialises in this area.

Clause passed.

Clauses 19 and 20 passed.

Clause 21—"Training in declared vocations to be offered only under prescribed conditions."

The Hon. D. J. WRIGHT: Subclause (8) provides that the commission may enter into a contract of training, assuming the rights and obligations of an employer under the contract. My interpretation is that, whatever the circumstances may be, there is the right (it is not mandatory for the commission to do so) for it to enter into a contract if all parties agree to take over the obligations. Does that mean that the commission has a responsibility of finding further employment for that employee? What other obligations does it involve in relation to taking over such a contract?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The provision gives the commission the right to become a signatory to the indenture as an employer. That places immediately on the commission the responsibility which would go along with the responsibility of any employer. It would therefore be required, for instance, to pay wages as the nominal employer. There are a couple of areas where the commission would exercise power outside of this provision. Where, for economic reasons, an indenture has been cancelled by an existing employer, then automatically the commission would try to find a suitable replacement employer for the apprentice or trainee. That is done reasonably successfully under the Apprenticeship Commission, and it would be my intention that it would continue. It does not need the specific power here to do that.

If an apprentice has had his indenture cancelled because of economic circumstances, the apprentice involved has a right to finish his trade training, even though he does not have a formal indenture any longer. He can do that without having to sign a new indenture with the commission or any other employer. That sort of power is not required in this clause. This provision was put in specifically to cover circumstances where there might be a valid reason why the commission, on a short-term basis, should take over such an indenture agreement as the employer, to the mutual satisfaction of the apprentice and the commission.

Mr. PETERSON: This is an area I was worried about when I referred to vocational training. Here we have a situation where an employer shall not undertake to train a person in a declared vocation except in pursuance of a contract of training. Without a definition of a vocation, how do we define who needs a contract of training? When will these vocations be declared?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I do not think it is necessary to try to define vocations. It is a commonly used phrase in the language, and most people have a broad idea of what it means. It cannot be specific, because to be specific creates problems as to whether something is or is not a vocation.

Mr. Peterson: You've got to be specific, that's the problem.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The commission has the right to decide what is or what is not a vocation and to set up training accordingly. I would hate to see the commission bound by legal restrictions in defining what is or what is not a vocation. That would create the problem we are trying to overcome.

Clause passed.

Clauses 22 and 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Contract of training to provide for employment."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

Page 11—

Line 25—Leave out "A contract of training must provide for the employment" and insert "Subject to subsection (2), a contract of training must provide for the full-time employment".

Lines 27 to 29—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclauses as follows:

- (2) The commission may, upon the application of a party to a contract of training, reduce the hours of employment of an apprentice or other trainee under a contract of training.
- (3) A reduction in the hours of employment of an apprentice or other trainee shall not be made under subsection (2) unless the commission is satisfied that the reduction is justified by a deterioration in the economic circumstances affecting employment of apprentices or other trainees.

Subclause (2) states:

The commission may, upon the application of all parties to a contract of training, alter the contract so that it provides for part-time training instead of full-time training, or full-time training instead of part-time training.

My concern is that there is a development from within the employing class to create part-time occupations rather than full-time occupations. I do not believe that that is a satisfactory situation, nor do I believe that the clause should be totally opposed or deleted. I believe that there should be a protection that, in times of economic downturn, the employer and the employee can get together and reach agreement through the commission, which would allow the employer to reduce the working hours—but only in situations of economic downturn. If we do not have that provision, I would be afraid that, rather than have a discussion with the employee to work out something, the employer would retrench him. I object to the clause as drafted. I believe it would be an open sesame situation for employers to do deals with employees, especially young people who would not understand the situation and, rather than have full-time occupations, we would be running into too many part-time jobs.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I cannot accept the amendment. Again, I stress that this Bill is designed specifically to make sure that there are no concrete weights hanging around the commission to reduce the degree of flexibility. I think this sort of amendment imposes a new restriction which is most undesirable. I cannot think where it might be used in the apprenticeship area, but it might quite conceivably be used in a non-apprenticeship area where there is a specific contract of training.

A person may be undertaking training and employment on a part-time basis and, in such circumstances, he should be allowed to complete his training, including the contract of training, without inhibition. I cannot accept the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

New clause 24a—"Retrenchment of apprentices or other trainees."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

After clause 24—Insert new clause as follows:

- 24a. (1) Where, upon an application by an employer under this section, the commission is satisfied that it would, by reason of a deterioration in economic circumstances affecting the employment of apprentices or other trainees by that employer, be uneconomic for the employer to continue to employ an apprentice or other trainee under a contract of training, the commission shall certify to that effect and cause a copy

of the certificate to be served on all parties to the contract of training.

(2) Upon the making of a certificate under subsection (1) the employer shall be relieved of further obligations under the contract of training, and the commission shall succeed to the rights and obligations of the employer under the contract.

(3) Except as provided in this section, an employer is not entitled to retrench an apprentice or other trainee employed under a contract of training by reason of a deterioration in economic circumstances.

In a downturn situation, because of uneconomic circumstances, the employer can, under the last clause particularly, displace an employee in his employment. This new clause takes into consideration what happens to the employee in those circumstances. It provides that mandatorily they become employees of the commission. The Minister pointed out that, under clause 21 (8), there is a possible solution: the commission may make the employee an employee of the commission, but my amendment would give the employee the guarantee that, if he is discharged in these circumstances, well known to the employer, the commission, and the employee, the commission becomes the employer and takes all the responsibility for obligations, wages, and long service leave until the commission is able to replace that employee in some other occupation. I know that the Minister will object to my amendment, so I ask whether he will guarantee, perhaps by regulation, that the commission will provide that the training of the employee will be continued under its control.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I cannot accept the amendment, because it would cost the South Australian Government millions of dollars a year.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I thought the economy was booming at present.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: We have cut taxes as well. The commission would not have the resources or the training facilities to give that sort of training. For example, last year 50 trade apprentices left the building industry alone. There is nothing stopping a lad from finishing his formal technical training in a Department of Further Education institution, so it is not necessary to give that undertaking. I cannot guarantee that a lad will do so, because it is a personal choice, but the option is available.

New clause negatived.

Clause 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Discipline."

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I move:

Page 12—

Lines 9 and 10—Leave out "a person who is employed under a contract of training is, in the opinion of his employer," and insert "an employer has reasonable grounds to believe that an apprentice or other trainee employed by the employer under a contract of training is".

The amendment does not alter the meaning of the clause, but clarifies it. Mr. Gregory of the United Trades and

Labor Council expressed some concern about the original wording, and I believe that this amendment clarifies the position and overcomes Mr. Gregory's objection.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have an amendment standing in my name to delete the words "in the opinion of his employer", which would have put the employee in a very unsatisfactory position, because that was vague and uncertain. Someone could wake up in the morning and say, "I have an opinion that one of my employees is guilty of wilful and serious misconduct, and I will suspend him." There would be no objectivity and no proof would be required. The clause was weak in the first place. I do not know whether the Minister has taken notice of my amendment or whether he has thought about it, but I have looked closely at, and taken some advice on, his amendment. It serves the purpose, and I will not move the amendment standing in my name.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (27 to 33) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: During Question Time, I indicated to the members for Mitchell, Elizabeth and Whyalla that water testing had been carried out on a daily basis at Whyalla since the amoeba incident. I would like to clarify that the daily testing that has been occurring is chlorination testing to determine the accurate level of chlorine to ensure that the amoeba cannot live within that concentration. Before the incident, samples were taken on a weekly basis for testing for amoeba and other bacteriological contamination, and after the incident, immediately following 25 January, water supply samples were taken on 26, 28 and 30 January for tests for amoeba. Since no further amoeba have been identified in the system, the testing for amoeba has now reverted to a weekly basis—the same basis that exists in Port Augusta.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 24 February at 2 p.m.